

Submission 753 (Michael Banner, July 8, 2020)

1 I recognize has your hand raised.  
 2 Michael, if you could please repeat your name  
 3 and spell it, if there's an unusual spelling, any  
 4 affiliation, and you have three minutes, please, to  
 5 make your comment.  
 6 It looks like you are still muted, Michael.  
 7 Can you try unmuting your phone -- or your --  
 8 MR. BANNER: How about now? Can you hear me?  
 9 MS. ARELLANO: There you go. We can hear you.  
 10 Go ahead and comment.  
 11 MR. BANNER: Michael Banner, M-I-C-H-A-E-L,  
 12 B-A-N-N-E-R. I'm a property owner in Lincoln Heights,  
 13 and I had a question about -- as you said, it is a  
 14 voluminous document.  
 15 There are no elevations that I can make any  
 16 sense out of that show what's going to happen with, I  
 17 guess, the bridge that's coming in on Main Street.  
 18 And I wonder if there is -- is that going to  
 19 be shown later, or are there any models that somebody  
 20 can actually see to get a sense of what this thing is  
 21 going to look like once it's finished.  
 22 And then my second question would be, you  
 23 know, you partner with Metro Link Up. And Metro was --  
 24 one of its projects has something that's called a  
 25 business interruption fund that is designed to help

103



753-1133

1 businesses that are impacted by construction of their  
 2 projects.  
 3 Is that something that's being looked at by  
 4 high-speed rail?  
 5 MS. ARELLANO: Thank you, Michael, for both of  
 6 your questions.  
 7 Just as a reminder, the public hearing is to  
 8 be used to receive your questions or your comments for  
 9 the record. The panel is not answering questions, but  
 10 those will definitely be asked as part of the  
 11 environmental document.  
 12 If I can ask you, however, Michael, to repeat  
 13 your first question. The audio on that dropped out  
 14 just a bit. I think you were asking about the  
 15 elevation of the Main Street bridge. So if you can  
 16 just repeat that for the record. I want to make sure  
 17 we have that accurately.  
 18 And then please know that those questions will  
 19 be answered in the final environmental document. You  
 20 may also want to consider an office appointment to talk  
 21 one on one with a member of our staff to have that  
 22 answer in hand prior to any additional public comment  
 23 you might want to offer.  
 24 So can you repeat your first question, please.  
 25 MR. BANNER: Yes.

104



753-1131

753-1132

## Submission 753 (Michael Banner, July 8, 2020) - Continued

753-1134

1           So my first question goes to the new bridge  
2 that is coming in on Main Street. In my looking at the  
3 documents, I'm not an engineer or anything, and I was  
4 wondering whether or not there is a model or models or  
5 something that shows elevations of the height of the  
6 new bridge so you can have some perspective on how it's  
7 going to fit into the community.

8           MS. ARELLANO: Excellent. Thank you for --  
9 for your comment, Michael.

10           Again, I would encourage you and any member to  
11 do a one-on-one appointment if you have a specific  
12 question like that that would be helpful to you prior  
13 to the end of the comment period, for you to advance  
14 any additional comment period that you might have about  
15 that specific geographical area.

16           I would like to encourage any other individual  
17 who is online now to raise your hand to provide us your  
18 formal comment. The panel is sitting here available to  
19 listen and to hear your comments as part of today's  
20 formal public hearing.

21           As we await any additional members of the  
22 public to provide us formal public comments, I would  
23 invite the panel to be free -- feel free to turn off  
24 your camera to stretch or walk. We know you're still  
25 there. We are still in live mode to receive public

105



## Response to Submission 753 (Michael Banner, July 8, 2020)

### 753-1131

The commenter states that elevation drawings were not provided for the Main Street bridge. Detailed plans, including profile views for the Main Street overpass, were provided in Volume 3.3 General and Grade Separations, beginning on sheet CV-TO151 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Refer to that same volume of this Final EIR/EIS for the updated plans of the Main Street grade separation.

### 753-1132

The commenter requests models of the new Main Street bridge that is proposed by the HSR Project. As described in Section 3.16.6.3, a key-viewpoint was provided to assess the visual change to the existing environment from the new Main Street Bridge. Figure 3.16-23, Key Viewpoint 20, shows the existing and simulated view from Albion Street looking south and provides perspective on the sense of how the new Main Street bridge would look in the existing visual environment. The new Main Street bridge would be 86 feet wide and 75 feet high at its highest point over the Los Angeles River, and would place three columns within the river channel. Main Street would begin its ascent just east of Sotello Street on the west side of the Los Angeles River; the new bridge would come down to grade at Clover Street on the east side of the Los Angeles River. Albion Street would be reconfigured. The existing Main Street bridge would not be modified.

The new Main Street bridge would be designed to reduce intrusiveness to primary viewer groups, as stated in the Draft EIR/EIS. Moreover, AVQ-IAMF#1 (Aesthetic Options) requires that the Authority prioritize the design of HSR non-station structures consistent with the local context. This IAMF will be implemented throughout the design of the proposed project.

### 753-1133

The commenter states that Metro has a business interruption fund that is designed to help businesses that are impacted by construction of their projects and questioned if this is something that the Authority is considering. The Authority currently does not have a program similar to Metro's Business Interruption Fund. However, business owners who believe they have suffered a loss as a result of the project may file a claim with the State of California's Government Claims Program. More information on filing a claim may be obtained online at the following link: <https://www.dgs.ca.gov/ORIM/Services/Page-Content/Office-of-Risk-and-Insurance-Management-Services-List-Folder/File-a-Government-Claim#@ViewBag.JumpTo>

### 753-1134

The commenter requests models of the new Main Street bridgegrade separation that is proposed by the HSR Project. As described in Section 3.16.6.3, a KVP was provided to show the new Main Street bridge's visual impact. Figure 3.16-23, Key Viewpoint 20, shows the existing and simulated view from Albion Street looking south, which provides perspective on the height of the bridge in context and relation to the existing conditions. The new Main Street bridge would be 86 feet wide and 75 feet high at its highest point over the Los Angeles River, and would place three columns within the river channel. Main Street would begin its ascent just east of Sotello Street on the west side of the Los Angeles River; the new bridge would come down to grade at Clover Street on the east side of the Los Angeles River. Albion Street would be reconfigured. The existing Main Street bridge would not be modified.

The new Main Street grade separation bridge would be designed to reduce intrusiveness to primary viewer groups, as stated in the Draft EIR/EIS. Moreover, AVQ-IAMF#1 (Aesthetic Options) requires that the Authority prioritize the design of HSR non-station structures consistent with the local context. This IAMF will be implemented throughout the design of the proposed project.

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

## Submission 740 (Anais Campa, July 8, 2020)

1 Next we have Anais as our next speaker.

2 Following Anais, we have Zennon Ulyate-Crow, and then  
3 Robert E. following Zennon.

4 So next up -- Anais, if you can -- I'd ask you  
5 to state and spell your full name for the record, and  
6 you have three minutes.

7 MS. CAMPA: Hi. My name is Anais Campa. You  
8 can spell my name A-N-A-I-S, last name C-A-M-P-A. I am  
9 the assistant principal of PUC Excel Charter Academy,  
10 located on the same campus to PUC Milagro, to which  
11 Ms. Robinett just spoke about.

12 I would like to also ask you to extend public  
13 comment. As a leader of a community-based school, we  
14 are really concerned about the impact of this project  
15 on our students. We service many students who come  
16 from the William Mead projects, and they depend on Main  
17 Street to be able to attend our school and have the  
18 opportunity to attend a small charter school in which  
19 we are part of disrupting the narrative that they could  
20 potentially face if they didn't have a small school  
21 that cared about their well-being.

22 We make sure that we connect them with  
23 community resources and ensure that their health and  
24 social, emotional well-being is something that's at the  
25 center of our work. And with this project, it could

22



740-1087

1 potentially cause us to have students not be able to  
2 attend because of traffic.

740-1088

3 I read in the impact report provided by  
4 Mr. Riboli that so many trains running could  
5 potentially have the rail -- the safety thing going  
6 down 45 to 50 minutes, an hour. I worry about students  
7 being able to get to school on time. I worry about the  
8 traffic, the noise, the air quality affecting their  
9 social, emotional, and health.

740-1089

10 We ask that you extend this public comment  
11 because as a community-based school, we are part of the  
12 hub of educating our parents. We at Excel have a  
13 parent center, and I know that if our -- we were able  
14 to get this information to our parents, we could help  
15 them understand, and they could advocate for their  
16 beloved community.

740-1090

17 We also ask that you improve the information  
18 going out to the community. As -- as a  
19 college-educated person with three degrees, I found it  
20 very hard to understand the 3-D models, and I would  
21 like to understand it better to help my community  
22 understand this.

740-1091

23 So please, we ask for your support to extend  
24 this public comment so that community centers like  
25 ourselves can work to educate our community and this

23



740-1085

740-1086

740-1087

## Submission 740 (Anais Campa, July 8, 2020) - Continued

740-1091

1 could be a community-based decision. Thank you.

2 MS. ARELLANO: Excellent. Thank you, Anais.

3 Next, Zennon Ulyate-Crow, followed by Robert  
4 E. And then we have an additional speaker, Christine  
5 Nash.

6 And it looks like we've resolved our Spanish  
7 interpretation simultaneously, so thankfully that is  
8 proceeding.

9 And Zennon, you have the floor. If you can  
10 spell -- completely spell your name so we have that for  
11 the record. And you have three minutes.

12 MR. ULYATE-CROW: Hi. My name is Zennon  
13 Ulyate-Crow, spelled Z-E-N-N-O-N, U-L-Y-A-T-E, hyphen,  
14 C-R-O-W. I know it's a mouthful.

15 So I'm a resident over here in L.A., and I'm  
16 just going to raise the whole climate crisis and  
17 everything. And I've been looking at the station plans  
18 for the Burbank station, and I just would like to  
19 provide some input that I think even just having a  
20 station in -- at Bob Hope Airport is not the correct  
21 decision at this moment, especially considering the  
22 fact that this is a station that will be surrounded  
23 with 4,000 parking spots, which would just completely  
24 encourage other people to -- it's going to encourage  
25 people to drive to the airport, and it's going to

24



## Response to Submission 740 (Anais Campa, July 8, 2020)

### 740-1085

The commenter requests an extension of the public comment period. In response to agency and stakeholder requests and in consideration of limitations caused by the novel coronavirus pandemic, the Authority elected to extend the initial 45-day public review period for 15 days to July 31, 2020, and then for another 30 days to August 31, 2020. Therefore, the comment period provided was a total of 94 days, which is twice the minimum requirement, pursuant to CEQA and NEPA, of 45 days.

### 740-1086

The commenter expresses concern about the impacts of the HSR project on students who attend the PUC Excel Charger Academy.

The potential for construction of the HSR Build Alternative to result in impacts on children's health and safety is evaluated in Appendix 3.12-C, Children's Health and Safety Risk Assessment.

While the HSR Build Alternative would be constructed and operate primarily within an existing railroad corridor in urban areas of Burbank, Glendale, and Los Angeles, as described in Section 3.12.7, IAMFs and mitigation measures would be implemented to address impacts on children's health and safety from the HSR project. Construction impacts that could affect children's health and safety (e.g., traffic hazards, air emissions, noise and vibration, and use of hazardous materials near schools) are described in Section 3.12.6.3, Impact SOCIO #14, Temporary Impacts on Children's Health and Safety from Construction. Implementation of IAMFs would avoid and/or minimize impacts related to temporary changes in access, increases in noise and dust, and visual changes; therefore, temporary impacts on children's health and safety from construction of the HSR Build Alternative would be less than significant.

Additionally, Impact SOCIO#18, Permanent Impacts on Children's Health and Safety from Operations, addresses permanent impacts to children's health and safety from operation. Refer to Section 3.2, Transportation, for information on the location and nature of permanent impacts on access and circulation. Out-of-direction travel distances required due to road closures would not result in long detours, and the Authority would work with the local jurisdictions to provide additional access as needed. The HSR Build Alternative would be grade-separated from the existing roads, so there would be no conflict between school buses and the HSR trains. The HSR Build Alternative would provide new grade-separated crossings, which would remove roadway conflicts with the railroad corridor and improve safety and access for buses, resulting in a beneficial effect related to children's health and safety. Refer to Section 3.11, Safety and Security, for additional information about risks to sensitive land uses including schools including train accidents, accidents associated with seismic events, and fire.

## Response to Submission 740 (Anais Campa, July 8, 2020) - Continued

### 740-1087

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Section 3.12 SOCIO-03: Impacts Related to the Main Street Grade Separation.

The commenter expresses concern related to traffic impacts on schools. Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Section 3.12 SOCIO-03: Impacts Related to the Main Street Grade Separation. Chapter 2 of this Final EIR/EIS, has been revised to include an updated design for the Main Street Grade Separation Early Action Project. The traffic analysis provided in Section 3.2.6 of this Final EIR/EIS does not indicate the HSR Build Alternative would result in induced travel demand to the extent that there would be new significant impacts to land uses in the corridor, including schools. As there would be no significant impacts to schools from induced travel demand, traffic volumes would not be so high as to prohibit school attendance. As discussed in Section 3.2.7.1, Mitigation Measure TRAN-MM#1 would be implemented to address temporary construction-related impacts. In addition, as discussed in Section 3.13.6.3 of this Final EIR/EIS, although construction of the HSR Build Alternative would result in a short-term land use that is incompatible with adjacent residential land uses, schools, and parks, it would not cause adjacent land to temporarily change uses and would not temporarily alter land use patterns because none of these inconveniences resulting from the construction process are expected to be severe enough to require the indirect displacement of residences, schools, parks, or any other land uses.

### 740-1088

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Section 3.12 SOCIO-03: Impacts Related to the Main Street Grade Separation.

The comment expresses concern regarding the safety of children and impacts related to traffic, noise, and air quality affecting students. Refer to Response to Comment 740-1086, contained in this chapter.

Also refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Section 3.12 SOCIO-03: Impacts Related to the Main Street Grade Separation.

### 740-1089

The commenter requests an extension of the public comment period. Refer to response to comment 740-1085 contained in this chapter of this Final EIR/EIS.

### 740-1090

The commenter stated that the information sent out by the Authority regarding the HSR project was hard to understand. Volume 3 of the Draft EIR/EIS included a user guide for interpreting the Preliminary Engineering for Project Definition plans. Key View Points were selected in various neighborhoods and included visual simulations of the project. These can be referenced in the Aesthetics Section, specifically in section 3.16.6.3. No revisions to this Final EIR/EIS have been made in response to this comment.

### 740-1091

The commenter requests an extension of the public comment period. Refer to response to comment 740-1085 contained in this chapter of this Final EIR/EIS.

## Submission 747 (Armando Carvalho, July 8, 2020)

1 which, excepting for the aforementioned park by the  
2 previous commenter, is almost all cement and could be  
3 used as an easy place to put an underground tunnel, as  
4 that L.A. River, and then either just pave it back or  
5 put parks over it, since you dug it up.

6 So I'm just wondering if there's been  
7 consideration towards looking towards essentially a  
8 longer term future as was prior mentioned, like by  
9 essentially taking advantage of larger drilling methods  
10 and/or already unused areas.

11 Anyway, that's my comment.

12 MS. ARELLANO: Excellent. Thank you very  
13 much, James. I do not see any additional persons with  
14 their hands raised, but I would encourage you to do so.

15 Here we go. We have one more commenter.  
16 Armando Carvalho, you are being recognized. If you can  
17 please state your name and spell it for us correctly,  
18 if you can, for the record, and any affiliation. Go  
19 right ahead. You have three minutes.

