

Submission 816 (Arthur Sohikian, North Los Angeles County Transportation Coalition Joint Powers Authority, NCTC, April 23, 2020)

Bakersfield - Palmdale - RECORD #816 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	5/19/2020
Affiliation Type :	Local Agency
Submission Date :	5/19/2020
Interest As :	Local Agency
Submission Method :	Public Hearing - Oral Comment
First Name :	Arthur
Last Name :	Sohikian
Professional Title :	Executive Director
Business/Organization :	North Los Angeles County Transportation Coalition Joint Powers Authority, NCTC
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	
State :	CA
Zip Code :	00000
Telephone :	
Email :	
Cell Phone :	
Email Subscription :	
Add to Mailing List :	Yes
EIR/EIS Comment :	Yes
Attachments :	816_Sohikian_OHTranscript.pdf (67 kb)

1 comments. It is important that you slowly and clearly
2 spell out your first and last name so the Court Reporter
3 can accurately capture your remarks. The Court Reporter
4 may interrupt you occasionally to ask you to spell an
5 unusual word or ask you to repeat something. This ensures
6 that your comment is accurately recorded.

7 Remember, you can always submit your comment
8 through our website, by email, or mail directly to the
9 Authority website at www.hsr.ca.gov.

10 At the end of each hour, we will take a ten-
11 minute break. I will announce the break and start time
12 each hour.

13 At this time, I'd like to give any elected
14 officials that are on the line the opportunity to provide
15 their comments first.

16 Okay, so I will go to the phone. And we have the
17 first commenter.

18 Arthur Sohikian, if you could spell out your
19 first and last name and name of the organization you are
20 with? Arthur, can you hear us?

21 MR. SOHIKIAN: Hold on. I got it. Yeah.
22 Can you hear me?
23 MS. TINOCO: Yes.
24 MR. SOHIKIAN: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.
25 Good afternoon. My name is Arthur Sohikian.

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Submission 816 (Arthur Sohikian, North Los Angeles County Transportation Coalition Joint Powers Authority, NCTC, April 23, 2020) - Continued

1 It's A-R-T-H-U-R, Sohikian, S-O-H-I-K-I-A-N. And I am the
 2 Executive Director of the North Los Angeles County
 3 Transportation Coalition Joint Powers Authority, NCTC. I
 4 know that was a mouthful but thank you. I appreciate the
 5 opportunity to give comments today.

816-869

6 On behalf of the North Los Angeles County
 7 Transportation Coalition JPA, I speak in support of the
 8 Bakersfield-to-Palmdale Section of the California High-
 9 Speed Rail Project. The NCTCJPA, representing Los Angeles
 10 County's 5th District, North Los Angeles County region, the
 11 Cities of Palmdale, City of Lancaster, and the City of
 12 Santa Clarita voted their unanimous support for this
 13 section at their July 22nd, 2019 Board of Governor's
 14 meeting. And we appreciate the working relationship we
 15 have had with California High-Speed Rail staff, including
 16 Ms. Gomez, who is here on the panel today.

816-870

17 The NCTC supports Alternative 2 with the Cesar
 18 Chavez National Monument design options, as depicted in the
 19 Draft Project Environmental Impact Report/Environmental
 20 Impact Statement, referred to as the DEIR/DEIS. With the
 21 release of the DEIR Bakersfield-to-Palmdale Section on
 22 February 28th, 2020, the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale,
 23 as well as Los Angeles County Public Works and Regional
 24 Planning Departments, have additional detailed comments
 25 and/or mitigation requests.

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

816-870

1 The NCTCJPA strongly urges the High-Speed Rail
 2 Authority staff carefully consider Lancaster, Palmdale, and
 3 L.A. County Public Works and Regional Planning comments and
 4 mitigation requests as you prepare the Final Bakersfield-
 5 to-Palmdale Section EIR/EIS.

816-871

6 In closing, CalSTA, the State Transportation
 7 Agency, announced this week the Transit and Intercity Rail
 8 Capital Program, TIRCP, grant of \$107 million grant award
 9 to the Metro/Metrolink Antelope Valley Line Capital and
 10 Service Improvements Project. The NCTC Board has allocated
 11 over \$116 million, roughly 53 percent of the total \$220
 12 million AVL Improvement Project costs.

13 As a funding partner, the NCTC has been working
 14 with Metro, Metrolink, and CalSTA on the projects included
 15 in the Lancaster Terminal Improvements at the Lancaster
 16 Metrolink Station. The NCTC strongly urges California
 17 High-Speed Rail Authority staff collaborate with Metro and
 18 Metrolink on the Lancaster Metrolink Station terminal
 19 improvements to avoid duplicative efforts and potential
 20 expensive delays.

21 We look forward to working with you and your
 22 staff throughout the environmental clearance process to
 23 make high-speed rail a reality for North Los Angeles
 24 County.

25 And then my contact information is provided. And

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Submission 816 (Arthur Sohikian, North Los Angeles County Transportation Coalition Joint Powers Authority, NCTC, April 23, 2020) - Continued

12

1 I'll also provide these comments in writing. So thank you
2 very much for your time today.

3 MS. TINOCO: Thank you, Arthur.

4 I'd like to remind those who would like to submit
5 a comment today to please use the "raise-your-hand" feature
6 at the bottom of your screen.

7 And if you've already provided a comment, to
8 please end your session on Zoom. You can also watch our
9 public hearing on our YouTube channel as well.

10 So next I'll be going to Ileene Anderson. If you
11 can spell out your first and last name and provide your
12 organization?

13 MS. ANDERSON: Good afternoon. Ileene Anderson,
14 I-L-E-E-N-E, Anderson, A-N-D-E-R-S-O-N. And I am here
15 representing the Center for Biological Diversity.

16 Today, I would like to request a further
17 extension on the comment period for at least a month after
18 this public meeting. The reasons for this are -- is that
19 complete appears that the document is over 15,000 pages
20 long. And, also, it is a document that tiers to the
21 programmatic EIR/EIS done for the whole high-speed rail.
22 So we just believe that, in order to actually provide
23 comments that are useful, we need to be able to understand
24 how the programmatic document interacts with this document.

25 And in addition, I have requested documents, such

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Response to Submission 816 (Arthur Sohikian, North Los Angeles County Transportation Coalition Joint Powers Authority, NCTC, April 23, 2020)

816-869

The commenter's support of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section of the HSR project, and specifically the Preferred Alternative, is acknowledged.

816-870

The commenter states that the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale as well as the Los Angeles County Public Works and Regional Planning Departments have additional detailed comments and/or mitigation requests, and asks that Authority staff consider them.

The Authority has considered and provided responses in this Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) to all comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS. Refer to the responses to local agency comments submitted by the City of Lancaster (Comment Letter 759), City of Palmdale (Comment Letters 779 and 820), and Los Angeles County (Comment Letters 787 and 788) to see how the Authority has considered their comments and recommended mitigation. Local agency comments and the Authority's responses are contained in Chapter 22 of this Final EIR/EIS.

816-871

The commenter also encourages the Authority to collaborate with the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) and Metrolink on the Lancaster Metrolink Station Terminal Improvements to avoid duplication of effort and delays.

The Authority fully supports continued coordination and collaboration with Metro, Metrolink, and the City of Lancaster to discuss issues related to the Lancaster Metrolink Station. To this end, coordination meetings with these stakeholders have occurred on June 18 and July 28, 2020. Future coordination meetings are planned with these stakeholders to discuss these issues.

Submission 817 (Ileene Anderson, Center for Biological Diversity, April 23, 2020)

Bakersfield - Palmdale - RECORD #817 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	5/19/2020
Affiliation Type :	Business and/or Organization
Submission Date :	4/23/2020
Interest As :	Business and/or Organization
Submission Method :	Public Hearing - Oral Comment
First Name :	Ileene
Last Name :	Anderson
Professional Title :	
Business/Organization :	Center for Biological Diversity
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	
State :	CA
Zip Code :	00000
Telephone :	
Email :	
Cell Phone :	
Email Subscription :	
Add to Mailing List :	Yes
EIR/EIS Comment :	Yes
Attachments :	817_Anderson_OHTranscript.pdf (66 kb)

817-878

817-879

1 I'll also provide these comments in writing. So thank you
 2 very much for your time today.

3 MS. TINOCO: Thank you, Arthur.
 4 I'd like to remind those who would like to submit
 5 a comment today to please use the "raise-your-hand" feature
 6 at the bottom of your screen.

7 And if you've already provided a comment, to
 8 please end your session on Zoom. You can also watch our
 9 public hearing on our YouTube channel as well.

10 So next I'll be going to Ileene Anderson. If you
 11 can spell out your first and last name and provide your
 12 organization?

13 MS. ANDERSON: Good afternoon. Ileene Anderson,
 14 I-L-E-E-N-E, Anderson, A-N-D-E-R-S-O-N. And I am here
 15 representing the Center for Biological Diversity.

16 Today, I would like to request a further
 17 extension on the comment period for at least a month after
 18 this public meeting. The reasons for this are -- is that
 19 complete appears that the document is over 15,000 pages
 20 long. And, also, it is a document that tiers to the
 21 programmatic EIR/EIS done for the whole high-speed rail.
 22 So we just believe that, in order to actually provide
 23 comments that are useful, we need to be able to understand
 24 how the programmatic document interacts with this document.

25 And in addition, I have requested documents, such

California Reporting, LLC
 (510) 224-4476

Submission 817 (Ileene Anderson, Center for Biological Diversity, April 23, 2020) - Continued

817-879

1 as the Biological and Aquatic Resources Technical Report,
2 and the Noise and Vibration Technical Report, via email and
3 have not received a response to date. We believe that,
4 actually, those types of reports should be available online
5 but we're unable to find them, hence, requesting them with
6 no responses.

817-880

7 The Impact Analysis also is not transparent and
8 we -- in how the decisions or the findings were made,
9 hence, the request for additional documentation. And at
10 this point, we disagree with the finding of no significant
11 impact with mitigation from the Biological Resources
12 section. We don't believe that it's supported in the EIR,
13 at least with the information that we have. We will be
14 submitting detailed comments to support our position on
15 this.

817-881

16 We also think that the alternatives are not
17 comprehensive in the respect that there was no alternative
18 analyzed on a tunnel-only alternative through the critical
19 wildlife connectivity area as identified by California
20 Department of Fish and Wildlife.

817-882

21 There are numerous other issues where we think
22 that the EIR/EIS does not meet CEQA/NEPA requirements. And
23 we'll be submitting detailed written comments on those.

817-883

24 Obviously, with more time, we'll be able to provide more
25 useful comments.

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

817-883

817-884

1 So in summation, at this time, we request
2 additional time to submit useful comments, at least 30 days
3 after today. We're very worried about the legal adequacy
4 of the DEIR/EIS at this time.

5 Thank you very much.

6 MS. TINOCO: Thank you.

7 We'll now go to the Mayor of City of Palmdale.

8 Steve Hofbauer, if you could spell out your first
9 and last name and then give your organization?

10 MAYOR HOFBAUER: Thank you. It's Steve, common
11 spelling, Hofbauer, H-O-F, as in Frank, -B, as in boy, -A-
12 U-E-R. I'm the Mayor of the City of Palmdale, California.

13 Is that coming through okay?

14 MS. TINOCO: Yes.

15 MAYOR HOFBAUER: Thank you. Okay. I would just
16 like to make a couple comments supportive of what Mr.
17 Sohikian had said. You know, the North County is in
18 unanimous support of this stretch of the high-speed rail.
19 The City of Palmdale has long been supportive of high-speed
20 rail. We are well invested and prepared for the arrival of
21 a high-speed rail in our community here.

22 You know, we've been working with Virgin Trains
23 USA for that eventual connection, along with Metro,
24 Metrolink, and SCAG to make this all come together. So we
25 have a station area plan that is going to be done later

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Response to Submission 817 (Ileene Anderson, Center for Biological Diversity, April 23, 2020)

817-878

Refer to Standard Response BP-Response-GENERAL-02: Public Outreach on the Draft EIR/EIS.

The commenter requests a further extension of the public review period. See BP-Response-GENERAL-02: Public Outreach on the Draft EIR/EIS.

The commenter further asks for clarification on the relationship of the Tier 1 documents to the Draft EIR/EIS. The Authority has used a tiered environmental review process to support tiered decisions for the high-speed rail (HSR) system. Tiering of environmental documents means addressing a broad program in a "Tier 1" environmental document, then analyzing the details of individual projects within the larger program in subsequent project-specific or "Tier 2" environmental documents. For more information about the tiering process and the Tier 1 documents, see Section S.2 and Section 1.1.2 of this Final EIR/EIS.

817-879

Per the commenter's request, a USB flash drive containing the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section technical reports was mailed on April 23, 2020 to the address provided. The Authority provided access to the technical reports at public libraries in the project vicinity, at the Authority's offices, and upon request. Electronic media containing these documents were made available, free of charge, to anyone who requested them in writing or via the project hotline.

817-880

The commenter does not believe the EIR/EIS is transparent in how findings and decisions were made regarding the impact analysis, as well as in its determination that biological impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. The commenter requested copies of the Biological and Aquatic Resources Technical Report and the Noise and Vibration Technical Report on April 15, 2020, but at the time of the public hearing had not yet received them.

While the commenter disagrees with the findings in the EIR/EIS that the project would result in no significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation, Section 3.7 in the EIR/EIS presents detailed analysis, which summarizes the findings of the Biological and Aquatic Resources Technical Report and its appendices. Specifically, Section 3.7.4 of this Final EIR/EIS discusses the methods of analysis used in the technical report; Section 3.7.4.2 of this Final EIR/EIS outlines the IAMFs that will be used during design, construction, and operations of the project; Section 3.7.6 of this Final EIR/EIS discusses the analysis of impacts on biological resources; and Sections 3.7.7, 3.7.7.1, and 3.7.7.2 of this Final EIR/EIS outline in detail mitigation measures designed to reduce those impacts. With the implementation of the impact avoidance and minimization features and mitigation measures, the Authority determined impacts on biological and aquatic resources would be less than significant.

Copies of the Biological and Aquatic Resources Technical Report and the Noise and Vibration Technical Report were sent to the Center for Biological Diversity. The additional comments provided by the commenter have been received and reviewed. Separate responses to those comments have been provided in this Final EIR/EIS.

Response to Submission 817 (Ileene Anderson, Center for Biological Diversity, April 23, 2020) - Continued

817-881

Refer to Standard Response BP-Response-GENERAL-01: Alternatives.

The 2010 Preliminary Alternatives Analysis Report (Authority 2010b) for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section identifies feasible and practicable HSR study alternatives to carry forward for environmental review and evaluation in the Draft EIR/EIS under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This included Alternative T3-2B through the Tehachapi Subsection. Table ES-1 of the 2010 Preliminary Alternatives Analysis Report shows that Alternative T3-2B had the least amount of elevated structure, but the most tunneling, so it had the highest capital cost; it had the lowest maintenance cost because of the least amount of elevated structure; and of the alternatives it would affect the fewest number of residential parcels; and would cross the most acres of endangered species habitat.

The 2012 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis Report (Authority 2012a, 2012b) presented a refined range of alternatives for the Antelope Valley alignment based on new information obtained since the 2010 study. The 2012 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis Report responded specifically to the Authority's concerns about reducing environmental impacts and overall project costs. Potential land use conflicts, wetland issues, and other potential environmental impacts, project purpose/objectives and requirements, and stakeholder input were considered in modifying the alternatives. In addition, the higher costs associated with elevated profiles and tunneling were reduced by increasing track grade; lowering alignment profiles and bringing them close to grade; and reducing tunnel length where possible. As a result, Alternative T3-2B, among other alternatives, was eliminated from further consideration. Section 2.3.12 of this Final EIR/EIS provides additional discussion of the range of alternatives considered.

817-882

The commenter states that they will submit detailed written comments on the Draft EIR/EIS. No changes to the EIR/EIS were made in response to this comment.

817-883

The commenter reiterates their request for a further extension of the public review period. Refer to Response to Comment 817-878, contained in this chapter.

817-884

The commenter states that they are "worried about the legal adequacy" of the Draft EIR/EIS.

The Authority used its best judgment in preparing this combined EIR/EIS to satisfy both NEPA and CEQA requirements.

NEPA requires federal agencies to consider the context and intensity of potential environmental impacts (both adverse and beneficial) in the evaluation of any proposed federal agency action. NEPA also obligates federal agencies to consider the environmental consequences and costs in their projects and programs as part of the planning process. The Authority carries out its obligations under NEPA through compliance with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (C.F.R. Title 40, Parts 1500–1508) implementing NEPA and Federal Railroad Administration's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (Federal Register Volume 64, Page 28545).

CEQA (C.C.R. 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.) require state and local agencies to identify the significant environmental impacts of their actions and to avoid or mitigate those impacts when feasible. California Public Resources Code Section 21100(b)(3) provides that an EIR shall include a statement setting forth the mitigation measures proposed to minimize the significant effects on the environment.

The requirements of NEPA and CEQA are not necessarily the same; similar requirements found in both statutes may have different performance criteria, and some requirements that appear in one statute may not appear in the other. In addition to NEPA and CEQA, the proposed project is subject to additional federal and state environmental statutes and regulations, which also require analyses that must be incorporated into the EIR/EIS. In circumstances where more than one regulation or statute might apply, this joint EIR/EIS has been prepared in compliance with the more stringent or inclusive set of requirements, whether federal or state, to ensure that all regulatory objectives are fully satisfied. Moreover, the Authority's policies require a rigorous technical and legal review prior to the publication of documents to help ensure the documents meet the regulatory guidelines and standards.

Response to Submission 817 (Ileene Anderson, Center for Biological Diversity, April 23, 2020) - Continued

817-884

The Draft EIR/EIS analyzes the environmental impacts and benefits of implementing the HSR System in the area between the Bakersfield and Palmdale stations. This analysis is based on site-specific and detailed analysis. Pursuant to U.S.C. Title 23 Section 327, under the NEPA Assignment Memorandum of Understanding between the Federal Railroad Administration and the State of California, effective July 23, 2019, the Authority is the project sponsor and the lead federal agency for compliance with NEPA and other federal laws for the HSR system, including the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section. The Authority is also the state lead agency under CEQA. Three cooperating agencies are included in the NEPA review process for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section: the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Land Management, and the Surface Transportation Board. Each of these cooperating agencies has reviewed the Draft EIR/EIS and found it adequate.

No changes to the text in the Draft EIR/EIS were made in response to this comment.