20 MR. CARVALHO: Hello. My name's Armando  
21 Carvalho, C-A-R-V, as in Victor, A-L-H-O. I am a  
22 resident of Lincoln Heights. I've been here for two or  
23 three years now, and I've been reading through your  
24 report, and I think -- I know there's already some  
25 sacrifices that will need to be made concerning some of

39



747-1105

747-1106

1 the conveniences of us here in Lincoln Heights,  
2 particularly with the construction.

3 But I believe that it will be a positive  
4 improvement to our community, and I think that's  
5 something that is important for both the community and  
6 the state and the larger Los Angeles area, so I very  
7 much hope to see this project done as soon as possible.  
8 Thank you.

9 MS. ARELLANO: Excellent. Armando, thank you  
10 for your comments.

11 I just want to take a moment and just wait to  
12 see if we have any additional persons raising their  
13 hand before the -- I will ask the panel to take a quick  
14 break before we resume.

15 While I am waiting, just to make sure, I want  
16 to also announce we've been publicizing the  
17 availability of office hours, appointments that you can  
18 schedule with our staff, to ask any one-on-one  
19 questions or clarify any information that you might  
20 have in the document. These appointments are available  
21 by reservation, and we have three additional dates  
22 prior to the end of the public comment period that you  
23 can choose from, and you can go online to actually  
24 reserve these appointments.

25 If you have a pen and paper handy, I'll

40



747-1105

## Response to Submission 747 (Armando Carvalho, July 8, 2020)

### 747-1105

The commenter acknowledges that temporary construction impacts will occur in Lincoln Heights. As Lincoln Heights is adjacent to the proposed HSR project alignment in Los Angeles, it will experience temporary construction impacts, which are described in detail in various resource-specific sections of Chapter 3 of this Final EIR/EIS. No revisions to this Final EIR/EIS have been made in response to this comment.

### 747-1106

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-GENERAL-04: General Support.

The commenter expresses their support for the HSR project. The commenter's support for the HSR Build Alternative is acknowledged.

Submission 737 (Karla Contreras, July 8, 2020)

1 Karla?  
2 MS. CONTRERAS: Hi. Are you able to hear me?  
3 MS. ARELLANO: Yes. Absolutely. Thank you,  
4 Karla. You have three minutes.  
5 MS. CONTRERAS: Thank you. I am a 26-year  
6 resident of Lincoln Heights. I not only grew up here,  
7 but I also teach in my community. And I'm sorry that  
8 I'm emotional, but this really hits home. I just found  
9 out about this railway going through our community, and  
10 this railway would devastate our community.  
11 Lincoln Heights is a community of color, of  
12 immigrant families. They cannot afford to move because  
13 this -- this would cause them to have to relocate. The  
14 rent prices in our area are above \$2,000 for a  
15 two-bedroom home or an apartment, and the people who  
16 live here cannot go anywhere else. They can barely  
17 make ends meet where they are living.  
18 Not only would this affect the residents, but  
19 it would also affect the schools in the area. There  
20 are three schools that you are trying to build  
21 around -- actually, four. Those schools would be  
22 heavily impacted. What would happen to those students?  
23 Are those students going to be able to learn? No.  
24 There's going to be health concerns for them  
25 already. All the noise, the pollution that's going to

737-1068

737-1069

737-1070

13



737-1070

737-1071

737-1072

737-1073

737-1074

1 happen from all of this that is going on -- they would  
2 not be okay with this. You're not thinking about the  
3 community or the kids that you're affecting or the  
4 families that you are affecting. This would create so  
5 many disparities in the education system already.  
6 These kids -- people think that these kids are already  
7 falling behind. You are going to add to that.  
8 Also, we would be losing things that are  
9 important to our community. We just built a brand-new  
10 park that kids depend on. Hundreds -- thousands of  
11 kids in our community depend on that park to go and  
12 play, to get some kind of outdoor space where they can  
13 just be free. That would totally be taken away from  
14 them.  
15 We would also lose businesses that have been  
16 long-standing there, like Lanza Brothers Deli, who we  
17 would -- who depend on us, and we depend on. They have  
18 been there. They have been a staple for us for a very  
19 long time.  
20 You would also affect religious places of  
21 worship. You would take away so much from our  
22 community by doing this, and I believe that the people  
23 of Lincoln Heights deserve a voice, and that is going  
24 to happen. I'm asking you to please extend this time  
25 period for comments so others for those who can be told

14



Submission 737 (Karla Contreras, July 8, 2020) - Continued

737-1074

1 what is happening in their community so they can also  
2 have a voice. They need to be able to have a voice and  
3 say what's going to happen in their community because  
4 they're not -- they're the people who are directly  
5 affected.

6 I'm asking you to please extend this so they  
7 are properly informed so they have a say to be able to  
8 come and comment because their voices are (inaudible).  
9 Thank you very much.

10 MS. ARELLANO: Thank you very much, Karla. I  
11 very much appreciate your comments.

12 If I can just take one moment. I want to  
13 acknowledge that I believe we have our Spanish  
14 interpreter overlapping on our English. So if I can  
15 ask our technician to just troubleshoot on that. It  
16 looks like he's going to go ahead and address that.  
17 Thank you.

18 And I do notice that we do have one of our  
19 representatives from the elected office of Senator  
20 Portantino joining us, so Ronnie Rudolph, Sascha  
21 Robinett, and then the next speaker would be Amin. If  
22 you do not mind, we will be taking Vickere Murphy as  
23 our next speaker.

24 Vickere? Vickere, can you -- are you still  
25 online? Okay. It may have been -- it looks like I --

15



## Response to Submission 737 (Karla Contreras, July 8, 2020)

### 737-1068

Refer to Standard Responses BLA-Response-Chapter 5 EJ-01: Environmental Justice Communities, BLA-Response-Section 3.12 SOCIO-01: Relocations, ROW Process, Eminent Domain.

The comment states that that the HSR project would create impacts in the Lincoln Heights community. The commenter also expresses concern that Lincoln Heights is a community of color and immigrant families who cannot afford to move elsewhere due to the HSR project.

In response to public comments on the Draft EIR/EIS, design changes were made to the Main Street Grade Separation to further reduce impacts to the Lincoln Heights community to the extent feasible. Refer to Section 3.12.6.3 of this Final EIR/EIS for an updated discussion of impacts. Design refinements to the Main Street Grade Separation have resulted in 1 fewer single-family residential displacement and 4 fewer commercial displacements in the vicinity of the Main Street Grade Separation that were previously identified in the Draft EIR/EIS. The HSR alignment is proposed within an existing rail corridor in the Lincoln Heights neighborhood.

However, as discussed in Section 3.12.6, of this Final EIR/EIS, the displacements in Lincoln Heights Neighborhood Council Area would be clustered within the area of the new Main Street overcrossing. Businesses that would be subject to displacement in the area are generally industrial and commercial establishments directly adjacent to a residential neighborhood. The removal of these businesses would change the nature and character of this community by removing businesses that may be used as community gathering spaces and that are directly adjacent to established neighborhoods. Several neighborhoods within the City of Los Angeles, including Lincoln Heights, display high levels of community cohesion based on their demographics. Because Lincoln Heights possesses a high degree of community cohesion, it is reasonable to conclude that the displacements in this neighborhood as a result of the HSR Build Alternative would have disruptive effects on the community and could contribute to a degradation of community character and cohesion within the Lincoln Heights neighborhood.

As discussed in Section 3.12.4.2, IAMFs, which are part of the HSR Build Alternative design, help avoid and/or minimize these effects. SOCIO-IAMF#2 would provide

### 737-1068

relocation assistance to all persons displaced by the HSR Build Alternative in compliance with the Uniform Act. SOCIO-IAMF#3 would establish an appraisal, acquisition, and relocation process in consultation with affected cities, counties, and property owners. These IAMFs minimize the potential for construction of the HSR Build Alternative to relocate businesses outside their existing communities. Also, refer to Appendix 3.12-B, Relocation Assistance Benefits.

As described in Section 3.12.6.3, Impact SOCIO#3 sufficient number of comparable replacement residences are available in all areas where there would be displacements and relocations. There are 56 vacant single-family residential and 58 vacant multifamily residential units within the city of Los Angeles, which exceeds the 4 multifamily residential displacements in the city of Los Angeles. As described under Impact SOCIO#4, there are enough sites available among the industrial, commercial, and retail properties in Los Angeles for the businesses that would be displaced by the HSR Build Alternative.

Additionally, refer to BLA-Response-Chapter 5 EJ-01: Environmental Justice Communities and BLA-Response-Section 3.12 SOCIO-01: Relocations, ROW Process, Eminent Domain.

Consistent with the requirements of the Uniform Act and California Relocation Assistance Act, the Authority is committed to working closely and proactively with residents and businesses to help them plan ahead for relocation, find new homes or sites, and solve problems related to the acquisitions.

## Response to Submission 737 (Karla Contreras, July 8, 2020) - Continued

### 737-1069

The comment expresses concern about how the HSR project would affect the four schools in the area and the students who attend them.

The potential for the construction of the HSR Build Alternative to result in impacts on children's health and safety is evaluated in Appendix 3.12-C, Children's Health and Safety Risk Assessment.

While the HSR Build Alternative would be constructed and operate primarily within an existing railroad corridor in urban areas of Burbank, Glendale, and Los Angeles, as described in Section 3.12.7, IAMFs and mitigation measures would be implemented to address impacts on children's health and safety from the HSR project. Construction impacts that could affect children's health and safety (e.g., traffic hazards, air emissions, noise and vibration, and use of hazardous materials near schools) are described in Section 3.12.6.3, Impact SOCIO #14, Temporary Impacts on Children's Health and Safety from Construction. Implementation of IAMFs would avoid and/or minimize effects related to temporary changes in access, increases in noise and dust, and visual changes.

Additionally, Impact SOCIO#18, Permanent Impacts on Children's Health and Safety from Operations, addresses permanent impacts to children's health and safety from operation. Refer to Section 3.2, Transportation, for information on the location and nature of permanent impacts on access and circulation. Out-of-direction travel distances required due to road closures would not result in long detours, and the Authority would work with the local jurisdictions to provide additional access as needed. The HSR Build Alternative would be grade-separated from the existing roads, so there would be no conflict between school buses and the HSR trains. The HSR Build Alternative would provide new grade-separated crossings, which would remove roadway conflicts with the railroad corridor and improve safety and access for buses, bicyclists, and pedestrians, resulting in a beneficial effect related to children's health and safety. Refer to Section 3.11, Safety and Security, for analysis of risks to sensitive land uses including schools from train accidents, accidents associated with seismic events, and fire.

### 737-1070

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Chapter 5 EJ-01: Environmental Justice Communities.

The commenter expresses concerns regarding the health of children in the vicinity of the HSR project and resulting disparities in the education system. The Authority shares the commenter's concerns on the HSR project's impacts on children, especially those in low-income and minority communities and has rigorously evaluated impacts to these populations in Chapter 5, Environmental Justice, of this Final EIR/EIS. Refer also to Response to Comment 737-1069.

### 737-1071

The commenter expresses concern that park resources would be removed from the community with regard to Albion Riverside Park. As discussed in Section 3.15.6.3 of this Final EIR/EIS, the permanent easement at Albion Riverside Park would be required for the proposed grade separation, which is an early action project, and not for the proposed alignment of the rail. Furthermore, this permanent easement is in a portion of the park that is currently used as a cell tower easement and is identified in the master plan for Albion Riverside Park to continue operating as a cell tower easement area. Therefore, the permanent easement for the proposed pier walls would not remove any existing recreational facilities or amenities and would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of this property. No revisions to this Final EIR/EIS have been made in response to this comment.

## Response to Submission 737 (Karla Contreras, July 8, 2020) - Continued

### 737-1072

The comment states that the community would lose longstanding businesses local residents depend.

The HSR project would require property acquisition that would result in the displacement of several community businesses, but the HSR project would not displace the Lanza Brothers Market. As described in Section 3.12.6.3 of this Final EIR/EIS, although construction of the HSR Build Alternative would have permanent disruptive impacts related to residential and business displacements, SOCIO-IAMF#2 would provide relocation assistance to all residents and businesses displaced by the HSR Build Alternative in compliance with the Uniform Act. SOCIO-IAMF#3 also would establish an appraisal, acquisition, and relocation process in consultation with affected cities, counties, and property owners. These IAMFs would minimize the potential for construction of the HSR Build Alternative to relocate residents and businesses outside their existing communities.

As described in Section 3.12.6.3, Impact SOCIO#3 sufficient number of comparable replacement residences are available in all areas where there would be displacements and relocations. There are 56 vacant single-family residential and 58 vacant multifamily residential units within the city of Los Angeles, which exceeds the 1 single-family and 4 multifamily residential displacements in the city of Los Angeles. As described under Impact SOCIO#4, there are enough sites available among the industrial, commercial, and retail properties in Los Angeles for the businesses that would be displaced by the HSR Build Alternative.

### 737-1073

The comment states that the HSR project would affect places of worship. The HSR Build Alternative does not propose any full or partial acquisitions on places of worship and would not result in the displacement of any community facilities.

The comment also states that the residents of Lincoln Heights deserve a voice.

The Authority has implemented an extensive public and agency outreach program to provide opportunities for public involvement throughout project planning, alternative evaluation, and the EIR/EIS process. Environmental justice-related meetings were held with local officials; public, local and regional organizations; and government agencies, as well as with representatives from affected communities, as shown in Table 5-8, Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section Environmental Justice Targeted Outreach Activity (August 2015–December 2018), in Chapter 5, Environmental Justice. As shown in Table 5-8, outreach activities with the Lincoln Heights Neighborhood Council Area were conducted on July 21, 2016, and October 18, 2018. The Authority's outreach efforts are ongoing, and outreach to minority and low-income populations will continue throughout the HSR project to ensure that communities have the opportunity to comment on the project as described in Section 5.5 of this Final EIR/EIS. Chapter 9, Public and Agency Involvement, includes detailed information on the numerous opportunities for participation that have occurred including a complete log of meetings. The purpose of these efforts was to gain the input of minority and low-income populations regarding the project and to obtain their comments as part of the public record, and so the analyses and conclusions in this EIR/EIS accurately reflect the setting and potential impacts of the project in those communities.

### 737-1074

The commenter requests an extension of the public comment period. In response to agency and stakeholder requests and in consideration of limitations caused by the novel coronavirus pandemic, the Authority elected to extend the initial 45-day public review period for 15 days to July 31, 2020, and then for another 30 days to August 31, 2020. Therefore, the comment period provided was a total of 94 days, which is twice the minimum requirement, pursuant to CEQA and NEPA, of 45 days.

Submission 746 (James Cramer, July 8, 2020)

1 state all of your comment on -- with us today, I would  
2 encourage you to e-mail us in your additional comments  
3 or, again, use any number of ways to provide us your  
4 written statement prior to Friday, July 31st.

5 I see that we do not have any additional folks  
6 who are online. Oh. Just as I say that, we get some  
7 folks commenting, so I appreciate that. We definitely  
8 want to hear your comments first, and that's what we  
9 are here for.

10 So I see an additional hand raised from James  
11 Cramer. James, you are now recognized. And if you can  
12 spell your name for the record and any affiliation, you  
13 have three minutes. Thank you.

14 MR. CRAMER: Sure. My name is -- can you hear  
15 me okay?

16 MS. ARELLANO: Sure can.

17 MR. CRAMER: James Cramer, C-R-A-M-E-R, for  
18 Cramer.

19 And I'm curious, in looking over -- I  
20 understand why the train is going where it wants to go.  
21 It's following existing track. But has any  
22 consideration been given to, essentially, building a  
23 tunnel under that track? That's not a particularly,  
24 you know, oil- and tar-filled part of Los Angeles.

25 And additionally -- or under the L.A. River,



746-1104

1 which, excepting for the aforementioned park by the  
2 previous commenter, is almost all cement and could be  
3 used as an easy place to put an underground tunnel, as  
4 that L.A. River, and then either just pave it back or  
5 put parks over it, since you dug it up.

6 So I'm just wondering if there's been  
7 consideration towards looking towards essentially a  
8 longer term future as was prior mentioned, like by  
9 essentially taking advantage of larger drilling methods  
10 and/or already unused areas.

11 Anyway, that's my comment.

12 MS. ARELLANO: Excellent. Thank you very  
13 much, James. I do not see any additional persons with  
14 their hands raised, but I would encourage you to do so.

15 Here we go. We have one more commenter.  
16 Armando Carvalho, you are being recognized. If you can  
17 please state your name and spell it for us correctly,  
18 if you can, for the record, and any affiliation. Go  
19 right ahead. You have three minutes.

20 MR. CARVALHO: Hello. My name's Armando  
21 Carvalho, C-A-R-V, as in Victor, A-L-H-O. I am a  
22 resident of Lincoln Heights. I've been here for two or  
23 three years now, and I've been reading through your  
24 report, and I think -- I know there's already some  
25 sacrifices that will need to be made concerning some of



746-1104

## Response to Submission 746 (James Cramer, July 8, 2020)

### 746-1104

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Chapter 2 Alt-01: Alternatives.

The commenter expresses concern over the range of alternatives and requests consideration of a tunnel alignment. The commenter's viewpoint is acknowledged . Although tunnels are used throughout the statewide alignment when warranted and feasible, provision of the entire 14-mile Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section in an underground tunnel would be cost-prohibitive and would eliminate the benefits of the shared alignment, including planned improvements such as grade separations along the existing rail corridor. Tunneling also introduces constructability and logistical issues and greatly increases capital costs when compared to at-grade construction. Please refer to BLA-Response-Chapter 2 Alt-01: Alternatives for more information about the range of alternatives. No revisions to this Final EIR/EIS have been made in response to this comment.

Submission 750 (Ana Dahan, July 8, 2020)

1 MS. DAHAN: Okay. Sorry. I also have a baby.  
2 My name is Ana Dahan, A-N-A, D-A-H-A-N, and I'm a  
3 homeowner at Taylor Yard. And as you hear, I have a  
4 newborn and a toddler.

5 MS. ARELLANO: Congratulations. Yes.

6 MS. DAHAN: I wanted to comment my concern  
7 that this project is going to require the railroad to  
8 get 30 feet closer to our homes, and I just wanted to  
9 share, as it is already, our homes shake, and we  
10 experience loud noise whenever the trains go by.

11 And we knew that when we bought this home, but  
12 I was -- I didn't know that there was the potential of  
13 the railway -- the high-speed railway coming. And I  
14 was just concerned to see that the reports on this  
15 project didn't have any mitigation.

16 So while I recognize that I did choose to live  
17 near the railroad, I just wanted to express my sincere  
18 concerns about the fact that this new project doesn't  
19 have any mitigation, and I -- I'm shocked, because,  
20 like I said, we already experience shaking in our home  
21 as well as very loud noises.

22 And then because of this pandemic, I don't  
23 think a lot of people are aware or have the time to  
24 really focus in on the issue, but I know a lot of  
25 people would share my concerns.

76



750-1118

1 We're also -- in this parcel, we also have a  
2 lot of -- there's low-income apartments, and there's  
3 also senior living next to us, that I also imagine  
4 would be impacted by this and who may not have the time  
5 to get involved and to express their concerns.

6 So I just wanted the record to reflect and --  
7 just to put kind of a face to the people who live near  
8 this project. And, again, I recognize that we knew  
9 what we were moving into, but this project without any  
10 mitigation is very concerning, and I would hope that  
11 there would be some more outreach and time to consider  
12 the project, given that we're in the middle of the  
13 pandemic, and I just think that a lot of people don't  
14 have time to focus on this because we're all, you know,  
15 trying to, you know, stay safe. So thank you for this  
16 opportunity to share my comments.

17 MS. ARELLANO: Absolutely. And thank you,  
18 Ana, for making the time to share with us your  
19 concerns. It's very important to have that for the  
20 record. Thank you very much.

21 Next we have another speaker joining us who  
22 has raised their hand. I see Joanne Weidman. Joanne,  
23 I'm recognizing you, and if you can please restate your  
24 name, spell it for our benefit, and any affiliation.  
25 Please go right ahead. You have three minutes.

77



750-1116

750-1117

## Response to Submission 750 (Ana Dahan, July 8, 2020)

### 750-1116

The commenter's concern is regarding the results and the perceived lack of mitigation presented at Taylor Yard within this Final EIR/EIS.

It is correct that some of the existing tracks will be moved closer to the existing residences. It is an accurate assumption that this adjustment has the potential to result in noise and vibration increases. However, it has been confirmed by the project engineer that the number of switches in the area close to the Taylor Yard residences is being reduced from three to two. The existing crossover provided for movements between tracks at higher speeds and the existing left-hand turnout allowed movements to a siding track at similar speeds. However, this siding track (Glendale Slide) has since been relocated north between SR 134 and Chevy Chase Boulevard on the east side of the corridor, so the Taylor Yard community would not be exposed to noise from this siding track (refer to the updated plans provided in Volume 3 of this Final EIR/EIS).

Additionally, based on the proposed design, the existing UPRR trains would no longer use turnouts in this area, so there would no longer be noise exposure from UPRR trains.

These changes in track design, along with the improved track bed and track underlayment, will offset the increases in noise and vibration due to distance reduction. The discussion under Impact N&V #4 and Impact N&V #5 have been updated in Section 3.4.6 of this Final EIR/EIS to reflect the design changes described above.

As it relates to the overall increase in noise at the Taylor Yard residences, it is expected that the noise level would increase with the implementation and operation of the HSR project. This increase is classified as a moderate impact instead of a severe impact because the noise levels generated by HSR train operation and other modifications to existing trackwork would not elevate the existing noise environment to a level which would cause a severe effect to the nearby sensitive receivers. Mitigation is being considered for residences that would be severely impacted by the future HSR project operations.

### 750-1117

The commenter expresses concern about the level of information provided to the communities affected by the project. Chapter 9 of this Final EIR/EIS provides an updated list of meetings and stakeholder outreach that has been ongoing for the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section since 2014. In addition, in response to similar concerns and in order to maximize outreach to all stakeholders and affected parties to the greatest extent practicable, the Authority extended the Draft EIR/EIS comment period through August 31, 2020, for a total public review period of 94 days. In addition, the Authority also provided a variety of forums for the public to engage directly with the project team to ask questions and discuss concerns, including virtual "office hours" meetings throughout the public review period; information meetings with the Taylor Yard community on July 20 and with the Lincoln Heights community on August 25; and, telephone town hall meetings on June 29 and August 19. These meetings were in addition to the required public hearing held on July 8. Chapter 9 also provides a comprehensive list of newspapers in which the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS was advertised. In addition to the newspaper advertisements, direct mail was sent to occupants and property owners within 500 feet of the proposed alignment.

## Response to Submission 750 (Ana Dahan, July 8, 2020) - Continued

### 750-1118

The commenter states that low-income residents and those residing in senior living communities may not have time to get involved and express their concerns.

The Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section Draft EIR/EIS was originally made available for a minimum 45-day public review beginning on May 29, 2020, and ending on July 16, 2020. The Authority then extended the comment period to end on July 31. The comment period was extended again to August 31, 2020, in response to agency and stakeholder requests in consideration of limitations caused by the novel coronavirus pandemic. In total, the duration of the 45-day public comment period was extended to a total of 94 days (from May 29, 2020, through August 31, 2020) so that interested parties would have sufficient time to review the Draft EIR/EIS.

In addition to posting sections of the Draft EIR/EIS on the Authority's website, a printed copy of the Draft EIR/EIS was made available at Caltrans District 7 Headquarters, 100 S Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012. Printed and/or electronic copies of the Draft EIR/EIS and electronic copies of associated technical reports were also made available for review during business hours at the Authority's Southern California Regional Office at 355 S Grand Avenue, Suite 2050, Los Angeles, CA 90071. Moreover, as discussed in the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR/EIS, interested parties could request a copy of the Draft EIR/EIS by calling (877) 977-1660.

### 750-1119

See the response to comment 750-1116.

### 750-1120

The commenter expresses concern about the level of information provided to the communities affected by the project and the amount of time to consider the project. Refer to response to comment 750-1117 contained in this chapter of this Final EIR/EIS.

Submission 742 (Robert Engle, Los Angeles Boys & Girls Club, July 8, 2020)

742-1094

1 MR. ENGLE: Sure thing. It's Robert Engle.  
2 I'm the chairman and president of the Los Angeles Boys  
3 & Girls Club in the neighborhood. I'm neither for nor  
4 against the project, mainly because there has not been  
5 enough time for myself or my team to review the  
6 documents.  
7 I'd like to encourage you guys to extend the  
8 comment period. That's all. Thank you, and I look  
9 forward to digging in the plans a little bit more.  
10 MS. ARELLANO: Excellent. Please do. Thank  
11 you, Robert.  
12 Next, we have Christine Nash. Christine,  
13 you're next. If you can state any affiliation and your  
14 full name. I believe we have that spelling, but please  
15 indicate that for the record.  
16 MS. NASH: Hi. Thanks so much. Can you hear  
17 me all right?  
18 MS. ARELLANO: Yes. Go right ahead,  
19 Christine.  
20 MS. NASH: Great. It's Christine Nash,  
21 C-H-R-I-S-T-I-N-E, Nash.  
22 I'm a property manager. We have over 150  
23 tenants in our Lincoln Heights parcel that is directly  
24 affected. Our property, according to this, is going to  
25 have a new road cutting through it, and I'm kind of

27



## Response to Submission 742 (Robert Engle, Los Angeles Boys & Girls Club, July 8, 2020)

### 742-1094

The commenter requests an extension of the public comment period. In response to agency and stakeholder requests and in consideration of limitations caused by the novel coronavirus pandemic, the Authority elected to extend the initial 45-day public review period for 15 days to July 31, 2020, and then for another 30 days to August 31, 2020.

Therefore, the comment period provided was a total of 94 days, which is twice the minimum requirement, pursuant to CEQA and NEPA, of 45 days.

## Submission 754 (Dr. Gloria Gasca, July 8, 2020)

1 MS. GASCA: Hello. Good evening, everybody.  
2 My name is Dr. Gloria Gasca. That's Gloria,  
3 G-L-O-R-I-A; Gasca, G-A-S-C-A. And I am the principal  
4 of PUC Excel Charter Academy. It's the middle school  
5 on Main Street.

754-1135

6 And I'm speaking to you just as a concerned  
7 parent and administrator. I'm a little disappointed at  
8 the lack of time around announcing this meeting and  
9 really how it reached out to us, as one of your  
10 community stakeholders.

11 I do appreciate -- I listened to some of the  
12 meeting, and I appreciate the opportunity to make  
13 appointments, so we'll be doing that in the future,  
14 too, for the other July dates.

754-1136

15 But for now, as voicing our school community  
16 concerns, our biggest concern is around just -- just  
17 the change in the route and the devastation that's  
18 going to cause our community.

754-1137

19 So one of my questions is: Why the change of  
20 the route? We were under the impression that it would  
21 go with the existing railroad route. And we would just  
22 like more information as to why this in your future  
23 response.

754-1138

24 Just that the proposed route is going to go  
25 through a beautiful new park that they just built. It

115



754-1138

1 took years to start to -- to enjoy that park, and now  
2 it's going to be impacted.

754-1139

3 Also, I think just the overall concern that  
4 this new -- or the proposed route will impact our  
5 neighborhood streets. We were already highly  
6 congested. I've had students be the victims of drivers  
7 rushing to get -- or to try to do a shortcut and  
8 hitting them as they cross the street or travel on  
9 their bikes to school.

10 So it's just -- a huge concern for the traffic  
11 and the route changing that we will have in our  
12 neighborhood.

754-1140

13 So I just want more clarity around the impact  
14 study of our streets. It's also already a community  
15 that's heavily impacted with the -- with the truck  
16 traffic, so this is going to cause another layer of  
17 wait time for our commuters, as I've read up on some of  
18 the wait times, that the railroad will -- will impact  
19 our communities as well.

754-1141

20 So just to -- to really think about the  
21 project itself. It's going to be taking out huge  
22 chunks of our neighborhood, and it's really devastating  
23 and endangering our community.

754-1142

24 So I just want to know why -- why this new  
25 proposed route when the first route that was in place,

116



## Submission 754 (Dr. Gloria Gasca, July 8, 2020) - Continued

754-1142

1 you know, was an already existing railroad.

2 So thank you.

3 MS. ARELLANO: Dr. Gasca, thank you very much.

4 I appreciate you making comments for us today, and I  
5 think I heard you say that you might consider the  
6 office hours, which, of course, I would encourage, to  
7 get any of those specific questions answered during  
8 this comment period. Thank you very much.

9 I also see some additional folks online, but  
10 no one with their hands raised. So, again, I just want  
11 to remind the audience that the panel is assembled here  
12 today as part of the formal public hearing of the  
13 Burbank-to-Los Angeles Project Section.

14 We are approaching -- it's 6:43 right now.  
15 What we have been doing is, on the hour, taking a  
16 ten-minute break for the panelists to stretch their  
17 legs, turn cameras off and microphones off to reconvene  
18 on the hour.

19 So we are still here until, let's say, 6:50.  
20 If we don't have any additional people raising their  
21 hands ready to make a comment, I will instruct the  
22 panel to take a ten-minute break at that point.

23 So just for the audience to know, we are still  
24 here on the screen. You can see that we have various  
25 methods of providing formal public comments.

117



## Response to Submission 754 (Dr. Gloria Gasca, July 8, 2020)

### 754-1135

The commenter expresses disappointment in the outreach efforts and meetings held for community members. Chapter 9 of this Final EIR/EIS provides an updated list of meetings and stakeholder outreach that has been ongoing for the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section since 2014. In response to similar concerns, and in order to maximize outreach to all stakeholders and affected parties to the greatest extent practicable, the Authority extended the Draft EIR/EIS comment period through August 31, 2020, for a total public review period of 94 days. With regard to the provision of notice of the public hearing, Chapter 9 of this Final EIR/EIS also provides a comprehensive list of newspapers in which the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS was advertised, pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and NEPA. In addition to the publication in newspapers, the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR/EIS and public hearings were distributed by direct mail to members of the public who subscribed to the project mailing list, attended project events or meetings, or submitted comments or questions via email or on the Authority's website. Occupants and property owners within 500 feet of the alignment, one-half mile from each proposed HSR station location, and one-half mile from each proposed grade separation were mailed a notice as well. Printed or electronic copies of the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section Draft EIR/EIS were sent to federal, state, and local agencies, regional transportation agencies, and other organizations and persons who had expressed an interest in the project. In addition, the Authority also provided a variety of forums for the public to engage directly with the project team to ask questions and discuss concerns, including virtual "office hours" meetings throughout the public review period; information meetings with the Taylor Yard community on July 20 and the Lincoln Heights community on August 25. Telephone town hall meetings were held on June 29 and August 19. These meetings were in addition to the required public hearing held on July 8.

### 754-1136

The commenter states that the largest concern of the school community is the change in the route and the devastation that the project would cause on the community. The commenter's concerns have been acknowledged. As discussed in Section 3.12.6.3, the HSR project in the Lincoln Heights neighborhood would be built within the existing rail right-of-way. The HSR alignment would be within the existing rail corridor. The permanent property easement at Albion Riverside Park is required for the Main Street grade separation. Because trains already operate along the existing rail corridor, the addition of HSR trains would not substantially disrupt community character and cohesion and would not divide a community or alter the overall physical shape of the community. Access to the existing communities and neighborhoods would be maintained or improved (particularly at locations where the existing at-grade rail crossings would be grade-separated), and the function of communities would not be affected. The HSR Build Alternative would be grade-separated from the existing roads, so there would be no conflict between school buses and the HSR trains. The HSR Build Alternative would provide new grade-separated crossings, which would remove roadway conflicts with the railroad corridor and improve safety and access for buses, bicyclists, and pedestrians, resulting in a beneficial effect related to children's health and safety.