Submission 818 (Steve Hofbauer, City of Palmdale, April 23, 2020)

Bakersfield - Palmdale - RECORD #818 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	5/19/2020
Affiliation Type :	Elected Official
Submission Date :	4/23/2020
Interest As :	Local Elected
Submission Method :	Public Hearing - Oral Comment
First Name :	Steve
Last Name :	Hofbauer
Professional Title :	Mayor
Business/Organization :	City of Palmdale
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	
State :	CA
Zip Code :	00000
Telephone :	
Email :	
Cell Phone :	
Email Subscription :	
Add to Mailing List :	Yes
EIR/EIS Comment :	Yes
Attachments :	818_Hofbauer_OHTranscript.pdf (64 kb)

1 So in summation, at this time, we request
2 additional time to submit useful comments, at least 30 days
3 after today. We're very worried about the legal adequacy
4 of the DEIR/EIS at this time.
5 Thank you very much.
6 MS. TINOCO: Thank you.
7 We'll now go to the Mayor of City of Palmdale.
8 Steve Hofbauer, if you could spell out your first
9 and last name and then give your organization?
10 MAYOR HOFBAUER: Thank you. It's Steve, common
11 spelling, Hofbauer, H-O-F, as in Frank, -B, as in boy, -A-
12 U-E-R. I'm the Mayor of the City of Palmdale, California.
13 Is that coming through okay?
14 MS. TINOCO: Yes.
15 MAYOR HOFBAUER: Thank you. Okay. I would just
16 like to make a couple comments supportive of what Mr.
17 Sohikian had said. You know, the North County is in
18 unanimous support of this stretch of the high-speed rail.
19 The City of Palmdale has long been supportive of high-speed
20 rail. We are well invested and prepared for the arrival of
21 a high-speed rail in our community here.
22 You know, we've been working with Virgin Trains
23 USA for that eventual connection, along with Metro,
24 Metrolink, and SCAG to make this all come together. So we
25 have a station area plan that is going to be done later

818-885

818-886

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Submission 818 (Steve Hofbauer, City of Palmdale, April 23, 2020) - Continued

15

818-886

1 this summer or early fall. And that station plan is
2 designed to take all comers-in so that we can have a,
3 basically, relatively seamless transition. If you show up
4 on Metrolink and need to get on the high-speed rail, you
5 walk across the platform. If you want to get onto Virgin
6 Trains, you walk to another platform. It's all going to be
7 relatively seamless. And we're working with the
8 technology.

9 And I was, actually, quite impressed when the CEO
10 of High-Speed Rail spoke to looking at the technology and
11 the systems that places, like Virgin Trains, they're
12 successful and technology they've been using, so we're not
13 reinventing the wheel here.

818-887

14 So, nevertheless, I'll cut it short. And we
15 have -- Mike Behen is our Deputy City Manager. He can
16 provide some more technical details, but I just wanted to
17 get in and let you know that we're here and we're in
18 support.

19 Thank you.

20 MS. TINOCO: Thank you, Mayor.

21 I'd like to remind those who are online, if you
22 would like to submit a comment, please use the "raise-your-
23 hand" feature at the bottom of your screen. The Mayor's
24 comment was our last online comment right now.

25 I'll go to the phones next. You should hear a

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Response to Submission 818 (Steve Hofbauer, City of Palmdale, April 23, 2020)

818-885

The commenter's support of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section of the HSR project is acknowledged.

818-886

The commenter states that the City of Palmdale will develop a Station Area Plan starting in 2020, and that the City aims to provide a seamless transition for intermodal users of the HSR station in Palmdale. The Authority acknowledges the intention to develop an intermodal station area, and has been coordinating with the City of Palmdale to this effect, including providing funding for the Station Area Plan mentioned by the commenter. This comment does not pertain to the environmental analysis presented in the Draft EIR/EIS. No changes to the EIR/EIS were made in response to this comment.

818-887

The commenter's support of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section of the HSR project is acknowledged.

Submission 819 (Adam Livingston, Sequoia Riverlands Trust, April 23, 2020)

Bakersfield - Palmdale - RECORD #819 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	5/19/2020
Affiliation Type :	Business and/or Organization
Submission Date :	4/23/2020
Interest As :	Business and/or Organization
Submission Method :	Public Hearing - Oral Comment
First Name :	Adam
Last Name :	Livingston
Professional Title :	Director of Planning
Business/Organization :	Sequoia Riverlands Trust
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	
State :	CA
Zip Code :	00000
Telephone :	
Email :	
Cell Phone :	
Email Subscription :	
Add to Mailing List :	Yes
EIR/EIS Comment :	Yes
Attachments :	819_Livingston_OHTranscript.pdf (62 kb)

819-888

1 prompt that you're un-muted. That should queue you to give
 2 your comment.

3 So we'll go to our first caller. Please
 4 provide your spelling of your first and last name and your
 5 organization.

6 MR. LIVINGSTON: This Is Adam Livingston,
 7 Director of Planning and Policy with Sequoia Riverlands
 8 Trust.

9 And I just want to support the previous comment
 10 asking for an extension of the comment period. And that's
 11 all I have to add for now.

12 MS. TINOCO: Thank you.

13 I'll go to our second caller. You should hear an
 14 un-mute prompt. Please spell out your first and last name
 15 and the organization you're with.

16 Okay. I'll go to our third caller. You should
 17 hear yourself un-mute. Please spell out your first and
 18 last name, and the organization you're with, and provide
 19 your comment.

20 Okay. I will go to our third caller. If you
 21 hear yourself un-mute, please spell out the first and last
 22 name, and the organization you're with, and provide your
 23 comment.

24 MR. BEHEN: Good afternoon.
 25 (Call drops.)

California Reporting, LLC
 (510) 224-4476

Response to Submission 819 (Adam Livingston, Sequoia Riverlands Trust, April 23, 2020)

819-888

Refer to Standard Response BP-Response-GENERAL-02: Public Outreach on the Draft EIR/EIS.

The commenter requests a further extension of the public review period. Due to the uncertainty caused by the outbreak of COVID-19, the Authority extended the original public review period 15 days to end on April 28, 2020. This extension provided members of the public with additional time to review the Draft EIR/EIS and submit a comment. This is consistent with CEQA and NEPA requirements (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15080–15088, 40 C.F.R. 1506.6(c), and 40 C.F.R. 6.23 (c)(3)(vii)).

Submission 820 (Mike Behen, City of Palmdale, April 23, 2020)

Bakersfield - Palmdale - RECORD #820 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	5/19/2020
Affiliation Type :	Local Agency
Submission Date :	4/23/2020
Interest As :	Local Agency
Submission Method :	Public Hearing - Oral Comment
First Name :	Mike
Last Name :	Behen
Professional Title :	Deputy City Manager
Business/Organization :	City of Palmdale
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	
State :	CA
Zip Code :	00000
Telephone :	
Email :	
Cell Phone :	
Email Subscription :	
Add to Mailing List :	Yes
EIR/EIS Comment :	Yes
Attachments :	820_Behen_OHTranscript.pdf (65 kb)

1 MS. TINOCO: We heard you talking. Can you hear
2 us?
3 Okay. We'll go to our next caller. Please spell
4 out your first and last name and the organization you're
5 with.
6 Okay. That is all for all of our commenters
7 right now.
8 Again, if you'd like to submit a comment and
9 you're online, please use the "raise-your-hand" feature at
10 the bottom of your screen.
11 If you'd like to join us via phone, please use
12 the phone number on the screen or on our website at
13 www.hsr.ca.gov.
14 Until we get another commenter, we will be here
15 until we announce that commenter.
16 (Pause)
17 MR. BEHEN: Reaching out to telephone land. This
18 is Mike Behen. Can you hear me?
19 MS. GOMEZ: Yes, Mike, we can hear you now.
20 MR. BEHEN: Fantastic. Michael Behen,
21 M-I-C-H-A-E-L, Behen, B-E-H-E-N. I'm the Deputy City
22 Manager for the City of Palmdale.
23 I just wanted to say thank you for the
24 opportunity to speak today. And I know the technology is
25 super challenging, so I appreciate you guys using the

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Submission 820 (Mike Behen, City of Palmdale, April 23, 2020) - Continued

820-889

1 technology to get us to provide input.
 2 I'd like to start off by congratulating the
 3 Authority on the release of the environmental document, the
 4 Bakersfield-to-Palmdale document. It shows that we're
 5 making progress.

820-890

6 The City of Palmdale is a station city. And our
 7 station will be a connection point for the California High-
 8 Speed Rail Authority Project, Virgin Trains USA, Metrolink,
 9 Amtrak, Greyhound, and the Antelope Valley Transit
 10 Authority, and other modes of transportation.

820-891

11 As a general comment, the City of Palmdale would
 12 like to request that the final EIR document be consistent
 13 with our city's goals for future development. In
 14 particular, we're looking at street and grade separation
 15 designs. And we will provide additional details in our
 16 comment letter that will be forwarded to the Authority.

820-892

17 In closing, we'd like to say that high-speed rail
 18 is a much needed transportation option in the state and in
 19 this region. We are looking forward to working together to
 20 develop the best possible project. In particular, we'd
 21 like to mention that we appreciate the good working
 22 relationship with Rick Simon and Diana Gomez. There is a
 23 good exchange of information and we're appreciative of
 24 that.

25 And, like our Mayor said, Mayor Steve Hofbauer,

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

820-893

1 we support the California high-speed rail and have for many
 2 years. And we encourage the Authority, the Board, and all
 3 the workers who are making this project happen, stay the
 4 course. We believe that this is a truly a transformational
 5 project.