### 754-1137

The commenter expresses concern that the alignment route has been changed. The commenter's statement that there has been a change in route is incorrect. As discussed in Section 2.5.2.2 of this Final EIR/EIS, the HSR alignment would run along the existing railroad corridor along the west bank of the Los Angeles River in this area. No changes would be made to the existing tracks along the east bank of the Los Angeles River. No revisions to this Final EIR/EIS have been made in response to this comment.

## Response to Submission 754 (Dr. Gloria Gasca, July 8, 2020) - Continued

### 754-1138

The commenter expresses concern that park resources would be removed from the community. As discussed in Section 3.15.6.3 of this Final EIR/EIS, permanent impacts would occur to Rio de Los Angeles State Park, Albion Riverside Park, and the Proposed Taylor Yard G2 River Park. However, permanent impacts would only occur in the form of permanent easements or grading and no permanent acquisition of park property would be required for the HSR Project resulting in a permanent loss of parkland. The commenter's statement that the proposed route is going to go through a beautiful new park is not accurate. The HSR alignment will be within the existing rail corridor, and the permanent easement at Albion Riverside Park is due to the Main Street grade separation. This permanent easement is in a portion of the park that is currently used as a cell tower easement and is identified in the master plan for Albion Riverside Park to continue operating as a cell tower easement area. The permanent easement at Albion Riverside Park would not remove any existing recreational facilities or amenities and would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the properties.

### 754-1139

The commenter expresses concerns regarding congestion on neighborhood streets and safety related to pedestrian travel. As stated in Section 3.11.6.3, TR-IAMF#2 would require the creation of a Construction Transportation Plan, which would address how the design-build contractor would carry out each phase of construction to maintain traffic flow during peak travel periods, address pedestrian safety, and promote child safety (via crossing guards near schools, daycare centers, and parks).

Additionally, Table 3.12-C-4 in Appendix 3.12-C of this Final EIR/EIS summarizes information about the potential impacts on children's health and safety from construction of the HSR Build Alternative.

For discussion of access and circulation in the neighborhood, refer to Response to Comment 754-1140, contained in this chapter.

### 754-1140

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Section 3.12 SOCIO-03: Impacts Related to the Main Street Grade Separation.

The commenter expresses concern related to truck traffic. Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Section 3.12 SOCIO-03: Impacts Related to the Main Street Grade Separation. Chapter 2 of this Final EIR/EIS, has been revised to include an updated design for the Main Street Grade Separation Early Action Project. The delays cited by the commenter would occur if the grade crossing were left intact. However, with construction of the Main Street bridge and grade separation, as included in the early action projects, the delays of the crossing gates at Main Street would not occur and no significant impacts related to access would occur.

## Response to Submission 754 (Dr. Gloria Gasca, July 8, 2020) - Continued

### 754-1141

The commenter states that the HSR project would remove large areas of the neighborhood (in which PUC Excel Charter Academy is located) and would endanger the community. In fact, the HSR project in the Lincoln Heights neighborhood would be built largely within the existing rail right-of-way. Although parcel acquisitions would be required, parcel acquisitions have been minimized to the extent possible in the HSR project design. As described in Section 3.12.6.3, Impact SOCIO#3 sufficient number of comparable replacement residences are available in all areas where there would be displacements and relocations. There are 56 vacant single-family residential and 58 vacant multifamily residential units within the city of Los Angeles, which exceeds the 1 single-family and 4 multifamily residential displacements in the city of Los Angeles. As described under Impact SOCIO#4, there are enough sites available among the industrial, commercial, and retail properties in Los Angeles for the businesses that would be displaced by the HSR Build Alternative.

Additionally, as described in Section 3.12.6.3 of this Final EIR/EIS, although construction of the HSR Build Alternative would have permanent disruptive impacts related to residential and business displacements, SOCIO-IAMF#2 would provide relocation assistance to all residents and businesses displaced by the HSR Build Alternative in compliance with the Uniform Act, and SOCIO-IAMF#3 would establish an appraisal, acquisition, and relocation process in consultation with affected cities, counties, and property owners. These IAMFs would minimize the potential for construction of the HSR Build Alternative to relocate residents and businesses outside their existing communities.

Impacts related to safety and security are discussed in detail in Section 3.11.6.

### 754-1142

Refer to Response to Comment 754-1137.

Submission 748 (Jose Gomez, July 8, 2020)

1 joining us. Go right ahead.

2 MR. GOMEZ: Thank you. So, for the record, my  
3 name is Jose, J-O-S-E, Gomez, G-O-M-E-Z.

4 So thank you all for giving me the time to  
5 voice a little bit of my concerns.

6 So I think I come to this project with a very  
7 unique perspective in that I'm both a community member  
8 of the San Fernando Valley, but also a teacher at  
9 S. School in East L.A., middle school teacher.

748-1107

10 And one of the concerns that I have is  
11 basically the safety of our students. With this  
12 community -- or this project or proposal being so close  
13 to our school, what measures are being taken into place  
14 to protect our students?

748-1108

15 Another concern I have is gentrification. As  
16 a lot of us know, East L.A. has been subject to  
17 gentrification, and I'm concerned, in terms of what  
18 plans have been in place to prevent gentrification from  
19 happening, if this project does go into fruition, and  
20 how the community member -- or the community members  
21 are going to be allowed to basically stay in their  
22 homes without being pushed out as a possible  
23 unprecedented repercussion of this project.

748-1109

24 And then my last concern is just whether, as a  
25 public, we've been given a cost-benefit analysis in

48



748-1109

1 terms of what are the benefits of this rail line in  
2 terms of are people actually using Metro line as a  
3 transportation, what's the need that the community has  
4 in terms of just numbers, and just -- I'm curious, in  
5 terms of -- we do have Amtrak in the Valley, and that  
6 goes all the way to Union Station. So how is this  
7 going to differ from possibly being able to use the  
8 Amtrak, to use this alternative source of  
9 transportation?

10 But that's the end of my comments. Thank you  
11 so much for your time.

12 MS. ARELLANO: Absolutely. Thank you, Jose.  
13 We appreciate you taking the time today.

14 I do not see any other hands raised, so the  
15 panel, again, is here today to receive any comments  
16 from the public or any of our offices on the  
17 Burbank-to-Los Angeles Project Section. We encourage  
18 you to please either raise your hand or push star nine  
19 on your phone to indicate you're ready to comment.

20 While we are waiting, I just want to remind  
21 anyone just joining us that we are in our public  
22 hearing for the Burbank-to-Los Angeles Project Section,  
23 draft environmental documents. We are ready to receive  
24 any -- anyone's comment, and we'll be online tonight  
25 until 8:00 o'clock p.m.

49



## Response to Submission 748 (Jose Gomez, July 8, 2020)

### 748-1107

The commenter expresses concerns for the safety of students at “S. School” given the school’s proximity to the High-Speed Rail (HSR) Project. It is unclear to which school the commenter is referring. A school by the name provided by the commenter is not identified in Section 3.11 (Safety and Security) or Section 3.12 (Socioeconomics and Communities) as being within a 0.5-mile radius from the centerline of the HSR Project. A total of 14 schools were identified within the 0.5-mile radius from the centerline of the HSR Project (refer to the Schools section under Section 3.11.5.2 of this Final EIR/EIS). The HSR Project would be constructed and operated primarily within the existing railroad corridor. Therefore, similar train operations already occur near these schools, and there would not be a substantial change from existing conditions. Additionally, because the HSR system would carry passengers and be electric-powered, there would be no safety hazard associated with HSR cargo or fuel. As discussed under Impact S&S #5 in Section 3.11.6 of this Final EIR/EIS, a basic design feature of an HSR system is containment of trainsets within the operational corridor. Therefore, if an HSR derailment were to occur next to a school, the train would remain within the operational corridor. Additionally, the HSR Build Alternative would implement positive train control, which would help to avoid collisions with other trains that could otherwise lead to derailment. Because it would operate within an existing railroad corridor, the HSR Build Alternative would not result in a substantial change from existing conditions related to safety impacts on schools.

Additionally, the commenter is referred to Table 3.12-C-4 in Appendix 3.12-C of this Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS), which summarizes information about the potential impacts on children’s health and safety from construction of the HSR Build Alternative.

### 748-1108

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Section 3.12 SOCIO-02: Impacts to Property Values.

The comment expresses concern regarding gentrification related to the HSR project especially in East Los Angeles.

Additionally, as discussed in Section 5.6.2, under the No Project Alternative discussion, gentrification may occur in the vicinity of the HSR alignment regardless of whether or not the HSR Build Alternative is constructed, because the project is within an existing rail corridor where these trends are already occurring. Moreover, there is no HSR train station located in this community.

### 748-1109

The commenter questions the benefits of the HSR project in terms of people using Metro lines as transportation and the need for this type of project in the community. As stated in Section 1.2.4 of this Final EIR/EIS, the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section is an essential component of the statewide HSR system as it will provide access to a new transportation mode and contribute to increased mobility throughout California. Additionally, the capacity of California’s intercity transportation system, including within the greater Los Angeles area, is insufficient to meet existing and future travel demands. The introduction of HSR service in the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section would improve the existing corridor’s rail infrastructure and would build grade separations, which would greatly benefit Metrolink service as well as accommodating high-speed rail service. As population and employment continue to increase within Southern California, there is a need to provide a variety of options for regional and statewide travel. HSR service in the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section would reduce stress on the existing transportation systems by reallocating some of the regional demand from the highways and airports to HSR. Refer to Section 1.2.4 of this Final EIR/EIS for more detail on the need for the HSR project. Although Amtrak serves the state of California, just as HSR would, it does not offer a high-speed alternative that would draw people who would typically use air travel to access destinations throughout the State.

### Submission 757 (Derek Lane, July 8, 2020)

1 document that is available for public review and  
 2 comment until Friday, July 31st. We are in our final  
 3 moments of our final hearing, which will adjourn at  
 4 8:00 o'clock this evening.

5 I do see that we have one individual who has  
 6 raised their hand for a comment prior to our  
 7 adjournment, which is great, so I would like to  
 8 recognize Derek Lane.

9 Derek, you're the next person to speak on the  
 10 program. If you can please state your name, any  
 11 affiliation, and be sure to spell your name so we have  
 12 that accurately for the record.

13 Go right ahead, Derek.

14 MR. LANE: Can you hear me now?

15 MS. ARELLANO: Yes. Absolutely. Go right  
 16 ahead. We have you.

17 MR. LANE: Thank you. My name's Derek Lane.  
 18 That's D-E-R-E-K, L-A-N-E.

19 I want to thank the panel for the opportunity  
 20 to speak publicly, and I appreciate the report being  
 21 distributed to the community regarding this project. I  
 22 appreciate the process, and I do appreciate the need  
 23 for these sorts of projects, you know, to go forward  
 24 and to happen.

25 I hate to have a not-in-my-backyard type of

147



757-1148

1 attitude about this, but I do have to voice that I was  
 2 pretty concerned upon reading the report.

3 My general feeling is that more people in my  
 4 community would be concerned if they had the patience  
 5 or the knowledge to be able to read the report and  
 6 understand it. It's very extensive, but I thought some  
 7 of the more concerning items are kind of buried in that  
 8 thing.

9 You know, I live in a community that is just  
 10 southeast of Rio de Los Angeles Park. It's a brand-new  
 11 community. It's only been here for a couple of years.  
 12 It has about 100 privately owned condos, one of which  
 13 my wife and I live in.

14 There's also Section 8 housing, extensive  
 15 Section 8 housing, and there's some elder care -- or  
 16 I'm sorry, an elder community also here on the  
 17 property, all people who have moved here recently. And  
 18 you get people, particularly in the condos, are young  
 19 families. My wife is pregnant, and we're expecting a  
 20 child this fall.

21 And to read this report and see things, you  
 22 know, regarding the child health and safety that impact  
 23 the air quality issues during the operation, in  
 24 construction, our thoughts on noise, vibration during  
 25 construction, carbon monoxide -- carbon monoxide

148



## Submission 757 (Derek Lane, July 8, 2020) - Continued

757-1149

1 emissions that would (inaudible) general conformity  
2 that would have (inaudible) mitigating, with or without  
3 mitigations.

4           You know, we purchased this location knowing  
5 that we were near Metro property, and we knew Metro was  
6 running some trains, but we didn't really have any idea  
7 that a project like this was going to be taken upon so  
8 nearby.

757-1150

9           I don't know if we're within the 500 feet  
10 listed in the report that we should be concerned about  
11 vibration, but I just wish there was more information  
12 because I think in reading this thing, it's kind of  
13 scary to think that we're going to be having a baby and  
14 living here next to something that can be very  
15 disruptive.

16           The trains that come by already are sometimes  
17 loud. Sometimes they shake. It feels like an  
18 earthquake is happening in our condo.

757-1151

19           So the idea of another extensive operation  
20 nearby is frightening. The pollution is frightening  
21 for a young child to be around. And I know there are a  
22 lot of other families around here.

757-1152

23           So I hope there will be reconsideration on the  
24 location. And if not, I certainly hope there will be  
25 more information provided to the community about this.

757-1153

149



757-1154

1           And, again, like I said, I understand these  
2 projects are necessary, but I also do feel like, with  
3 everything that's going on in the world right now and  
4 the pandemic and everything else, I can't help but  
5 think that there might be better uses of public funds  
6 in this time, you know, just here as of recently.

7           So I want to thank you again for the  
8 opportunity to speak.

9           MS. ARELLANO: Absolutely. Thank you very  
10 much, Derek. Your points are received, and we  
11 appreciate you making them.

12           Please know, and everyone online listening to  
13 this broadcast, that the Authority appreciates and  
14 takes very seriously each and every comment that we  
15 received throughout this very important public comment  
16 period. We've made every effort to extend the public  
17 comment period and ensure that there's accessibility  
18 for all to learn about the project and comment about  
19 the project.

20           Once again, all of your comments will be  
21 recorded as part of the formal environmental process.  
22 This process comment period will end on Friday,  
23 July 31st, and I will encourage you, again, to consider  
24 any additional comments and to share with others that  
25 this is -- opportunity is available.

150



## Response to Submission 757 (Derek Lane, July 8, 2020)

### 757-1148

The commenter expressed concern that impacts were not readily available to a standard reader of the Draft EIR/EIS. The Summary of the Draft EIR/EIS condensed the scope of impacts from the HSR project into a single table in Section S.11 (specifically, in Table S-5). The Summary was translated into eight languages, so as to reach the broadest audience possible.

The Preface of the Draft EIR/EIS states: “While the science and analysis that supports this Draft EIR/EIS are complex, this document is intended for the general public. Every attempt has been made to limit the use of technical terms and acronyms. Where this cannot be avoided, the terms and acronyms are defined the first time they are used in each chapter.” The Preface goes on to indicate: “For a reader with limited time to devote to this document, the Summary is the place to start. It provides an overview of all of the substantive chapters in this document including the potential environmental impacts for each environmental resource topic.”

### 757-1149

Because this comment was provided verbally, portions of it were inaudible and it is not clear what concern was raised. Refer to Section 3.3 of this Final EIR/EIS for a discussion of the general conformity determination for air quality.

### 757-1150

The commenter is not sure of the location of his home relative to the HSR corridor and is concerned about future vibration effects. The vibration assessment provided under Impact N&V #5 in Section 3.4.6 of this Final EIR/EIS has been completed consistent with the FRA’s High-Speed Ground Transportation Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (FRA 2012). The criteria in the HSR manual is intended to determine the levels at which potential impacts would occur. Based on the technical analysis completed, there would be no vibration impacts to the existing Taylor Yard residences associated with the HSR project. No changes have been made to the Final EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

### 757-1151

This comment suggests that toxic pollutants will result in impacts to sensitive receptors in the project vicinity. Construction-related criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants were assessed in Section 3.3.6.3. It should be noted that the regional construction impact would be significant for NO<sub>2</sub> and CO pollutants (as shown in Table 3.3-16 on pages 3.3-50 through 3.3-52). All other criteria pollutants (VOC, SO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) were found to be less than significant under CEQA.