6 Thank you.

7 MS. TINOCO: Thank you.

8 I'll go back to our phone list. If you do hear
 9 the prompt that you're un-muted, that means that's your
 10 queue to submit your comment.

11 So our next caller, if you can spell out your
 12 first and last name and provide the organization that
 13 you're with?

14 Okay. Our next caller, once you hear yourself
 15 un-mute, please spell out your first and last name and
 16 provide the organization you're with.

17 UNIDENTIFIED CALLER: No comment.

18 MS. TINOCO: Okay. Thank you.

19 The next caller, once you hear the un-mute
 20 prompt, please spell out your first and last name and
 21 provide your comment.

22 MR. HIGHTOWER: Good afternoon. My name is Troy
 23 Hightower, T-R-O-Y H-I-G-H-T-O-W-E-R. I'll try and be
 24 brief in my comments.

25 First of all, I'm a long-time supporter of the

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Response to Submission 820 (Mike Behen, City of Palmdale, April 23, 2020)

820-889

The commenter offers congratulations for the release of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Draft EIR/EIS. This comment does not pertain to the environmental analysis presented in the Draft EIR/EIS.

820-890

The Authority has acknowledged the City's comment.

820-891

The commenter requests that the Final EIR/EIS be consistent with the City of Palmdale's goals for future development, in particular street and grade separation designs. This comment indicated that additional details will be provided in the formal letter forwarded to the Authority. Refer to Responses to Comments 779-438 and 779-443, contained in Chapter 22 of this Final EIR/EIS, which address the commenter's requests regarding the project's consistency with City of Palmdale planning documents.

820-892

The commenter's support of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section of the HSR project is acknowledged.

820-893

The commenter's support of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section of the HSR project is acknowledged.

Submission 821 (Troy Hightower, April 23, 2020)

Bakersfield - Palmdale - RECORD #821 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	5/19/2020
Affiliation Type :	Individual
Submission Date :	4/23/2020
Interest As :	Individual
Submission Method :	Public Hearing - Oral Comment
First Name :	Troy
Last Name :	Hightower
Professional Title :	
Business/Organization :	
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	
State :	CA
Zip Code :	00000
Telephone :	
Email :	
Cell Phone :	
Email Subscription :	
Add to Mailing List :	Yes
EIR/EIS Comment :	Yes
Attachments :	821_Hightower_OHTranscript.pdf (65 kb)

1 we support the California high-speed rail and have for many
2 years. And we encourage the Authority, the Board, and all
3 the workers who are making this project happen, stay the
4 course. We believe that this is a truly a transformational
5 project.

6 Thank you.

7 MS. TINOCO: Thank you.

8 I'll go back to our phone list. If you do hear
9 the prompt that you're un-muted, that means that's your
10 queue to submit your comment.

11 So our next caller, if you can spell out your
12 first and last name and provide the organization that
13 you're with?

14 Okay. Our next caller, once you hear yourself
15 un-mute, please spell out your first and last name and
16 provide the organization you're with.

17 UNIDENTIFIED CALLER: No comment.

18 MS. TINOCO: Okay. Thank you.

19 The next caller, once you hear the un-mute
20 prompt, please spell out your first and last name and
21 provide your comment.

22 MR. HIGHTOWER: Good afternoon. My name is Troy
23 Hightower, T-R-O-Y H-I-G-H-T-O-W-E-R. I'll try and be
24 brief in my comments.

25 First of all, I'm a long-time supporter of the

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Submission 821 (Troy Hightower, April 23, 2020) - Continued

821-894

1 high-speed rail project. I'm an independent transportation
2 consultant based in Bakersfield.

3 It's come to my attention when I began reviewing
4 the Bakersfield-Palmdale Draft EIR is that I noticed that
5 there's a gap between where the LGA was approved to the F
6 Street (phonetic) Station but does not continue the five
7 miles to Oswell Street, which is the beginning of the
8 Bakersfield-Palmdale segment.

9 So I have more of a question on how would people
10 from Bakersfield get to Palmdale if there's no approved
11 section between F Street and LGA -- I mean, and Oswell
12 Street? I do understand that the original hybrid Fresno-
13 Bakersfield segment that was approved does go to Oswell
14 Street.

15 And then, at the same time, I had the question:
16 How do people from Palmdale get to Bakersfield and beyond?

17 So these are questions that have come up. And
18 this is just recently. And I downloaded a map from the
19 High-Speed Rail station called Approved Project Local-
20 Generated Alternatives. And it does show the LGA approved
21 to the F Street Station, 34th and F Street, but it does not
22 continue to Oswell. And so I believe this would -- it
23 would -- it could be a significant concern as a gap, as
24 well as my understanding is that the Bakersfield-Palmdale
25 segment begins at Oswell Street.

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

821-894

1 In addition, and I'll close with this, I reviewed
2 the Supplemental Record of Decision from FRA on the LGA.
3 And they mention here that the approval stops at the
4 intersection of 34th Street and Oswell -- and F Street,
5 excuse me. And then following environmental evaluation of
6 Bakersfield-Palmdale, they anticipate future review, if at
7 all, of that gap between F Street and Oswell Street.

8 So I know that this may be technically outside of
9 the boundary of the Bakersfield-Palmdale segment. But I
10 think, operationally, and even going back to that
11 independent utility, that section must go from one station
12 to another. I'm not sure how that would work at this
13 point.

14 So I'm just bringing this to your attention.
15 It's something I'm still looking into. But I think it is a
16 matter that should be addressed.

17 Thank you.

18 MS. TINOCO: Thank you. Okay.

19 We'll go to our next caller. Please spell out
20 the first and last name and the organization you're with.

21 Okay. We'll go to our next caller. Please spell
22 out your first and last name and the organization you're
23 with. Can you hear us? No? Okay.

24 We'll go to our last caller on the phone list.

25 Please spell out your first and last name and the

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Response to Submission 821 (Troy Hightower, April 23, 2020)

821-894

On October 16, 2018, the Authority Board certified the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final Supplemental EIR and approved the portion of the Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated Alternative (F-B LGA) from just north of Poplar Avenue in Kern County up to and including the F Street Station (specifically, to the intersection of 34th Street and L Street in Bakersfield). As stated in Resolution #HSRA 18-17, the Authority Board reserved the decision on an alignment to the south and east of the F Street Station for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section of the HSR project. In November 2019, the Authority published the combined Supplemental Record of Decision/Final Supplemental EIS. With issuance of the Supplemental Record of Decision, the Authority, as NEPA lead agency, approved the portion of the F-B LGA from just north of Poplar Avenue in Kern County up to and including the F Street Station.

The Authority Board will consider CEQA and NEPA decisions on the portion of the F-B LGA from the intersection of 34th Street and L Street to Oswell Street at the time it takes action on the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section. Analysis for the portion of the F-B LGA from the intersection of 34th Street to L Street and Oswell Street was presented in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Supplemental EIR/EIS, and this Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Final EIR/EIS summarizes that analysis. This Final EIR/EIS therefore includes the IAMFs and mitigation measures described in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Supplemental EIR/EIS. Consideration of the F-B LGA analyses in conjunction with the analyses performed for the B-P Build Alternatives, which includes measures that conform to the Authority's programmatic IAMFs (Appendix 2-E) and Standardized Mitigation Measures (Appendix 3.1-A), will inform the Authority Board's decision on the project.

Therefore, there will not be a "gap" between the F Street Station and Oswell Street; the decision on the portion of the HSR alignment between the intersection of 34th Street and L Street in Bakersfield and Oswell Street will be made alongside the decision on the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section alignment, and the station-to-station alignment will be continuous.

Submission 822 (Susan Greenfeld, April 23, 2020)

Bakersfield - Palmdale - RECORD #822 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	5/19/2020
Affiliation Type :	Individual
Submission Date :	4/23/2020
Interest As :	Individual
Submission Method :	Public Hearing - Oral Comment
First Name :	Susan
Last Name :	Greenfeld
Professional Title :	
Business/Organization :	
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	
State :	CA
Zip Code :	00000
Telephone :	
Email :	
Cell Phone :	
Email Subscription :	
Add to Mailing List :	Yes
EIR/EIS Comment :	Yes
Attachments :	822_Greenfield_OHTranscript.pdf (65 kb)

1 organization you're with. No? Okay.

2 As a reminder, if you would like to just watch

3 the public hearing and listen in to the comments, you can

4 go to our YouTube channel. That's so that you can just

5 view the public hearing from that channel.

6 If you'd like to submit a comment today, please

7 participate with us online. You can see the link on your

8 screen, or you can call in using the phone number on the

9 screen, and there's a webinar I.D. as well. This

10 information is on our website at www.hsr.ca.gov.

11 (Pause)

12 MS. TINOCO: Okay. We have one person on the

13 phone.

14 Once you hear the un-mute prompt, that is your

15 queue that you are ready to give your comment. If you can

16 spell out your first and last name and the organization

17 you're with?

18 MS. GREENFIELD: Hi. Are you able to hear me?

19 MS. TINOCO: Yes.

20 MS. GREENFIELD: Good afternoon. My name is

21 Susan Greenfield. I'm representing myself.

22 I am calling in about Section 3-5,

23 Electromagnetic Interference and Electromagnetic Fields.

24 And in the summary of the report section, the report

25 states,

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Submission 822 (Susan Greenfeld, April 23, 2020) - Continued

822-895

1 "Population and facilities close to the high-speed
2 rail could experience effects from exposure to EMI and
3 EMF, including medical laboratories, research,
4 technology parks, dense housing developments, schools
5 and colleges, electric power lines."