Impact AQ#5 in the Draft EIR/EIS describes the health risk assessment prepared for the project. As shown in Table 3.3-22, the project would not result in a significant increase in cancer or noncancer health risk for receptors (including children) adjacent to the project site.

As described in Section 3.3.4.3, the project would incorporate standardized HSR features to avoid and minimize air quality impacts. These IAMFs would substantially reduce emissions from the project.

For example, AQ-IAMF#4 requires the use of Tier 4 engines to reduce criteria exhaust emissions from construction equipment. AQ IAMF#5 requires the use of newer-model-year on-road construction trucks. TR-IAMF#7 requires the use of construction truck routes away from sensitive receptors.

Long-term health consequences of the project are not anticipated based upon the air quality analysis and health risk assessment prepared for the project. No revisions have been made to the Final EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

### 757-1152

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Chapter 2 Alt-01: Alternatives.

The commenter expresses opposition to the location of the HSR alignment. As discussed in Section 2.4.2.2 of this Final EIR/EIS, the existing railroad corridor was first identified in the 2005 Statewide Program EIR/EIS and selected as the preferred alignment in subsequent alternative analyses, as it had the fewest environmental impacts. Please refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Chapter 2 Alt-01: Alternatives for more information about the range of alternatives. No revisions to this Final EIR/EIS have been made in response to this comment.

## Response to Submission 757 (Derek Lane, July 8, 2020) - Continued

### 757-1153

The commenter expresses concern about the level of information provided to communities affected by the project and hopes more information will be provided. Chapter 9 of this Final EIR/EIS provides an updated list of meetings and stakeholder outreach that has been ongoing for the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section since 2014. In addition, in response to similar concerns, and in order to maximize outreach to all stakeholders and affected parties to the greatest extent practicable, the Authority extended the Draft EIR/EIS comment period through August 31, 2020, for a total public review period of 94 days. In addition, the Authority also provided a variety of forums for the public to engage directly with the project team to ask questions and discuss concerns, including virtual “office hours” meetings throughout the public review period; information meetings with the Taylor Yard community on July 20 and with the Lincoln Heights community on August 25; and, telephone town hall meetings on June 29 and August 19. These meetings were in addition to the required public hearing held on July 8.

Project information, including electronic versions of the Draft EIR/EIS, can be found on the Authority’s website at [https://hsr.ca.gov/programs/environmental/eis\\_eir/draft\\_burbank\\_los\\_angeles.aspx](https://hsr.ca.gov/programs/environmental/eis_eir/draft_burbank_los_angeles.aspx). Electronic copies of documents that are not posted on the website can be accessed by calling (877) 977-1660 or emailing [Burbank\\_Los.Angeles@hsr.ca.gov](mailto:Burbank_Los.Angeles@hsr.ca.gov).

### 757-1154

The commenter indicates that funds expended on the project may be better used for other purposes. The HSR System is being developed in compliance with the High-Speed Rail Act of 1996, as well as the voter-approved Proposition 1A, which made available \$9.95 billion in bond funds to initiate construction of the HSR system. More details on the history and funding sources for the HSR system can be found in Section 1.1, Introduction, of Chapter 1, Project Purpose, Need, and Objectives, of this Final EIR/EIS.

Submission 744 (Graciela Munoz, July 8, 2020)

1 it down and send us your hand -- your written comment  
2 anytime as long as it's postmarked, again, prior to  
3 Friday, July 31st.

4 We definitely respect the individual -- the  
5 folks' comments about the comment period, but please  
6 know formally all comments are being requested to be  
7 received by Friday, July 31st.

8 I see that we have another additional person  
9 with their hand raised. I appreciate that. Graciela  
10 Munoz, I see that you raised your hand. You are the  
11 next speaker. If you would like to state your name  
12 fully, any affiliation, and -- you have three minutes.  
13 Go right ahead.

14 MS. MUNOZ: Hi. Good afternoon. My name is  
15 Graciela Munoz, and I am one of the middle school  
16 teachers that works right next to where the planned  
17 rail is expected to be built. And I can tell you being  
18 a teacher there, being a part of the community, it will  
19 serve a major impact, especially to the safety of our  
20 students. With traffic being the way it is as it is  
21 now, as someone mentioned earlier, with the UPS trucks  
22 and all the heavy traffic, this just puts another  
23 danger out to our students.

24 Also, with the park that just has been newly  
25 renovated -- and for that also to be taken away from

30



744-1100

1 the community to build a train through it is something  
2 that I would really like for you guys to reconsider.  
3 It takes a lot to put back into our community, and  
4 getting a park -- that's been really -- just newly  
5 done, and it services a lot of our students.

6 It's kind of disheartening to know that that  
7 is something that is going to be just taken away as  
8 soon as it's just been given. So I would really like  
9 for it all to be reconsidered, especially being an  
10 educator in the community, servicing the community. I  
11 think that it's something that needs to be rethought,  
12 and keeping the community's interest at bay. Thank  
13 you.

14 MS. ARELLANO: Graciela, thank you very much.

15 I do not see any additional persons with their  
16 hands raised, but we have plenty of time, so I will  
17 wait to see if any additional commenters make  
18 themselves available.

19 While we are waiting, I would like to indicate  
20 that it has been a challenge for the Authority, any  
21 public agency right now who is doing a public outreach  
22 program in order to release and obtain information from  
23 the public about any public program.

24 The fact that the public libraries are closed,  
25 it's normally a very -- ready-to-go access point for

31



744-1099

744-1100

## Response to Submission 744 (Graciela Munoz, July 8, 2020)

### 744-1099

The comment expresses concern regarding the safety of students, in particular as it relates to traffic.

The potential for the construction of the HSR Build Alternative to result in impacts on children's health and safety is evaluated in Appendix 3.12-C, Children's Health and Safety Risk Assessment.

While the HSR Build Alternative would be constructed and operate primarily within an existing railroad corridor in urban areas of Burbank, Glendale, and Los Angeles, as described in Section 3.12.7, IAMFs and mitigation measures would be implemented to address impacts on children's health and safety from the HSR project. Construction impacts that could affect children's health and safety (e.g., traffic hazards, air emissions, noise and vibration, and use of hazardous materials near schools) are described in Section 3.12.6.3, Impact SOCIO #14, Temporary Impacts on Children's Health and Safety from Construction. Implementation of IAMFs would avoid and/or minimize effects related to temporary changes in access, increases in noise and dust, and visual changes.

Additionally, Impact SOCIO#18, Permanent Impacts on Children's Health and Safety from Operations, addresses permanent impacts to children's health and safety from operation. Refer to Section 3.2, Transportation, for information on the location and nature of permanent impacts on access and circulation. Out-of-direction travel distances required due to road closures would not result in long detours, and the Authority would work with the local jurisdictions to provide additional access as needed. The HSR Build Alternative would be grade-separated from the existing roads, so there would be no conflict between school buses and the HSR trains. The HSR Build Alternative would provide new grade-separated crossings, which would remove roadway conflicts with the railroad corridor and improve safety and access for buses, resulting in a beneficial effect related to children's health and safety. Additionally, in response to comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS, the Authority has modified the design to limit truck access on neighborhood streets, while optimizing opportunities to keep truck access on Main Street and major roads. Refer to Section 3.11, Safety and Security for additional risks to sensitive land uses such as schools and risks due to train accidents, accidents due to a seismic event, and fire.

### 744-1099

### 744-1100

The commenter expresses concern that park resources would be removed from the community with regard to Albion Riverside Park. As discussed in Section 3.15.6.3 of this Final EIR/EIS, the permanent easement at Albion Riverside Park would be required for the proposed grade separation, which is an early action project, and not for the proposed alignment of the rail. Furthermore, this permanent easement is in a portion of the park that is currently used as a cell tower easement and is identified in the master plan for Albion Riverside Park to continue operating as a cell tower easement area. Therefore, the permanent easement for the proposed pier walls would not remove any existing recreational facilities or amenities and would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of this property. No revisions to this Final EIR/EIS have been made in response to this comment.

### Submission 749 (Dhiraj Narayan, July 8, 2020)

1 you.

2 Again, please visit the [www.meethrsocal.org](http://www.meethrsocal.org)  
3 website for full information, or the Authority's  
4 website, which takes you straight to the project  
5 section, where you can provide us your formal public  
6 comment.

7 We do have one individual with their hand  
8 raised, and so I would like to acknowledge Dhiraj  
9 Narayan to please provide your comment. We are happy  
10 to receive -- to see that you're online and ready to  
11 provide us a comment.

12 Please state your name, and if you can please  
13 spell it for benefit of the transcriber. And you have  
14 three minutes. Please go right ahead.

15 MR. NARAYAN: Can you hear me?

16 MS. ARELLANO: Yes. Please go right ahead.

17 Thank you for joining us.

18 MR. NARAYAN: Yes. My public comment is going  
19 to be closer to four, four-and-a-half minutes. I do  
20 have my wife here, so if you can consider both of us  
21 together for a total of six minutes?

22 MS. ARELLANO: Absolutely. Please go right  
23 ahead. And if you can please state your name and spell  
24 it.

25 MR. NARAYAN: Yes. My name is Dhiraj,

61



1 D-H-I-R-A-J; last name, Narayan, N-A-R-A-Y-A-N.

2 MRS. NARAYAN: And I'm Harini, Dhiraj's wife.  
3 My name is spelled H-A-R-I-N-I; last name is  
4 (inaudible). Thank you.

5 MS. ARELLANO: Absolutely. Please go right  
6 ahead.

7 MR. NARAYAN: Yes. Thank you for providing an  
8 opportunity to provide oral comments for the California  
9 High-Speed Rail Authority.

10 I am -- we are homeowners in the Taylor Yards  
11 community in Cypress Park. My home, along with several  
12 others', are in close proximity to the railroad  
13 right-of-way. Our home is presently 100 feet away from  
14 the nearest railroad track. So the high-speed rail  
15 would require moving the Amtrak and Metrolink tracks  
16 30 feet closer to our community in order to accommodate  
17 the high-speed rail.

18 And after we reviewed the noise and vibration  
19 chapter of the Draft EIR, I was shocked to realize that  
20 the report concluded that the project will only cause  
21 moderate impacts to our community. Therefore, the  
22 California high-speed rail is proposing zero -- I  
23 repeat zero -- mitigation measures to reduce noise or  
24 vibration impacts from this project.

25 I finally stated it in an office-hour

62



Submission 749 (Dhiraj Narayan, July 8, 2020) - Continued

749-1110

1 discussion with the California high-speed rail staff,  
2 who informed me that the forecasted noise levels and  
3 vibration levels will be lower than the current decibel  
4 and vibration decibel levels. We find that conclusion  
5 lacking in common sense and logic.

6 It is hard to believe that the shifting of the  
7 train tracks 30 feet closer to our homes will not lead  
8 to an increase in noise and vibration levels. And this  
9 is not even factoring the increased number and  
10 frequency of high-speed trains that will fly at full  
11 capacity and cause a high probability of trains  
12 crossing the tracks at the same time to increase in  
13 decibel levels even more.

14 Even without that consideration, and the fact  
15 that we are approximately 30 feet closer to us, is  
16 being thought -- has been concluded that there is going  
17 to be zero impact. So that is something that we  
18 totally disagree.

19 So we believe that the high-speed rail and the  
20 shifting of tracks will significantly and permanently  
21 increase the levels of noise, dust, and daily  
22 interruptions beyond what we currently endure.

749-1111

23 We are also concerned about the structural  
24 damage to the buildings that will occur over time due  
25 to increased vibrations and request that an assessment

63



749-1111

1 be made of potential damage, along with remedy to  
2 mitigate the long-term impacts.

749-1112

3 Currently, the noise and vibration studies  
4 carried out in the community can be inherently flawed,  
5 and I would request that DHSR direct staff to reanalyze  
6 the noise and vibrations in our community.

749-1113

7 We are also fearful that the approval of the  
8 drafting of the final EIR without factoring in any  
9 mitigation measures will lead to an immediate  
10 impairment of the property values. I don't believe the  
11 DEIR factored this analysis in their report, and I  
12 would like to get a written response on what  
13 compensation will be provided to property owners who  
14 will most likely experience a reduction in their value.

15 Please note that the Taylor Yard community  
16 includes four low-income housing developments that  
17 house 305 homes for extremely low-income, very  
18 low-income, and low-income families. These affordable  
19 homes comprise over 70 percent of the total number of  
20 residential units in Taylor Yards.

749-1114

21 However, no environmental justice impacts to  
22 this community has been analyzed. I, therefore,  
23 request the California high-speed rail to direct staff  
24 to study the environmental justice impacts on the  
25 Taylor Yards community.

64



Submission 749 (Dhiraj Narayan, July 8, 2020) - Continued

749-1115

1           And as many speakers have previously pointed  
2 out, in today's COVID environment, no one seems to be  
3 aware about this project or that the DEIR is out on the  
4 street, and what impacts will the community experience  
5 from this project. Therefore, in closing, I request  
6 that the California High-Speed Rail Authority to carry  
7 out better outreach to our impacted community and  
8 extend the public comment period beyond July 31st.

9 Thank you.

10           MS. ARELLANO: Thank you. And I'm showing an  
11 additional 2 minutes -- 2 minutes, 20 seconds, so  
12 please go right ahead.

13           MR. NARAYAN: No. Well, I conclude my  
14 comments. Thank you so much.

15           MS. ARELLANO: Okay. Okay. Excellent. Thank  
16 you very much for your comment, to you both.

17           I am not seeing any additional individuals  
18 with their hands raised. Again, I would like to  
19 encourage everyone that we are convening today  
20 specifically to receive your formal comments. The  
21 panel is assembled to listen to what you have to say  
22 about the project.

23           We are approaching our 5:00 o'clock hour, and  
24 if I do not see any additional hands raised, which I do  
25 not, what I'd like to do now is to ask for a ten-minute

65



## Response to Submission 749 (Dhiraj Narayan, July 8, 2020)

### 749-1110

The commenter's concern is regarding the findings of the noise/vibration studies in the EIR/EIS. Based on a review of this comment, it appears that there has been a misunderstanding during a conversation with the commenter regarding the noise increase that would occur with implementation of the HSR project.

It is correct that some of the existing tracks will be moved closer to the existing residences. It is an accurate assumption that relocating the existing tracks has the potential to result in noise and vibration increases. However, it has been confirmed by the project engineer that the number of switches in the area close to the Taylor Yard residences is being reduced from three to two. The existing crossover provided for movements between tracks at higher speeds and the existing left-hand turnout allowed movements to a siding track at similar speeds. However, this siding track (Glendale Slide) has since been relocated north between SR 134 and Chevy Chase Boulevard on the east side of the corridor, so the Taylor Yard community would not be exposed to noise from this siding track (refer to the updated plans provided in Volume 3 of this Final EIR/EIS). Additionally, based on the proposed design, the existing UPRR trains would no longer use turnouts in this area, so there would no longer be noise exposure from UPRR trains. These changes in track design, along with the improved track bed and track underlayment, will offset the increases in noise and vibration due to distance reduction. The discussion under Impact N&V #4 and Impact N&V #5 have been updated in Section 3.4.6 of this Final EIR/EIS to reflect the design changes described above. As it relates to the overall increase in noise at the Taylor Yard residences, it is expected that the noise level would increase with implementation and operation of the HSR project. This increase is classified as a moderate impact instead of a severe impact because the noise levels generated by HSR train operation and other modifications to existing trackwork would not elevate the existing noise environment to a level which would cause a severe effect to the nearby sensitive receivers. Mitigation is being considered for sensitive receptors that would be severely impacted by the future HSR project operations.

### 749-1111

Impact N&V #5 in this Final EIR/EIS discusses potential vibration impacts to the residential uses (including the Taylor Yard community) along the HSR alignment consistent with the FRA's High-Speed Ground Transportation Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (FRA 2012). As shown in Figure 3.4-9, in the area of the Taylor Yard community it was determined that the future vibration levels resulting from the HSR Build Alternative are well below the thresholds of damage for even the most sensitive buildings. Therefore, no mitigation would be required. No changes have been made to the Final EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

### 749-1112

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-GENERAL-05: Taylor Yard Community.

The commenter requests that noise and vibration impacts be reanalyzed in the Taylor Yard community. This Final EIR/EIS has assessed the potential noise and vibration impacts to the Taylor Yard community consistent with the FRA's High-Speed Ground Transportation Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (FRA 2012). Refer to BLA-Response-GENERAL-05: Taylor Yard Community. No changes have been made to the Final EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

## Response to Submission 749 (Dhiraj Narayan, July 8, 2020) - Continued

### 749-1113

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Section 3.12 SOCIO-02: Impacts to Property Values.

The comment expresses concern regarding the impairment of property values related to the HSR project.

As detailed throughout this Final EIR/EIS, the project incorporates project features referred to as IAMFs that will be implemented during project design, construction, and operation to avoid or reduce project effects. These features are considered part of the project, and the EIR/EIS explains how they will work and describes their effectiveness. If significant impacts are determined to occur even with the implementation of the IAMFs, feasible mitigation measures are identified and would be implemented as required under CEQA. As such, project impacts to any properties affected by the HSR project would be avoided, minimized, or mitigated, as appropriate.

Property owners who believe they have suffered a loss may file a claim with the State of California Government Claims Board. More information may be obtained online at <https://www.dgs.ca.gov/ORIM/Services/Page-Content/Office-of-Risk-and-Insurance-Management-Services-List-Folder/File-a-Government-Claim>

### 749-1114

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Chapter 5 EJ-01: Environmental Justice Communities.

The comment states that no environmental justice impacts to the Taylor Yard community have been identified. The environmental justice analysis in Chapter 5 of this Final EIR/EIS includes the census tracts where the Taylor Yard community is located.

### 749-1115

The commenter requests an extension of the public comment period. In response to agency and stakeholder requests and in consideration of limitations caused by the novel coronavirus pandemic, the Authority elected to extend the initial 45-day public review period for 15 days to July 31, 2020, and then for another 30 days to August 31, 2020. Therefore, the comment period provided was a total of 94 days, which is twice the minimum requirement, pursuant to CEQA and NEPA, of 45 days.

The commenter also states that the community is not aware of the project. Chapter 9 of this Final EIR/EIS provides an updated list of all of the meetings and stakeholder outreach that has been ongoing for the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section since 2014. Chapter 9 also provides a comprehensive list of newspapers in which the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS was advertised. In addition to the newspaper advertisements, direct mail was sent to occupants and property owners within 500 feet of the proposed alignment.

## Submission 743 (Christine Nash, July 8, 2020)

1 MR. ENGLE: Sure thing. It's Robert Engle.  
2 I'm the chairman and president of the Los Angeles Boys  
3 & Girls Club in the neighborhood. I'm neither for nor  
4 against the project, mainly because there has not been  
5 enough time for myself or my team to review the  
6 documents.

7 I'd like to encourage you guys to extend the  
8 comment period. That's all. Thank you, and I look  
9 forward to digging in the plans a little bit more.

10 MS. ARELLANO: Excellent. Please do. Thank  
11 you, Robert.

12 Next, we have Christine Nash. Christine,  
13 you're next. If you can state any affiliation and your  
14 full name. I believe we have that spelling, but please  
15 indicate that for the record.

16 MS. NASH: Hi. Thanks so much. Can you hear  
17 me all right?

18 MS. ARELLANO: Yes. Go right ahead,  
19 Christine.

20 MS. NASH: Great. It's Christine Nash,  
21 C-H-R-I-S-T-I-N-E, Nash.

22 I'm a property manager. We have over 150  
23 tenants in our Lincoln Heights parcel that is directly  
24 affected. Our property, according to this, is going to  
25 have a new road cutting through it, and I'm kind of

27



743-1095

743-1096

743-1097

743-1098

1 shocked that we heard about this yesterday.

2 We literally have -- are a business incubator.  
3 We have 110 small businesses that would be affected,  
4 not just by the road cut, but by the years that would  
5 be detoured during construction. We were impacted when  
6 they were working on the Main Street bridge putting in  
7 the fiber-optic line, and there's a lot of people that  
8 are affected by this directly.

9 We also have -- our property is surrounded by  
10 a cement plant. We have the winery. We've got UPS  
11 right next to us. So every day there is an incredible  
12 amount of trucks that go back and forth. And I'm  
13 talking container trucks and semis as well.

14 I happen to be the daughter of a city planner,  
15 and I used to film his public involvement hearings when  
16 it came to environmental impact and light rail, and I'm  
17 just kind of shocked that this is the first time, as a  
18 fairly large business, we're hearing about this.

19 So I would like to echo a lot of the previous  
20 comments. Can we please -- especially during this  
21 COVID, I know you guys are doing your best to try and  
22 loop everyone in during these crazy times, but can we  
23 please have more time to talk to not only our  
24 neighbors, which we're already doing -- it's kind of an  
25 uproar in Lincoln Heights right now -- but all of the

28



743-1095

Submission 743 (Christine Nash, July 8, 2020) - Continued

743-1098

1 subtenants and the people and the companies. It would  
2 really be helpful. So please lodge yet one more  
3 enthusiastic request for an extension to the public  
4 comment period. Thank you.

5 MS. ARELLANO: Christine, thank you very much.  
6 It looks like we do have other individuals online, but  
7 I do not see anyone else's hands raised. We have  
8 plenty of time, so please indicate if you are ready to  
9 make a comment by using the "Raise your Hand" button on  
10 your screen, and we are -- the panel is here ready to  
11 receive your comment at any time. For the moment,  
12 we'll just wait.

13 I would also just like to point everyone to  
14 the screen. Instructions will remain on screen as we  
15 are broadcasting live to indicate how you can provide  
16 your comment during, obviously, today's public hearing  
17 or anytime following today prior to today, Friday,  
18 July 31st.

19 As you can see, there is an online form on the  
20 Authority's website at [hsr.ca.gov](http://hsr.ca.gov). You can e-mail the  
21 project team directly at the Burbank-to-Los Angeles  
22 e-mail address that you see there on screen. Or we are  
23 still receiving traditional mail at the Authority's  
24 Los Angeles Southern California office, and you see  
25 that address there on the screen as well. You can jot

29



## Response to Submission 743 (Christine Nash, July 8, 2020)

### 743-1095

The commenter expresses concerns about effects to their property and the lack of noticing. Chapter 9 of this Final EIR/EIS provides an updated list of meetings and stakeholder outreach that has been ongoing for the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section since 2014. In response to similar concerns, and in order to maximize outreach to all stakeholders and affected parties to the greatest extent practicable, the Authority extended the Draft EIR/EIS comment period through August 31, 2020, for a total of 94 days. With regard to noticing, Chapter 9 of this Final EIR/EIS also provides a comprehensive list of newspapers in which the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS was advertised, pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and NEPA. In addition to the publication in newspapers, the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR/EIS and public hearings were distributed by direct mail to members of the public who subscribed to the project mailing list, attended project events or meetings, or submitted comments or questions via email or on the Authority's website. Occupants and property owners within 500 feet of the alignment, one-half mile from each proposed HSR station location, and one-half mile from each proposed grade separation were mailed a notice as well. Printed or electronic copies of the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section Draft EIR/EIS were sent to federal, state, and local agencies, regional transportation agencies, and other organizations and persons who had expressed an interest in the project.

### 743-1096

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Section 3.12 SOCIO-03: Impacts Related to the Main Street Grade Separation.

The commenter expresses concern about the impacts to businesses due to detours during construction in the vicinity of the Main Street Grade Separation.

As described in Section 3.12.6.3, access to some neighborhoods, businesses, and community facilities would temporarily be disrupted from road closures and detours during construction. However, access to the neighborhoods, businesses, and community facilities would not be eliminated. If roadways require closure or relocation, alternate access would be identified, and detours would be provided prior to closure for continuity of access to neighborhoods. Out-of-direction travel distances required due to road closures would not result in long detours, and the Authority would work with the local jurisdictions to provide additional access as needed.

### 743-1097

The commenter expresses concerns about the noticing and outreach performed on the project. Please refer to the Response to Comment 743-1095, contained in this chapter.

### 743-1098

The commenter requests an extension of the public comment period. In response to agency and stakeholder requests and in consideration of limitations caused by the novel coronavirus pandemic, the Authority elected to extend the initial 45-day public review period for 15 days to July 31, 2020, and then for another 30 days to August 31, 2020. Therefore, the comment period provided was a total of 94 days, which is twice the minimum requirement, pursuant to CEQA and NEPA, of 45 days.

Submission 729 (Steve Riboli, San Antonio Winery, Inc, July 8, 2020)

1 MR. RIBOLI: Good afternoon. Can you hear me?

2 MS. ARELLANO: Yes, Steve. Thank you for  
3 joining us. Please go right ahead with your comment.

4 MR. RIBOLI: Thank you very much. My name is  
5 Steve Riboli, and it's a pleasure to speak with you  
6 today.

7 First, I'm surprised and shocked that no  
8 government officials are on this call that were allowed  
9 to speak prior to me. Because of the importance of  
10 this project, this means I'm speaking in regards to the  
11 Main Street bridge overpass and roadway changes. It's  
12 an extremely large project that resembles a freeway  
13 overpass that impacts approximately six square blocks  
14 of properties.

15 I'm a stakeholder in the area. We've been a  
16 stakeholder for almost over 100 years with the  
17 San Antonio Winery. My goal today is to request an  
18 extension of time because, in speaking for myself and  
19 the community, no one understands this project. The  
20 outreach has been extremely poor or negligible due to  
21 the COVID crisis.

22 This community is made up of many, many  
23 immigrants, multigenerational families. Many don't own  
24 a computer. Many would not know how to understand the  
25 impact or read the line drawings that were presented.

10



729-1025

729-1026

729-1027

1 They're homeowners. They're business owners, and it is  
2 not fair to be experiencing this process with such a  
3 short comment period during these crisis periods of  
4 time.

5 So I'm asking you, the board and the board  
6 members, to expand this until the COVID crisis is over  
7 so this community can meet, see live models, a  
8 presentation showing elevations of not only what the  
9 bridge structure will look like, but the impacts to the  
10 community as well as the streets and how their homes,  
11 built on 1900-era -- 1900 AD-era streets, will be  
12 impacted due to the traffic patterns.

13 I've met with many members of the community,  
14 and I've met with many stakeholders who do not  
15 understand this, nor have they been contacted, so I'm  
16 really surprised and shocked. Here we are, July the  
17 8th, with two-and-a-half weeks left of a comment period  
18 before the shutdown of the comment period, where no one  
19 understands the implications or the ramifications of  
20 this project.

21 We have invested a tremendous amount of  
22 capital in a traffic study, which will be sent to you.  
23 Many people cannot do that. They can't afford it.  
24 It's obvious.

25 The two largest stakeholders in the community

11



729-1024

729-1025

Submission 729 (Steve Riboli, San Antonio Winery, Inc, July 8, 2020) - Continued

729-1027

1 besides ourselves -- the three largest, excuse me --  
2 Union Pacific Railroad, United Parcel Service, and  
3 CEMEX cement plant, have no idea about this project, so  
4 I'm -- I'm saying we -- you folks are doing business in  
5 a vacuum and taking advantage of the COVID situations  
6 for a very, very -- a community that's going to be left  
7 as a hostage here.

8 So with that being said, I know I'm probably  
9 running out of time.

10 MS. ARELLANO: Yes. Please wrap up your  
11 comments.

729-1028

12 MR. RIBOLI: We are asking for many, many,  
13 many more months of time to be able to comment so it  
14 can be clearly done so the community, as well as the  
15 local politicians, can understand what the  
16 ramifications are for a hundred years in the future,  
17 not just decades.

18 MS. ARELLANO: Thank you.

19 MR. RIBOLI: Thank you very much for your  
20 time, and I wish you all a good day.

21 MS. ARELLANO: Same as -- same to you. Thank  
22 you very much, Steve.

23 Next speaker is Karla Contreras, followed by  
24 Ronnie Robinett -- excuse me -- Ronnie Rudolph, and  
25 then Sascha Robinett.

12



## Response to Submission 729 (Steve Riboli, San Antonio Winery, Inc, July 8, 2020)

### 729-1024

The commenter requests an extension of the public comment period. In response to agency and stakeholder requests and in consideration of limitations caused by the novel coronavirus pandemic, the Authority elected to extend the initial 45-day public review period for 15 days to July 31, 2020, and then for another 30 days to August 31, 2020. Therefore, the comment period provided was a total of 94 days, which is twice the minimum requirement, pursuant to CEQA and NEPA, of 45 days.

### 729-1025

The commenter states that it is not fair to homeowners and business owners that the comment period was short. The Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section Draft EIR/EIS was originally made available for a minimum 45-day public review beginning on May 29, 2020, and ending on July 16, 2020. The Authority then extended the comment period to end on July 31. The comment period was extended again to August 31, 2020, in response to agency and stakeholder requests in consideration of limitations caused by the novel coronavirus pandemic. In total, the duration of the 45-day public comment period was extended to a total of 94 days (from May 29, 2020, through August 31, 2020) so that interested parties would have sufficient time to review the Draft EIR/EIS.

The Authority made a good faith effort to have copies of the Draft EIR/EIS available to the public at the libraries; but circumstances surrounding the continued COVID-19 closures did not allow the anticipated accessibility of the libraries. Therefore, beginning in July 2020, the Authority placed printed copies of the Draft EIR/EIS at Caltrans District 7 Headquarters in Los Angeles and noted this location on the website. Printed and/or electronic copies of the Draft EIR/EIS and electronic copies of associated technical reports were also made available for review during business hours at the Authority's Southern California Regional Office at 355 S Grand Avenue, Suite 2050, Los Angeles, CA 90071.

### 729-1026

The commenter requests an extension of the public comment period. Refer to response to comment 729-1024 contained in this chapter of this Final EIR/EIS. The commenter also requests that the community be shown a presentation depicting what the Main Street bridge structure will look like. As described in Section 3.16.6.3, a key viewpoint was provided to show the new Main Street Bridge visual impact. Figure 3.16-23, Key Viewpoint 20, shows the existing and simulated view from Albion Street looking south, which shows a perspective of the height of the new bridge in relation to the existing environment. The proposed new Main Street bridge would be 86 feet wide and 75 feet high [to be updated upon receipt of new design] at its highest point over the Los Angeles River, and would place three columns within the river channel. The existing Main Street bridge would not be modified. The proposed new Main Street Bridge would be designed to reduce intrusiveness to primary viewer groups, as stated in the Draft EIR/EIS. In addition, the commenter also expressed concern regarding traffic impacts to the area surrounding Main Street. Refer to response to comments 692-750 through 692-777 for detailed responses to comments on traffic impacts in this area.

The commenter also states that many stakeholders in the community have not been contacted regarding the project. Chapter 9 of this Final EIR/EIS provides an updated list of meetings and stakeholder outreach that has been ongoing for the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section since 2014. Chapter 9 also provides a comprehensive list of newspapers in which the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS was advertised. In addition to the newspaper advertisements, direct mail was sent to occupants and property owners within 500 feet of the proposed alignment.