6 The report does not indicate the effects, the
7 impact, or what close means. Can you add some clarity to
8 this?

9 MS. TINOCO: So for today's hearing, we are only
10 receiving comments. Our panelists are not able to provide
11 any answers to questions today. But we will take your
12 comment and include that in our final environmental
13 document.

14 MS. GREENFIELD: Okay. So, I guess, let me help
15 you with the comment. I don't know if you're recording
16 this or writing it down.

822-895

17 My comment is the report does not describe the
18 amount of EMI/EMS that would be generated, nor the
19 recommended distance. The report does not indicate, in my
20 reading, any effort made to reduce the EMI and EMF impacts.
21 I didn't see that in the report. And the report implies,
22 or I infer, that all existing facilities that are close
23 will, at their own cost, construct materials to prevent the
24 wavelengths from penetrating the facilities. And I'm
25 specifically referring to the medical facilities the

822-895

1 educational facilities, the health facilities.

2 Thank you for this opportunity.

3 MS. TINOCO: Thank you.

4 I'd like to remind those of you who are online,
5 if you'd like to submit a comment today, please use the
6 "raise-your-hand" feature at the bottom of your screen, so
7 that flags us that you're wanting to provide a comment.

8 For those who would like to call in, please look
9 for the prompt, that you're un-muted, to provide your
10 comment.

11 (Pause)

12 MS. TINOCO: Okay. We have a commenter online.
13 If you can, Lisa (phonetic), please spell out your first
14 and last name, and the organization you're with, and
15 provide your comment? Lisa, can you hear us? No? Okay.
16 We'll try you again a little bit later.

17 (Pause)

18 MS. TINOCO: Okay. We are going to break
19 momentarily. We'll return at four o'clock.

20 Again, those who have joined online, if you'd
21 like to submit a comment, please use the "raise-your-hand"
22 feature at the bottom of your screen.

23 Again, today, our panelists are not answering
24 questions or providing a presentation. The reason for our
25 public hearing today is just to receive comments that we'll

Response to Submission 822 (Susan Greenfeld, April 23, 2020)

822-895

The commenter indicates that the Draft EIR/EIS does not describe the amount of electromagnetic interference/electromagnetic field (EMI/EMF) that would be generated, the recommended distance, or any effort to reduce EMI/EMF impacts. The commenter is specifically referring to such impacts on the medical, educational, and health facilities in the vicinity.

Section 3.5 of this Final EIR/EIS provides an analysis of potential impacts on nearby sensitive uses due to EMI/EMF generated by the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section of the HSR system. Specifically, in Section 3.5, under the Summary of Results subheading, the text indicates analysis was conducted for "...populations and facilities close to the HSR system that could experience effects from exposure to HSR-related EMI and EMFs include medical laboratories, research and technology parks, dense housing developments, schools and colleges, employees, underground pipelines and cables, fences, and existing railroads." In order to determine existing ambient levels of EMI/EMF, magnetic fields were measured in various areas along the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section as described in Section 3.5.5.2, Local Conditions, and as shown on Figure 3.5-1, EMI/EMF Measurement Site Locations. Section 3.5.5.3 Receivers Susceptible to Electromagnetic Interference/Electromagnetic Fields/Radio Frequency Interference Effects, indicates that uses with unshielded equipment that is sensitive to magnetic field strengths in the range of 1 to 3 milligauss (e.g., magnetic resonance imaging systems), interference is possible at distances of up to approximately 200 feet from the centerline of the HSR right-of-way. For the most-sensitive electron-beam microscopes, which are sensitive to magnetic field strengths in the range of 0.1 to 0.3 milligauss, interference would be possible to approximately 700 feet from the centerline of the HSR right-of-way. Based on these distances of possible impact, a review of land uses along the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section identified a total of 7 potentially sensitive receptors within the 500-foot screening distance of the project. These facilities included:

1. Edison Middle School, Edison Road, Bakersfield (460 feet)
2. Antelope Valley Enrichment Services, Sierra Highway and Jackson Street, Lancaster (320 feet)
3. Lancaster Sheriff's Station, Sierra Highway and Lancaster Boulevard, Lancaster (375 feet)

822-895

4. Family Urgent Care, Sierra Highway and Avenue J, Lancaster (150 feet)
5. University of Antelope Valley, Sierra Highway and Avenue J8, Lancaster (330 feet)
6. North Valley Veterinary Clinic, Sierra Highway and Avenue K, Lancaster (190 feet)
7. Charter College, Business Center Parkway and Avenue K8, Lancaster (490 feet)

Analysis of Impact EMI/EMF #5 determined that the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not result in changes of EMI/EMF in exceedance of the established thresholds at the sensitive receptors as listed above; therefore, impacts would be less than significant under CEQA. EMI/EMF-IAMF#2 would be implemented as part of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section to ensure that sensitive uses would not be affected by EMI/EMF generated by the project. EMI/EMF-MM#1, described in Section 3.5.7 of this Final EIR/EIS, would be implemented in the final design to include suitable design provisions of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section to prevent EMI impacts on sensitive uses affected by EMI/EMF. No revisions have been made to this Final EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

No revisions have been made to this Final EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

Submission 823 (Tina McIntyre, CalPortland Company, April 23, 2020)

Bakersfield - Palmdale - RECORD #823 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	5/19/2020
Affiliation Type :	Business and/or Organization
Submission Date :	4/23/2020
Interest As :	Business and/or Organization
Submission Method :	Public Hearing - Oral Comment
First Name :	Tina
Last Name :	McIntyre
Professional Title :	
Business/Organization :	CalPortland Company
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	
State :	CA
Zip Code :	00000
Telephone :	
Email :	
Cell Phone :	
Email Subscription :	
Add to Mailing List :	Yes
EIR/EIS Comment :	Yes
Attachments :	822_McIntyre_OHTranscript.pdf (67 kb)

1 their comments.

2 And, again, if you are online, you can use the

3 "raise-your-hand" feature at the bottom of your screen.

4 That will let us know that you would like to provide a

5 comment.

6 If you are calling in over the phone and would

7 like to provide a comment, I will un-mute you. You should

8 hear a prompt and that will be your queue to provide your

9 comment. If you would like to simply listen in, please let

10 us know that you would like to not provide a comment and

11 we'll move on to the next caller.

12 So we have someone on the phone. If you can

13 spell out your first and last name, and the organization

14 you're with, and provide your comment?

15 MS. MCINTYRE: Tina McIntyre, T-I-N-A

16 M-C-I-N-T-Y-R-E. I'm with CalPortland Company.

17 MS. TINOCO: Thank you. If you could provide

18 your comment?

19 MS. MCINTYRE: Thank you. On behalf of

20 CalPortland Company, I'm here to convey our strong

21 opposition to the preferred alternatives in the

22 Bakersfield-to-Palmdale Draft Environmental Impact

23 Report/Environmental Impact Statement.

24 In 2018, our counsel submitted an official letter

25 to Chairman Richards and the Board, outlining our official

823-896

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Submission 823 (Tina McIntyre, CalPortland Company, April 23, 2020) - Continued

823-896

1 position on this matter, and will do so again during the
2 current public review period. The preferred alternative
3 crosses through current and future mining operations on
4 CalPortland's land. Our detailed review of the preferred
5 alternative determined that it will result in severe
6 financial, safety, and environmental impacts, and fails to
7 comply with CEQA and NEPA.

823-897

8 CalPortland is one of the largest businesses in
9 the local community. The Mojave cement plants and quarries
10 have been operating since 1955 and provides employment
11 equivalent to 200 full-time employees and contractors.
12 Under the preferred alternative alignment and necessary
13 safety buffers, CalPortland would suffer approximately 6.2
14 years of lost mines and cement plant life, and gross
15 revenue loss of \$1.2 billion.

16 The effects of this revenue loss would not only
17 adversely impact CalPortland but also the workers at the
18 plants and quarries, the Mojave community downstream
19 customers, such as ready-mix concrete producers, building
20 product manufacturers, in addition to Caltrans paving
21 projects, and other consumers with cement who could be
22 forced to pay higher prices in a less competitive cement
23 market.

823-898

24 The preferred alternative route is not feasible
25 from engineering and safety perspectives. CalPortland

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

823-898

1 Mojave quarries are surface mines with active pits running
2 approximately 1,000 feet below the surface. The preferred
3 alternative called to the constructions of portions of the
4 route adjacent to current pits, roads, conveyor designs,
5 and through plant material stockpiles. The Draft EIR/EIS
6 states there will be an underground, 220-foot exclusion
7 zone around the B-to-P build alternative tunnel structures
8 to provide a buffer from drilling and blasting excavation
9 activities. But this is still not a sufficient safety
10 buffer zone.

11 CalPortland recommends the minimum underground
12 blast buffer of 640 feet, not 220 feet. The 220-foot
13 blasting exclusion zone is simply inadequate to protect the
14 trains. CalPortland recommends a 1,500-foot buffer zone
15 between the surface rail line and quarries as flyrock and
16 vibration from mining blast areas can strike the rail
17 tracks or trains, resulting in potential derailment and
18 other significant hazards, including fatalities.

19 High-Speed Rail Authority has failed to include
20 surface safety buffer zones in their analysis. We are
21 aware of a fatality at a mine from blast flyrock that came
22 through a pickup trucks roof parked 1,200 feet from the
23 quarry blast zone.