## Response to Submission 729 (Steve Riboli, San Antonio Winery, Inc, July 8, 2020) - Continued

### **729-1027**

The commenter expresses concern that key stakeholders have not been made aware of the project, as well as concerns about project planning activities during the COVID-19 pandemic. The Authority met with Union Pacific to discuss potential impacts to its facilities and tracks on December 5, 2019. Chapter 9, Public and Agency Involvement, of this Final EIR/EIS provides a comprehensive discussion of the outreach to the general public, stakeholders, and agencies that has been ongoing since 2014. The Authority acknowledges that health and safety requirements put in place in response to the pandemic have not allowed for in-person meetings. In an effort to maximize outreach to all stakeholders and affected parties to the greatest extent practicable, the Authority has provided additional opportunities for “virtual” meetings, including virtual “office hours” meetings throughout the public review period; information meetings with the Taylor Yard community on July 20 and with the Lincoln Heights community on August 25; and, telephone town hall meetings on June 29 and August 19. These meetings were in addition to the required public hearing held on July 8.

### **729-1028**

The commenter requests an extension of the public comment period. Refer to response to comment 729-1024 contained in this chapter of this Final EIR/EIS.

Submission 739 (Sascha Robinett, July 8, 2020)

1 eching the previous speakers, I think this needs to be  
2 extended. If this was outside of this COVID issue, 60  
3 days, 45 days, I get it. You can hold, you know,  
4 different things.

5 But to wrap it up, I think it just needs to be  
6 extended. I think it's only fair, and I think it's the  
7 right thing to do, not just from a -- from your guys'  
8 standpoint, but just from a pure human-level standpoint  
9 that there's bigger things to deal with than  
10 rubber-stamping this right now.

11 Thank you. Have a good day.

12 MS. ARELLANO: Thank you very much for your  
13 comment.

14 We have two additional commenters lined up.  
15 The next speaker is Sascha Robinett. I am not sure if  
16 I'm pronouncing your name correctly. Just to make sure  
17 we have it properly for the record, if you would like  
18 to spell your name to make sure our transcriber has  
19 that properly. Sascha, you have three minutes.

20 MS. ROBINETT: Sascha Robinett. Hi. This is  
21 Sascha. You can spell my name R-O-B-I-N-E-T-T. I am  
22 the principal of PUC Milagro Charter School located on  
23 Main in Lincoln Heights. I am requesting your support  
24 in helping to extend the public comment for multiple  
25 months. Most of Lincoln Heights community members know

20



739-1082

739-1083

1 very little about this project because information was  
2 released during safer-at-home orders, and the  
3 information provided was mostly gone -- has mostly gone  
4 out to property owners, not community members.

739-1084

5 The proposed map has the high-speed rail  
6 project ripping apart a beloved and vital Lincoln  
7 Heights neighborhood. Milagro Charter has been part of  
8 the community for 17 years, along with Excel Middle  
9 School, Albion Elementary School, which the traffic  
10 would be routed around. The stop would be at our  
11 school. It would rip apart our very beloved and newly  
12 remodeled Downey Park, and destroy iconic businesses  
13 like Lanza Brothers and multiple other businesses as  
14 well as churches.

15 My concerns range from environmental impact to  
16 community displacement. It is time that kids matter,  
17 communities of color matter, and Lincoln Heights has a  
18 voice in determining the quality of life for its  
19 citizens. Innovation is needed in our world, but not  
20 at the expense of its people.

21 Again, I hope for your leadership, I hope for  
22 your extension, and I hope for a better outcome for our  
23 community. Thank you so much.

24 MS. ARELLANO: Excellent. Thank you, Sascha.  
25 We appreciate your comments.

21



## Response to Submission 739 (Sascha Robinett, July 8, 2020)

### 739-1082

The commenter requests an extension of the public comment period. In response to agency and stakeholder requests and in consideration of limitations caused by the novel coronavirus pandemic, the Authority elected to extend the initial 45-day public review period for 15 days to July 31, 2020, and then for another 30 days to August 31, 2020. Therefore, the comment period provided was a total of 94 days, which is twice the minimum requirement, pursuant to CEQA and NEPA, of 45 days.

### 739-1083

The commenter expresses concern about the circulation period for the Draft EIR/EIS during the “safer-at-home” orders required during the COVID-19 pandemic. Meetings and outreach events were held in the Lincoln Heights neighborhood in July 2016 and October 2018. Due to health and safety requirements that went into effect in early 2020, the community open house and public hearing for the Draft EIR/EIS was shifted to an online platform. During the public review period on August 25, 2020, the Authority hosted a virtual public meeting with the Lincoln Heights neighborhood to present information on and answer questions about the proposed Main Street Grade Separation.

The public was able to attend the meeting via computer and telephone.

In order to maximize outreach to all stakeholders and affected parties to the greatest extent practicable, the Authority extended the Draft EIR/EIS comment period through August 31, 2020 for a total of 94 days. Chapter 9 of this Final EIR/EIS provides a comprehensive list of newspapers in which the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS was advertised.

In addition to the publication in newspapers, the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR/EIS and public hearings were distributed by direct mail to members of the public who subscribed to the project mailing list, attended project events or meetings, or submitted comments or questions via email or on the Authority’s website. Renters and occupants within 500 feet of the alignment, one-half mile from each proposed HSR station location, and one-half mile from each proposed grade separation were mailed a notice as well. Printed or electronic copies of the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section Draft EIR/EIS were sent to federal, state, and local agencies, regional transportation agencies, and other organizations and persons who had expressed an interest in the project.

### 739-1084

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Section 3.12 SOCIO-01: Relocations, ROW Process, Eminent Domain.

The commenter expresses concern about the division of the Lincoln Heights neighborhood and potential impacts to four schools, the Downey Recreation Center at Albion Park, and community businesses including the Lanza Brothers Market.

The HSR project does not propose the closure of any parks. As described in Section 3.15.6 of this Final EIR/EIS, construction of the HSR Build Alternative would require a permanent easement within Albion Riverside Park. The area of permanent easement within this park would be minimal in size and would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the recreational resources. Specifically, in Albion Riverside Park, the impact is from a permanent aerial easement of 0.12 acre of land in the park that is required to construct the pier walls necessary to support the proposed Main Street Grade Separation. Although the piers would be placed within the park property boundary, this impact area is in the southern portion of the park, where no recreational amenities exist. The land in this area currently functions as a paved area with an existing cell tower. Moreover, the master plan for Albion Riverside Park indicates that this area would continue to operate as a cell tower easement area. As such, the HSR project would not result displace recreational facilities at Albion Riverside Park or displace the Downey Recreation Center, located to the northeast of Albion Riverside Park.

The construction of the HSR project would require the acquisition of additional property in the community, which would displace some existing uses but not the Lanza Brothers Market or any churches. As discussed in Section 3.12.6.3, with the implementation of SOCIO-IAMF#2, which would provide relocation assistance to all persons displaced by the HSR Build Alternative, and SOCIO-IAMF#3, which would establish an appraisal, acquisition, and relocation process in consultation with affected cities, counties, and property owners, permanent construction impacts on communities would be minimized. The property acquisitions would not divide the existing community as the displacements would generally occur along the existing railroad corridor or at the edges of neighborhoods.

## Response to Submission 739 (Sascha Robinett, July 8, 2020) - Continued

### 739-1084

The potential for the construction of the HSR Build Alternative to result in impacts on children's health and safety is evaluated in Appendix 3.12-C, Children's Health and Safety Risk Assessment. While the HSR Build Alternative would be constructed and operate primarily within an existing railroad corridor in urban areas of Burbank, Glendale, and Los Angeles, as discussed in Section 3.12.7, IAMFs and mitigation measures would be implemented to address effects on children's health and safety from the HSR project. Construction impacts that could affect children's health and safety (e.g., traffic hazards, air emissions, noise and vibration, and use of hazardous materials near schools) are described in Section 3.12.6.3, Impact SOCIO #14, Temporary Impacts on Children's Health and Safety from Construction. Implementation of IAMFs would avoid and/or minimize impacts related to temporary changes in access, increases in noise and dust, and visual changes; therefore, temporary impacts on children's health and safety from construction of the HSR Build Alternative would be less than significant.

Additionally, Impact SOCIO#18, Permanent Impacts on Children's Health and Safety from Operations, addresses permanent impacts to children's health and safety from operation. Refer to Section 3.2, Transportation, for information on the location and nature of permanent impacts on access and circulation. Out-of-direction travel distances required due to road closures would not result in long detours, and the Authority would work with the local jurisdictions to provide additional access as needed. The HSR Build Alternative would be grade-separated from the existing roads, so there would be no conflict between school buses and the HSR trains. The HSR Build Alternative would provide new grade-separated crossings, which would remove roadway conflicts with the railroad corridor and improve safety and access for buses, resulting in a beneficial effect related to children's health and safety. Refer to Section 3.11, Safety and Security, for additional information about potential risks to sensitive land uses such as schools from train accidents, accidents associated with a seismic event, and fire.

The commenter also expresses concern for displaced residents in the Lincoln Heights neighborhood. Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Section 3.12 SOCIO-01: Relocations, ROW Process, Eminent Domain.

Consistent with the requirements of the Uniform Act and California Relocation Assistance Act, the Authority is committed to working closely and proactively with residents and businesses to help them plan ahead for relocation, find new homes or

### 739-1084

sites, and solve problems related to the acquisitions. While relocation assistance would mitigate the displacement, relocation could still represent an inconvenience or hardship to some property owners.

## Submission 738 (Ronnie Rudolph, July 8, 2020)

1 know that our office is on this -- call isn't the right  
2 word, but we're here listening to everybody's comments  
3 and very involved in the process and very interested to  
4 know what the community has to say. And so we will --  
5 I will be probably -- for five hours I will probably  
6 have to go in and out a little bit, but I will be here,  
7 so -- and I think about half the route is in our  
8 district. So I just wanted to touch bases with you  
9 guys and let you know that, and that's it. Thanks.

10 MS. ARELLANO: Let me go back to our  
11 participants list. Ronnie, you have been very patient.  
12 Please proceed. You have three minutes.

13 MR. RUDOLPH: Can you hear me?

14 MS. ARELLANO: We sure can.

15 MR. RUDOLPH: My name is Ronnie Rudolph. I am  
16 a property manager, stakeholder in the community, and  
17 also oversee a few developments that have happened in  
18 this community and many different communities, and I am  
19 calling because, as echoing a couple of the prior  
20 speakers before me, I don't believe this has been  
21 properly notified to any tenants.

22 I've reached out to dozens, if not almost 100  
23 tenants -- or, sorry, residents or businesses or  
24 stakeholders in the community. Almost nobody's heard  
25 of the -- they've heard of the project through the

17



738-1075

1 rumor mill, but has no idea that it was even going near  
2 Lincoln Heights.

738-1076

3 Once I showed them the PDF, which is over 100  
4 pages long, and having to navigate to which pages  
5 affect not just Lincoln Heights, but also every  
6 community between L.A. and Burbank, you look at the --  
7 which is essentially CAD files -- a lot of people can't  
8 understand that, most definitely not the general  
9 public.

10 You know, I work in real estate and  
11 development, and I'm not an architect, and I'm not an  
12 engineer, and I can barely read that and understand  
13 what's going on. There's no real scale to show, hey,  
14 this is going to go 70 feet over the air, something  
15 massive that's even taller than what the 5 freeway was  
16 back in the '60s. And I feel like that's the only way  
17 you can compare this, is that it's going to go through  
18 a section of Lincoln Heights that was like the 5  
19 freeway.

738-1077

20 You know, there's a brand-new park in which --  
21 the city spent millions of dollars on that. Now,  
22 accordingly to these plans, a portion of that will be  
23 taken away. There's schools. There's, obviously,  
24 residents. I don't know if any one of you -- whether  
25 that would be any of the representatives, you know, on

18



738-1075

738-1078

Submission 738 (Ronnie Rudolph, July 8, 2020) - Continued

738-1078

1 this call -- were able to drive in those back streets  
2 where Albein is. There's a lot of one-sided parking.  
3 Two cars can't fit inside those areas. I don't know  
4 how that would work.

738-1079

5 I just feel that with not only the  
6 non-English-speaking people in Lincoln Heights -- and  
7 not just Spanish. There's also multiple other  
8 languages that are not available or -- on this call.  
9 The fact that it is low income, that they don't know  
10 how to operate -- they don't have computers or  
11 Internet -- you're really alienating a strong and huge  
12 amount of the city in which they don't have the ability  
13 to go look at this.

738-1080

14 You sent a flyer saying, "You have these Zoom  
15 calls. Plus, you can go to these libraries." Well,  
16 all those libraries are closed, so that in itself is  
17 very hypocritical by you guys even stating that on  
18 paper.

19 You know, obviously this COVID-19 has affected  
20 you in which -- why we're having these calls like this,  
21 and it's affected us, and everybody's so worried about  
22 their health and their well-being and -- do I have the  
23 proper mask? Is my business allowed to operate? This  
24 is just flying under the radar in which nobody's really  
25 going to understand, so for that I am requesting, in

738-1081

19



738-1081

1 eching the previous speakers, I think this needs to be  
2 extended. If this was outside of this COVID issue, 60  
3 days, 45 days, I get it. You can hold, you know,  
4 different things.

5 But to wrap it up, I think it just needs to be  
6 extended. I think it's only fair, and I think it's the  
7 right thing to do, not just from a -- from your guys'  
8 standpoint, but just from a pure human-level standpoint  
9 that there's bigger things to deal with than  
10 rubber-stamping this right now.

11 Thank you. Have a good day.

12 MS. ARELLANO: Thank you very much for your  
13 comment.

14 We have two additional commenters lined up.  
15 The next speaker is Sascha Robinett. I am not sure if  
16 I'm pronouncing your name correctly. Just to make sure  
17 we have it properly for the record, if you would like  
18 to spell your name to make sure our transcriber has  
19 that properly. Sascha, you have three minutes.

20 MS. ROBINETT: Sascha Robinett. Hi. This is  
21 Sascha. You can spell my name R-O-B-I-N-E-T-T. I am  
22 the principal of PUC Milagro Charter School located on  
23 Main in Lincoln Heights. I am requesting your support  
24 in helping to extend the public comment for multiple  
25 months. Most of Lincoln Heights community members know

20



## Response to Submission 738 (Ronnie Rudolph, July 8, 2020)

### 738-1075

The commenter expresses concern regarding the outreach efforts in the Lincoln Heights neighborhood. Meetings and outreach events were held in the Lincoln Heights neighborhood in July 2016 and October 2018. Chapter 9 of this Final EIR/EIS provides a comprehensive updated list of meetings and stakeholder outreach that has been ongoing for the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section since 2014. In response to similar concerns, and in order to maximize outreach to all stakeholders and affected parties to the greatest extent practicable, the Authority extended the Draft EIR/EIS comment period from May 29, 2020 through August 31, 2020, for a total of 94 days.

During the public review period on August 25, 2020, the Authority hosted a virtual public meeting with the Lincoln Heights neighborhood to present information on and answer questions about the proposed Main Street Grade Separation. The public was able to attend the meeting via computer and telephone.

Chapter 9 of this Final EIR/EIS also provides a comprehensive list of newspapers in which the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS was advertised. In addition to the publication in newspapers, the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR/EIS and notices for the public hearings were distributed by direct mail to members of the public who subscribed to the project mailing list, attended project events or meetings, or submitted comments or questions via email or on the Authority's website. Occupants and property owners within 500 feet of the alignment, one-half mile from each proposed HSR station location, and one-half mile from each proposed grade separation were mailed a notice as well. Printed or electronic copies of the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section Draft EIR/EIS were sent to federal, state, and local agencies, regional transportation agencies, and other organizations and persons who had expressed an interest in the project.