823-899

24 CalPortland has met with High-Speed Rail
25 representatives on several occasions to discuss and

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Submission 823 (Tina McIntyre, CalPortland Company, April 23, 2020) - Continued

823-899

1 illustrate our concerns but the meetings have not resulted
2 in any changes to the preferred alternative.

3 We welcome the opportunity to work with High-
4 Speed Rail Authority to assist in avoiding the significant
5 impacts of the preferred alternative in the Draft EIR/EIS.

6 Thank you.

7 MS. TINOCO: Thank you. Okay.

8 As a reminder, as soon as we get another
9 commenter, we'll announce them. For now, this public
10 hearing is just to receive comments. We will not be giving
11 a presentation or answering questions.

12 (Pause)

13 MS. TINOCO: If you are calling in the phone and
14 wish to provide a comment, I will un-mute your line. If
15 you do not wish to give a comment, simply say, "No
16 comment," and we'll move on to the next caller.

17 So for the first caller, if you can provide your
18 first and last name and spelling and the name of your
19 organization?

20 Okay.

21 (Pause)

22 MS. TINOCO: Again, I'd like to remind those of
23 you were online, if you wish to provide a comment on
24 today's public hearing, please use the "raise-your-hand"
25 feature at the bottom of your screen. That will let us

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Response to Submission 823 (Tina McIntyre, CalPortland Company, April 23, 2020)

823-896

Refer to Standard Response BP-Response-GENERAL-04: General Information on the Right-of-Way and Relocation Processes for Residential and Business Displacements.

The purpose of the Draft EIR/EIS is to analyze the potential impacts of a range of reasonable alternatives (C.C.R. Title 14, Section 15126.6; 40 C.F.R. 1502.14(a)). Under CEQA, the alternatives are to include a No Project Alternative and a range of potentially feasible alternatives that would (1) feasibly accomplish most of the project's basic objectives and (2) avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the project's significant adverse effects (C.C.R. Title 14, Section 15126.6(c)). Under NEPA, the Draft EIR/EIS is required to analyze reasonable alternatives to the proposed action as well as the No Action Alternative. (40 C.F.R. 1502.14.). Pursuant to Section 14(l) of the Federal Railroad Administration's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (FRA 1999), these include "all reasonable alternative courses of action that could satisfy the [project's] purpose and need" (Federal Register Volume 64, Page 28546). There is no minimum number of alternatives that must be considered in an EIS. In the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Draft EIR/EIS, potential alternatives were evaluated against the HSR System screening criteria (travel time, route length, intermodal connections, capital costs, operating costs, and maintenance costs). Screening also included environmental criteria to measure the potential effects of the proposed alternatives on the natural and human environment.

The commenter expresses concerns about impacts on CalPortland property. Coordination with CalPortland has been ongoing during the development of the EIR/EIS and has included a number of meetings. The objectives of this coordination has been to learn about CalPortland's concerns. The most recent meetings were in June 2020. The Preferred Alternative identified in the Draft EIR/EIS continues to be the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIR/EIS. This alternative minimizes impacts along the entire corridor, though it does continue to cross CalPortland property. In response to comments received from CalPortland and CalPortland's counsel, the Authority has made several small refinements to the alternatives (refer to Appendix 3.1-B), including refinements that further reduced impacts on the CalPortland property.

Following existing transportation and utility corridors has been a foundational component of the HSR System and project section planning. The planning process has been

823-896

documented beginning with the Statewide Program EIR/EIS (Authority and FRA 2005), and continuing through the Bay Area to Central Valley Program EIR/EIS (Authority and FRA 2008), and the project-level EIR/EISs. Proposition 1A's HSR performance criteria emphasize following existing transportation or utility corridors to the extent feasible, as determined by the Authority, as a mechanism to reduce impacts on communities and the environment (Public Utilities Code Section 2704.09). The Authority has maximized the use of existing transportation corridors where feasible to minimize potential impacts. This approach is balanced with considerations of minimizing potential impacts on urbanized areas (typically, noise impacts and residential and business displacements). However, many existing rail corridors do not have curve radii long enough to support HSR operation or the existing rail corridors do not allow HSR operation to maintain the speeds necessary to meet the Proposition 1A travel-time requirements. Consequently, an HSR alignment following such existing rail corridors would not be able to meet the project's purpose and need. Additionally, safety considerations dictate the need to separate HSR from roads and conventional rail (refer to Section 2.3.5, Grade Separations, of this Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Final EIR/EIS).

The Draft EIR/EIS provided a comparison of the relative differences among physical and operational characteristics and potential environmental consequences associated with the four B-P Build Alternatives, the two design options, and the portion of the Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated Alternative from the intersection of 34th Street and L Street and Oswell Street in Bakersfield. The physical and operational characteristics include alignment, length, capital cost, constructability, and operational issues. The potential environmental impacts include transportation-related topics (air quality and global climate change, noise and vibration, and energy), human environment (land use and community impacts including property acquisitions and displacements, farmlands and agriculture, aesthetics and visual resources, socioeconomic including business impacts, utilities and public services, and hazardous materials and wastes), cultural resources (archaeological resources and historical properties) and paleontological resources, natural environment (geology and seismic hazards, hydrology and water resources, biological and aquatic resources), and Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) resources (parklands, recreation areas, wildlife/waterfowl refuges, and historical sites).

As discussed in Section 8.3.1, Preferred Alternative, of this Bakersfield to Palmdale

Response to Submission 823 (Tina McIntyre, CalPortland Company, April 23, 2020) - Continued

823-896

Project Section Final EIR/EIS, the Authority identified the Preferred Alternative by balancing the adverse and beneficial impacts of the project on the human and natural environment. There was no single determining factor in identifying the Preferred Alternative because of the many issues considered and the varied input received from stakeholders on each of the four B-P Build Alternatives. Furthermore, many impacts on the natural environment and community resources would be the same, or very similar, across all four B-P Build Alternatives and, therefore, do not always provide enough meaningful information to distinguish between the relative merits of the B-P Build Alternatives. Due to the similarity of the four B-P Build Alternatives, in order to identify a Preferred Alternative, various differentiators were determined based on stakeholder, agency, and community input. The Authority weighed all of the issues, including natural resource and community impacts, the input of the communities along the route, the input of federal and state resource agencies, project costs, constructability, and differentiators to identify the B-P Build Alternative best suited to achieve the project's purpose and need.

At the October 16, 2018 Authority Board meeting, the Authority Board concurred with Authority staff that Alternative 2 with the César E. Chávez National Monument Design Option (CCNM Design Option) is the Authority's Preferred Alternative for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section. Through ongoing Section 106 consultation for César E. Chávez National Monument/Nuestra Señora Reina de la Paz (La Paz) after the Authority Board's action on October 16, 2018, the Authority developed the Refined CCNM Design Option, which is also analyzed in this Final EIR/EIS. Because the Refined CCNM Design Option avoids adverse effects at La Paz, Alternative 2 with the Refined CCNM Design Option is the Authority's Preferred Alternative for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section (Figure 8-1 of this Final EIR/EIS). This refinement to the Authority's Preferred Alternative is consistent with Resolution #HSRA 18-18, wherein the Authority Board directed Authority staff to "continue to consult and collaborate with the Cesar Chavez Foundation, and other consulting parties, regarding the CCNM Design Option."

The Authority used the information in the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Draft EIR/EIS and input from federal, state, and local agencies and the public to identify the Preferred Alternative designated in this Final EIR/EIS. The Authority's decision included

823-896

consideration of the project purpose and need and the project objectives presented in Chapter 1, Project Purpose Need, and Objectives, of the Draft EIR/EIS, as well as the objectives and criteria in the alternatives analysis and the comparative potential for environmental impacts. Table 8-A-1 in Appendix 8-A of this Final EIR/EIS compares the various criteria evaluated in the EIR/EIS for Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5. Section 8.3.1.3 of this Final EIR/EIS compares the various criteria evaluated in this Final EIR/EIS for the CCNM Design Options relative to the common alignment shared by Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5 in the vicinity of La Paz.

For more information about acquisitions, see BP-Response-GENERAL-04: General Information on the Right-of-Way and Relocation Processes for Residential and Business Displacements.

Refer to Responses to Comments 804-711 through 804-730, contained in Chapter 25 of this Final EIR/EIS.

Response to Submission 823 (Tina McIntyre, CalPortland Company, April 23, 2020) - Continued

823-897

Refer to Standard Response BP-Response-GENERAL-01: Alternatives.

This comment states that under the Preferred Alternative alignment and necessary safety buffers, CalPortland Cement Company would suffer approximately 6.2 years of lost mines and cement plant life, as well as gross revenue loss of \$1.2 billion, and that this revenue loss would not only adversely affect CalPortland but also the workers and consumers who would be forced to pay higher prices in a less competitive cement market. The Authority acknowledges CalPortland's concerns and will continue to work with the company to address its concerns.

Alternative 3 varies from Alternatives 1, 2, and 5 just south of Tehachapi in the vicinity of the CalPortland Cement Company property, where the alignment is approximately 3,000 feet west of Alternatives 1, 2, and 5, placing the HSR route closer to Tehachapi Willow Springs Road. Alternative 3 also has the design objective to identify a different alignment through the CalPortland property, which locates the HSR alignment further away from the company's active limestone quarry and closer to Tehachapi Willow Springs Road. Although Alternative 3 combines transportation corridors between the HSR alignment and Tehachapi Willow Springs Road, it would potentially result in a greater disruption to existing operations at the CalPortland property than Alternatives 1, 2, and 5. In response to a comment on the Draft EIR/EIS from CalPortland Cement Company, the project design for Alternatives 1, 2, and 5 has been revised to provide for construction of a cover extending 1,700 feet from the north portal of Tunnel #9 to protect the HSR infrastructure from the potential for damage from flyrock.

Although the alternatives analysis evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives, not all impacts on individual properties could feasibly be avoided. Refer to Responses to Comments 804-711 through 804-730, contained in Chapter 25 of this Final EIR/EIS.

823-898

The commenter recommends the minimum underground blast exclusion zone at the CalPortland mining area be 640 feet, not 220 feet as stated in the Draft EIR/EIS. The Authority has determined that a minimum 220-foot exclusion zone would be required for Tunnel #9 that traverses through CalPortland's operational area. This exclusion zone permits CalPortland to continue blasting operations for mineral resource recovery up to a distance of 220 feet from the HSR tunneling. In response to a comment on the Draft EIR/EIS from CalPortland Cement Company, the project design for Alternatives 1, 2, and 5 has been revised to provide for construction of a cover extending 1,700 feet from the north portal of Tunnel #9 to protect the HSR infrastructure from the potential for damage from flyrock. For additional details of the design refinements made between the publication of the Draft EIR/EIS and the release of this Final EIR/EIS, refer to the Preface, Chapter 2, and Appendix 3.1-B. During final design, the Authority will coordinate with CalPortland to obtain information (e.g., blasting details, vibration monitoring data, and geotechnical data) that would refine the detailed engineering design for the exclusion zone.

Refer to Responses to Comments 804-711 through 804-730, contained in Chapter 25 of this Final EIR/EIS.

823-899

The commenter notes that they have met with the Authority to discuss alternatives but have not achieved their goals to change the Preferred Alternative. The commenter expresses a desire to meet further with the Authority to continue to discuss changes to the Preferred Alternative.

The Authority will continue to work with stakeholders as it finalizes the project.

Refer to Responses to Comments 804-711 through 804-730, contained in Chapter 25 of this Final EIR/EIS.

Submission 824 (John Spalding, Kern-Inyo-Mono County Building and Construction Trades Council, April 23, 2020)

Bakersfield - Palmdale - RECORD #824 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	5/19/2020
Affiliation Type :	Local Agency
Submission Date :	4/23/2020
Interest As :	Local Agency
Submission Method :	Public Hearing - Oral Comment
First Name :	John
Last Name :	Spalding
Professional Title :	
Business/Organization :	Kern-Inyo-Mono County Building and Construction Trades Council
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	
State :	CA
Zip Code :	00000
Telephone :	
Email :	
Cell Phone :	
Email Subscription :	
Add to Mailing List :	Yes
EIR/EIS Comment :	Yes
Attachments :	823_Spalding_OHTranscript.pdf (62 kb)

824-900

1 p.m., so it is normal to hear silence as we wait for
2 commenters to join online or by phone.

3 Again, if you'd like to comment today, please use
4 the "raise-your-hand" feature at the bottom of your screen
5 and I will call on your name.

6 We may repeat these instructions from time to
7 time throughout the hour for those who are just joining us.

8 Thank you.

9 (Pause)

10 MS. TINOCO: Okay. We will go to our phone list.

11 Again, if you're calling in on the phone, you
12 will hear a prompt that you're now un-muted, so that is
13 your queue to give your comment. But if you wish to not
14 give a comment over the phone, simply say, "No comment,"
15 and we'll move on to our next caller or commenter.

16 So on the phone, if you can please spell out your
17 first and last name and organization you're with?

18 MR. SPALDING: John Spalding, Kern-Inyo-Mono
19 County Building and Construction Trades Council.

20 Support the EIR.

21 MS. TINOCO: Thank you.

22 (Pause)

23 MS. GOMEZ: Good afternoon. My name is Diana
24 Gomez, the Central Valley Regional Director for the
25 California High-Speed Rail Authority. I'd like welcome and

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Response to Submission 824 (John Spalding, Kern-Inyo-Mono County Building and Construction Trades Council, April 23, 2020)

824-900

The commenter expresses support of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section of the HSR project.

Submission 825 (John Joyce, Rosamond News, April 23, 2020)

Bakersfield - Palmdale - RECORD #825 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	5/19/2020
Affiliation Type :	Business and/or Organization
Submission Date :	4/23/2020
Interest As :	Business and/or Organization
Submission Method :	Public Hearing - Oral Comment
First Name :	John
Last Name :	Joyce
Professional Title :	
Business/Organization :	Rosamond News
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	
State :	CA
Zip Code :	00000
Telephone :	
Email :	
Cell Phone :	
Email Subscription :	
Add to Mailing List :	Yes
EIR/EIS Comment :	Yes
Attachments :	825_Joyce_OHTranscript.pdf (65 kb)

1 unusual word or ask you to repeat something. This ensures
2 that your comment is accurately recorded.

3 Remember, you can always submit your comment
4 through our website, by email, or by mail. Please visit
5 our website for more details at www.hsr.ca.gov.

6 At the end of each hour, we will take a ten-
7 minute break. I will announce the break and start time
8 each hour.

9 This public hearing will continue until 8:00
10 p.m., so it is normal to hear silence as we wait for
11 commenters to join online or by phone.

12 Again, if you'd like to comment today, please use
13 the "raise-your-hand" feature at the bottom of your screen
14 and I will call on your name.

15 We may repeat these instructions from time to
16 time throughout the hour for those who are just joining us.

17 Thank you.

18 (Pause)

19 MS. TINOCO: Okay. It looks like we have a
20 comment.

21 Joyce, if you can spell out your first and last
22 name, and the organization you're with, and provide your
23 comment? Okay, Joyce, if you can un-mute yourself?

24 MR. JOYCE: How's that?

25 MS. TINOCO: Perfect.

*California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476*

Submission 825 (John Joyce, Rosamond News, April 23, 2020) - Continued

1 MR. JOYCE: John, J-O-H-N, Joyce, J-O-Y-C-E. The
2 organization is Rosamond News.

3 For those of you that don't know where Rosamond
4 is, it's down near the Los Angeles County Line on Highway
5 14. The high-speed rail goes right through Rosamond on its
6 way to Palmdale.

7 I have three comments.

825-901

8 The first one has to do with the EIR that seems
9 to indicate that homes around Avenue A can be duplicated
10 across the line in Los Angeles County near Lancaster and
11 Palmdale. That's not true. The homes in Kern County are
12 valued much less. It would be difficult to replicate or
13 duplicate a Kern County home down in L.A. County. Some
14 thought needs to be given for that because about 15 homes
15 are going to have to be taken for the high-speed rail.

825-902

16 My next comment has to do with sales tax. The
17 bulk of the sales tax is indicated to go to Los Angeles
18 County, \$2.4 million per year for four years, whereas only
19 \$166,000 is indicated to go to Kern County. That seems
20 unfair because the 82.4 mile section of the high-speed rail
21 is almost predominantly in Kern County. A higher
22 percentage of the sales tax should go where the impact is.

825-903

23 And the final comment has to do with local hire.
24 The local hires should be in Kern County. That's where, as
25 I said, most of the rail is going to be built, so emphasis

825-903

825-904

1 should be there in Kern County. And there's plenty of
2 people to work there. We recently have put in wind farms,
3 solar farms, and people are happy to move there to find
4 jobs.

5 Those are my comments. I, personally, am for the
6 high-speed rail, happy it's coming, but please give some
7 attention to Rosamond.

8 MS. TINOCO: Thank you, John.

9 MR. JOYCE: You're welcome.

10 (Pause)

11 MS. TINOCO: Okay. We will now take a ten-minute
12 break and resume at six o'clock.

13 Thank you.

14 (Off the record at 5:50 p.m.)

15 (On the record at 6:03 p.m.)

16 MS. GOMEZ: Good afternoon. My name is Diana
17 Gomez, the Central Valley Regional Director for the
18 California High-Speed Rail Authority. I'd like to welcome
19 and thank you for participating in today's virtual public
20 hearing.

21 Due to the complications caused by the novel
22 coronavirus, COVID-19, in California, the Authority has
23 changed the format of the public hearing from an in-person
24 public hearing to a virtual public hearing. We appreciate
25 your patience and understanding.

Response to Submission 825 (John Joyce, Rosamond News, April 23, 2020)

825-901

Refer to Standard Response BP-Response-GENERAL-04: General Information on the Right-of-Way and Relocation Processes for Residential and Business Displacements.

The commenter states that the EIR/EIS seems to indicate that homes around Avenue A can be duplicated across the line in Los Angeles County near Lancaster and Palmdale. Replacement units were identified within the respective cities, communities, and counties where displacements would occur, based on housing stock available at the time the analysis was conducted. Therefore, the Final EIR/EIS does not consider a replacement home in Los Angeles County an acceptable replacement for a currently occupied home in Kern County. Additionally, as described in Section 3.12, Socioeconomics and Communities, Impact SO#4, Implementation of SOCIO-IAMF#2 (Compliance with Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act) and SOCIO-IAMF#3 (Relocation Mitigation Plan) would minimize the potential for construction to relocate residents outside their existing communities.

825-902

The commenter states that the bulk of the sales tax is indicated to go to Los Angeles County. The commenter suggests this is unfair because the alignment is predominantly in Kern County.

Actual sales tax revenue during construction would be based on the location of construction expenditures. The calculated estimated sales tax revenue for the two-county region would be \$24,241,420 to \$25,417,395 per year under the B-P Build Alternatives as discussed in Section 3.12.6.5 Impact SO#15. State law and local levies dictate how sales tax revenue would actually be distributed. Sales tax revenues during construction would be distributed to each county according to the sales tax rates specific to each county.

To evaluate the contribution of the project to local sales tax revenues during the construction period, the total local sales tax revenues generated from local purchases (such as wood, concrete, steel, and electrical equipment) were calculated under each of the alternatives, the maintenance facilities, and the Palmdale Station. The proportion of the local purchases that are likely to be purchased within each of the two counties in the economic impacts resource study area is assumed to be proportional to the population of the two counties.

Additionally, as described in Section 3.12.6.3, Impact SO#15, an increase in sales tax revenues is expected for the City of Bakersfield and Kern County as a result of the F-B LGA's construction. However, the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Supplemental EIR/EIS does not specifically analyze the sales tax revenue gains from the portion of the F-B LGA alignment that extends eastward to Oswell Street. As described in Section 3.12.4, Impact SO#15, construction of the Palmdale Station site could generate approximately \$2,510,110 in regional sales tax annually during the 4-year station construction period, the majority of which would be generated in Los Angeles County.

825-903

The commenter states that local hires should come from Kern County. Refer to Response to Comment 710-273, contained in Chapter 22 of this Final EIR/EIS.

Response to Submission 825 (John Joyce, Rosamond News, April 23, 2020) - Continued

825-904

The commenter expresses support of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section of the HSR project.

Submission 826 (John Joyce, Rosamond News, April 23, 2020)

Bakersfield - Palmdale - RECORD #826 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	5/19/2020
Affiliation Type :	Business and/or Organization
Submission Date :	4/23/2020
Interest As :	Business and/or Organization
Submission Method :	Public Hearing - Oral Comment
First Name :	John
Last Name :	Joyce
Professional Title :	
Business/Organization :	Rosamond News
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	
State :	CA
Zip Code :	00000
Telephone :	
Email :	
Cell Phone :	
Email Subscription :	
Add to Mailing List :	Yes
EIR/EIS Comment :	Yes
Attachments :	826_Joyce_OHTranscript.pdf (66 kb)

1 minute break. I will announce the break and start time
2 each hour.
3 This public hearing will continue until 8:00 p.m.
4 The purpose of this hearing is to receive comments only, so
5 it is normal to hear silence as we wait for commenters to
6 join online or by phone.
7 Again, if you'd like to comment today, please use
8 the "raise-your-hand" feature at the bottom of your screen
9 and I will call on your name.
10 We may repeat these instructions from time to
11 time throughout the hour for those who are just joining us.
12 Thank you.
13 (Pause)
14 MS. TINOCO: Okay, John, I see that you raised
15 your hand. If you could, again, spell out your first and
16 last name and provide your comment?
17 MR. JOYCE: John, J-O-H-N, Joyce, J-O-Y-C-E.
18 Organization, Rosamond News, the adjudicated Kern County
19 newspaper for this area.
20 My comment is I know many, many people locally
21 who want to say something about the high-speed rail. But
22 unless Diana notifies these people with a public notice in
23 the published media the people don't know to log on. They
24 have no idea.
25 I realize that COVID-19 has interrupted

826-905

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Submission 826 (John Joyce, Rosamond News, April 23, 2020) - Continued

826-905

1 everybody's schedule. But Kern County publishes notices of
2 public meetings ahead of time so that people can prepare
3 for it.

4 So I think in this case there's been an
5 overlooking of the normal way to notify the public of a
6 desire for public input on an issue. And, certainly, the
7 adjudicated newspapers are well known for Kern County. The
8 Kern County Recorder's Office has them all listed. And if
9 the high-speed rail goes right through their territory,
10 there should be a public notice put in those publications,
11 most of them are online or in print, at least three weeks
12 so that the people that know about this project and have
13 agonized and worried about this project can come online and
14 tell you what their concerns are.

15 I planned to let Senator Grove become aware of
16 what's happened and, also, congressman -- or Assemblyman
17 Lackey. They need to send letters to your office, making
18 you aware of the proper procedure to issue public notices
19 so that people have a chance to give feedback.

20 I appreciate the hard work that you people are
21 doing on this. And I realize the COVID-19 has interrupted
22 everybody. But I'm the only one making a comment. And I
23 know that there are many people here that would like to
24 make a comment. And I suggest that you do this again. Set
25 it up and do a proper public notice. And I venture to say,

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

826-905

1 you will find a lot more response.

2 Thank you.

3 MS. TINOCO: Thank you.

4 (Pause)

5 MS. GOMEZ: Good afternoon. My name is Diana
6 Gomez, the Central Valley Regional Director for the
7 California High-Speed Rail Authority. I'd like to welcome
8 and thank you for your participation in today's virtual
9 public hearing.

10 Due to the complications caused by the novel
11 coronavirus, COVID-19, in California, the Authority has
12 changed the format of the public hearing from an in-person
13 public hearing to a virtual public hearing. We appreciate
14 your patience and understanding.

15 We are conducting this public hearing to receive
16 your comments on the environmental analysis, alternatives,
17 impacts, and mitigation measures presented in the
18 Bakersfield-to-Palmdale Project Section Draft Environmental
19 Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement.

20 This public hearing is being held in compliance
21 with the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, and to
22 facilitate the goals of the California Environmental
23 Quality Act, also known as CEQA.

24 Your input is very important to us and will help
25 us continue developing the California High-Speed Rail

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Response to Submission 826 (John Joyce, Rosamond News, April 23, 2020)

826-905

Refer to Standard Response BP-Response-GENERAL-02: Public Outreach on the Draft EIR/EIS.

The commenter notes that many people want to comment and need to be notified with a public notice in published media.

Refer to BP-Response-General-02: Public Outreach on the Draft EIR/EIS.

Submission 827 (Gib Snow, Snow Orthodontics, April 23, 2020)

Bakersfield - Palmdale - RECORD #827 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	5/19/2020
Affiliation Type :	Business and/or Organization
Submission Date :	4/23/2020
Interest As :	Individual
Submission Method :	Public Hearing - Oral Comment
First Name :	Gib
Last Name :	Snow
Professional Title :	
Business/Organization :	Snow Orthodontics
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	
State :	CA
Zip Code :	00000
Telephone :	
Email :	
Cell Phone :	
Email Subscription :	
Add to Mailing List :	Yes
EIR/EIS Comment :	Yes
Attachments :	827_Snow_OHTranscript.pdf (64 kb)

827-906

827-906

1 please use the "raise-your-hand" feature at the bottom of
 2 your screen and I will call on your name.
 3 We may repeat these instructions from time to
 4 time throughout the hour for those who are just joining us.
 5 Thank you.
 6 (Pause)
 7
 8 MS. TINOCO: Okay. It looks like we have someone
 9 online who'd like to give a comment.
 10 Gib Snow, if you can please spell out your first
 11 and last name and then provide the organization you're
 12 with?
 13 MR. SNOW: Gib Snow with Snow Orthodontics.
 14 I just wanted to know, after this hearing, what's
 15 the next step?
 16 MS. TINOCO: So this hearing is just to receive
 17 comments only. Our panelists will not be answering
 18 questions or giving a presentation, so these comments will
 19 go into our final document.
 20 MR. SNOW: I see. And what's the next step after
 21 this hearing?
 22 MS. TINOCO: Like I mentioned, these comments
 23 that we receive -- so this public hearing was from 3:00 to
 24 8:00. We will take these comments and add them to our
 25 final document and publish that to the public.

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Submission 827 (Gib Snow, Snow Orthodontics, April 23, 2020) - Continued

827-906

1 MR. SNOW: So after it's published, then what
2 happens?

3 MS. TINOCO: If you would like, I can direct you
4 to our website, www.hsr.ca.gov, and there's more
5 information on our Bakersfield-to-Palmdale Section on the
6 process of our environmental process.

827-907

7 MR. SNOW: Okay. Then another question.
8 There's already quite a bit of construction that
9 has gone on already down in the Central Valley; isn't that
10 right?

11 MS. TINOCO: So, Mr. Snow, I'm not able to answer
12 any questions. If you have a comment, please provide it.
13 And then we'll take that comment and add it to our
14 document.

15 MR. SNOW: Okay. Thank you for your help.

16 MS. TINOCO: Thank you.

17 (Pause)

18 MS. TINOCO: Okay. It is now 7:30. This public
19 hearing will go until 8:00 p.m. And, again, the purpose of
20 this hearing is to receive comments only, so it is normal
21 practice to hear silence as we wait for commenters to join
22 online or by phone.

23 If you are online or you'd like to join online,
24 I'd like to remind you to use the "raise-your-hand" feature
25 at the bottom of your screen and I'll call on your name.

California Reporting, LLC
(510) 224-4476

Response to Submission 827 (Gib Snow, Snow Orthodontics, April 23, 2020)

827-906

The commenter asks about the next step in the environmental process after the public hearing. See Sections S.13.1 through S.13.2.4 of this Final EIR/EIS for an outline of the steps that followed the publication of the Draft EIR/EIS and the public review period.

827-907

The commenter asks about the next step in the environmental process after the public hearing. Refer to Response to Comment 827-906, contained in this chapter.