### 738-1076

The commenter noted that the general readability of the Draft EIR/EIS was difficult for the public to understand. The commenter also expressed concern regarding the community of Lincoln Heights and potential HSR project impacts within that community. The Preface of the Draft EIR/EIS states: "While the science and analysis that supports this Draft EIR/EIS are complex, this document is intended for the general public. Every attempt has been made to limit the use of technical terms and acronyms. Where this cannot be avoided, the terms and acronyms are defined the first time they are used in each chapter." The Preface goes on to indicate: "For a reader with limited time to devote to this document, the Summary is the place to start. It provides an overview of all of the substantive chapters in this document including the potential environmental impacts for each environmental resource topic."

Further, there is discussion of the project impacts in the Lincoln Heights Neighborhood in Aesthetics (Section 3.16), specifically Key View Points 20 & 21 (Section 3.16.6.3). These KVPs include visual simulations which can help the reader better visualize the project in the neighborhood.

### 738-1077

The commenter expresses concern that park resources would be removed from the community with regard to Albion Riverside Park. As discussed in Section 3.15.6.3 of this Final EIR/EIS, the permanent easement at Albion Riverside Park would be required for the proposed grade separation, which is an early action project, and not for the proposed alignment of the rail. Furthermore, this permanent easement is in a portion of the park that is currently used as a cell tower easement and is identified in the master plan for Albion Riverside Park to continue operating as a cell tower easement area. Therefore, the permanent easement for the proposed pier walls would not remove any existing recreational facilities or amenities and would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of this property. No revisions to this Final EIR/EIS have been made in response to this comment.

## Response to Submission 738 (Ronnie Rudolph, July 8, 2020) - Continued

### 738-1078

The commenter expresses concern regarding traffic impacts along Albion Street. Chapter 2 of this Final EIR/EIS, has been revised to include an updated design for the Main Street Grade Separation Early Action Project. The revised design would include a connection between Albion Street and Gibbons Street, but it would restrict truck traffic. A direct connection between Lamar Street and Main Street would also be maintained. Therefore, trucks would not be able to access Albion Street to cut through the residential neighborhood to access I-5. Furthermore, recommended roadway design and control treatments will be considered by the Authority or the City of Los Angeles during final design.

### 738-1079

The comment expresses concern that the non-English-speaking residents and residents without computers in Lincoln Heights are alienated in the environmental review process.

In March 2012, the Authority Board adopted a Title VI Program. In May 2012 the Board adopted an LEP Policy, and in August 2012 the Board adopted EJ guidance. The adoption of these policies formalized the Authority's longstanding efforts to ensure that no person in the State of California is excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of, its programs, activities, and services on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, sex, or disability as afforded by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes.

The LEP Policy articulates the Authority's policy to communicate effectively and with respect, and to provide meaningful access to LEP individuals to all the Authority's programs, services, and activities. Consistent with the Authority's LEP policy, the Authority has provided free language assistance services to LEP individuals encountered during public outreach or whenever requested by LEP individuals.

The EIR/EIS Summary, available in English, Arabic, Armenian, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese, provides an overview of the substantive chapters. It includes a table listing the potential environmental impacts for each environmental resource topic and directs the reader to where additional information can be found elsewhere in the document.

The Authority does not discriminate on the basis of disability and, upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities.

In addition to posting sections of the Draft EIR/EIS on the Authority's website, a printed copy of the Draft EIR/EIS was made available at Caltrans District 7 Headquarters, 100 S Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012. Printed and/or electronic copies of the Draft EIR/EIS and electronic copies of associated technical reports were also made available for review during business hours at the Authority's Southern California Regional Office at 355 S Grand Avenue, Suite 2050, Los Angeles, CA 90071.

Therefore, the Draft EIR/EIS was made accessible to those without access to the

## Response to Submission 738 (Ronnie Rudolph, July 8, 2020) - Continued

### 738-1079

Authority's website. Moreover, as discussed in the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR/EIS, interested parties could request a copy of the Draft EIR/EIS by calling (877) 977-1660.

### 738-1080

The commenter noted that the libraries identified in the Notice of Availability were temporarily closed due to COVID-19 protocols. However, the NOA specify that the document "may be available ...if circumstances allow." The Authority made a good-faith effort to have copies of the Draft EIR/EIS available to the public at the libraries; but circumstances surrounding the continued COVID-19 closures did not allow accessibility of the libraries. Therefore, in July 2020, the Authority placed printed copies of the Draft EIR/EIS at California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 7 Headquarters in Los Angeles and noted the Draft EIR/EIS could be reviewed at this location on the Authority's website. No revisions to this Final EIR/EIS have been made in response to this comment.

### 738-1081

The commenter requests an extension of the public comment period. In response to agency and stakeholder requests and in consideration of limitations caused by the novel coronavirus pandemic, the Authority elected to extend the initial 45-day public review period for 15 days to July 31, 2020, and then for another 30 days to August 31, 2020. Therefore, the comment period provided was a total of 94 days, which is twice the minimum requirement, pursuant to CEQA and NEPA, of 45 days.

Submission 745 (Jill Sourial, July 8, 2020)

1 to turn off cameras, do whatever we need to do, and  
2 then resume. I will go ahead and announce those times  
3 as we do that.

4 I do want to remind our participants -- we do  
5 have a few folks who are online via telephone. If you  
6 are on the phone only and not online, please, you can  
7 punch in star nine on your keypad if you are interested  
8 in raising your hand and providing a comment.

9 We are approaching, in a minute or so, a time  
10 where I think we can take a ten-minute break. I do not  
11 see any additional folks with their hands raised, but I  
12 would encourage you to do so if you're ready to make a  
13 comment. The panel is very interested in hearing your  
14 comments about the project, and we will be doing so  
15 over the next few hours, until 8:00 o'clock this  
16 evening.

17 All right. We do have one additional person  
18 who raised their hand, so we are very interested in  
19 receiving that commenter.

20 Jill Sourial, I see that you raised your hand.  
21 You have the floor. If you can hear us, if you can  
22 please state your name. Spell it for us to make sure  
23 we have it accurately for the record, and you have  
24 three minutes.

25 MS. SOURIAL: Thank you. This is Jill

35



745-1101

745-1102

1 Sourial. It's J-I-L-L. My last name is S-, as in Sam,  
2 O-U-R-I-A-L.

3 I work for the Nature Conservancy, and we  
4 intend to submit written comments as well, but I  
5 thought I'd take this opportunity to just briefly  
6 state, you know, I share the concerns that have been  
7 expressed by folks in Lincoln Heights.

8 The Nature Conservancy is particularly focused  
9 on open spaces in the area, such as Albion and Downey.  
10 And we do have a project and partnership with  
11 California State Parks at the Bowtie Parcel adjacent to  
12 Los Angeles River. So that parcel is part of the  
13 larger Taylor Yard complex.

14 And it's not listed in the set of resources  
15 around parks and open space, but it's in your draft  
16 environmental document, even though it's part of the  
17 general plan for Rio de Los Angeles State Park. So I  
18 would encourage a correction and a relook at actually  
19 calling out Bowtie and the 18 acres that's owned by  
20 State Parks.

21 I also, you know, more broadly, am more  
22 interested in connectivity through that area. The  
23 Metrolink tracks already create kind of a barrier, and  
24 I think if we're planning for long-term infrastructure,  
25 we need to think about the fact that those diesel

36



## Submission 745 (Jill Sourial, July 8, 2020) - Continued

745-1102

1 trains and Metrolinks may become obsolete in the future  
2 and really could be electrified. So we could think  
3 about that area differently.

745-1103

4 If you're in a trench, if you're thinking  
5 about, you know, only electrified trains running  
6 through there, you really have the opportunity to  
7 connect parcels from Cypress Park, Greater Los Angeles,  
8 all the way to the river in a way that enhances the  
9 community instead of detracting from it.

10 So as I said, we'll be providing more detailed  
11 written comments, but I wanted to put that on your  
12 radar and just suggest that we think a little bit more  
13 creatively about the options that are in front of us.  
14 Thank you.

15 MS. ARELLANO: Excellent. Thank you, Jill.  
16 And, actually, your comment makes me think of reminding  
17 all participants, in addition to your three-minute  
18 comment that you may be providing us today, if you have  
19 any additional comments that you would like to submit  
20 in writing, you are welcome and encouraged to do so.

21 Some folks, especially when we would do  
22 in-person public hearings, may exceed the three-minute  
23 mark, and we always want that individual to leave  
24 behind any written or prepared remarks. So if you have  
25 any additional thoughts or don't have enough time to

37



## Response to Submission 745 (Jill Sourial, July 8, 2020)

### 745-1101

The commenter requests the Bowtie Parcel, an 18-acre parcel owned by the State Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), be added as a recreational resource. Section 3.15 of this Final EIR/EIS has been revised to include the Bowtie Parcel. This resource has been added to Figure 3.15-2 and Table 3.15-3 and is now included in the impact discussion in Section 3.15.6.3.

The analysis concludes that the HSR Build Alternative project footprint would not encroach onto the Bowtie Parcel; therefore, the HSR project would not require any temporary construction easements, permanent easements, or permanent acquisition of the Bowtie Parcel. The HSR Build Alternative project footprint is adjacent to this proposed park; therefore, an analysis of impacts during construction was also added to Impact PK#2 in Section 3.15.6.3 of this Final EIR/EIS, to determine if the HSR Project would result in indirect air quality, noise or visual impacts of the proposed park. The impact under CEQA would be less than significant with implementation of AQ-IAMF#1, N&V-IAMF#1, AVR-IAMF#1, and AVR-IAMF#2 during construction of the HSR Build Alternative. Although fugitive dust, noise, vibration, and visual impacts during construction may influence users to choose alternative recreational resources and thereby increase the use of those resources, it is not anticipated that the temporary increase would be large enough to result in substantial physical deterioration of the alternative resources. Therefore, the impact under CEQA would be less than significant and CEQA does not require mitigation.

In the area adjacent to the Bowtie Parcel, the existing tracks would be removed and new tracks would be added slightly farther to the east, away from the proposed park property. After HSR Project implementation, HSR trains would run adjacent to the Bowtie Parcel.

As detailed in the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section Noise and Vibration Technical Report (Authority 2018), the HSR project would result in a noise increase at Site ST-09 (the closest noise monitoring location to this resource), from an existing level of 62 A-weighted decibels (dBA) to 69 dBA after project implementation, which would be a moderate impact. A moderate impact indicates that the introduction of the project would be noticeable to most people, but it may not be sufficient to cause strong reactions from the community. In addition, during operation, visual elements introduced within the rail corridor would include the trains, overhead contact system, lighting, and signage. The

### 745-1101

proposed elements near the Bowtie Parcel would be consistent with the existing railroad corridor, and the HSR project would not introduce any vertical elements that would be visually intrusive to users of the park. Therefore, proximity impacts would not substantially impair the activities, features, or attributes of the property.

For the reasons stated above, neither construction nor operation of the HSR Build Alternative would result in significant impacts on the Bowtie Parcel. Section 3.15 of this Final EIR/EIS has been revised to include this discussion.

### 745-1102

The commenter expresses their opinion that diesel trains and Metrolink may become obsolete in the future and really could be electrified. It is not within the Authority's purview to electrify diesel or Metrolink trains. Therefore, no revisions to this Final EIR/EIS have been made in response to this comment.

### 745-1103

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Chapter 2 Alt-01: Alternatives.

The commenter expresses concern over the range of alternatives and requests consideration of an alignment that does not disrupt the connection between Cypress Park and the Los Angeles River. The commenter's viewpoint is acknowledged. This alternative, which utilizes the existing rail right-of-way, was the outcome of a long-term effort to refine a range of alternatives that would adequately address the project's purpose and objectives, be minimally impactful, navigate a densely populated and urban area, and be noncost-prohibitive. Please refer to BLA-Response-Chapter 2 Alt-01: Alternatives for more information about the range of alternatives. No revisions to this Final EIR/EIS have been made in response to this comment.

## Submission 755 (Ana Suarez, July 8, 2020)

1 I very much appreciate that. I want to acknowledge Ana  
2 Suarez, who just raised her hand.

3 So, Ana, I will call on you next. If you  
4 would like to restate your name, any special spelling  
5 would be helpful for the transcriber, and affiliation.  
6 You have three minutes, please.

7 MS. SUAREZ: Thank you.

8 MS. ARELLANO: There you go.

9 MS. SUAREZ: Yeah. Thank you so much for your  
10 time.

11 Yes. My name is Ana Suarez. That's with one  
12 "n." And it's S-U-A-R-E-Z.

13 I'm an educator in the Lincoln Heights  
14 community for over a decade, and right now I'm asking  
15 that you extend the comment period times to reach out  
16 to the community of Lincoln Heights so that they are  
17 properly informed of the direct and indirect impacts of  
18 the railroad project.

19 My concerns are, first, the health and safety  
20 of the children who attend schools in the Lincoln  
21 Heights immediate community. The air quality will not  
22 be safe for them during and after construction. We  
23 should consider that they play outside and most get to  
24 and from school walking. Schools will face safety and  
25 attendance issues.

131



755-1145

1 Most of these children come from families with  
2 low income who rely on maintenance from neighboring  
3 support systems, such as the parks within Lincoln  
4 Heights.

5 These resources provide child care and  
6 recreational activities to enrich and uplift these  
7 children's lives. This project will require closing  
8 down needed resources for these families, so they  
9 should be given the opportunity of time to get better  
10 informed and share their concerns and opinions.

11 If I may, ask yourselves, given the choice,  
12 would you feel safe knowing your child is now going to  
13 go to school next to a railway and can't afford to  
14 move?

15 So, again, I please ask that you extend the  
16 comment period time and reach out to its community  
17 members and families. Thank you so much for your time.

18 MS. ARELLANO: Ana, thank you very much. We  
19 appreciate you providing us your comment today.

20 Just for benefit of the panel, I don't see any  
21 additional persons with their hands raised.

22 If you need to or just want to stretch, you  
23 are welcome to turn off cameras, but please stand by.  
24 We are still live in our public hearing to receive  
25 formal public comments on the Burbank-to-Los Angeles

132



755-1143

755-1144

755-1146

## Response to Submission 755 (Ana Suarez, July 8, 2020)

### 755-1143

The commenter requests an extension of the public comment period. In response to agency and stakeholder requests and in consideration of limitations caused by the novel coronavirus pandemic, the Authority elected to extend the initial 45-day public review period for 15 days to July 31, 2020, and then for another 30 days to August 31, 2020. Therefore, the comment period provided was a total of 94 days, which is twice the minimum requirement, pursuant to CEQA and NEPA, of 45 days.

### 755-1144

This comment suggests that toxic pollutants will result in impacts to sensitive receptors in the project vicinity during the construction period. Construction-related criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants were assessed in Section 3.3.6.3. Specifically, the Main Street Grade Separation Construction Area, which is located adjacent to the Lincoln Heights area, was assessed. Sensitive receptors, which include residences, Albion Elementary School, and recreational parks surrounding the Main Street Grade Separation Construction Area, were included in the air quality analysis and health risk assessment. The Draft EIR/EIS, Section 3.3, Air Quality and Global Climate Change, provided a summary of the air quality impact analysis associated with the Main Street Overcrossing Construction Area and determined the air quality impacts to be less than significant under CEQA for all criteria pollutants in the community of Lincoln Heights (refer to Table 3.3-17 in this Final EIR/EIS). It should be noted that the regional construction impact would be significant under CEQA for NO<sub>2</sub> and CO pollutants (as shown in Table 3.3-16 on pages 3.3-50 through 3.3-52). All other criteria pollutants (VOC, SO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) were found to be less than significant under CEQA. Appendix G of the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section Air Quality and Global Climate Change Technical Report (Authority 2020) provided the health risk assessment associated with the Main Street Grade Separation Construction Area and determined the human health risk (including children) to be less than significant under CEQA (refer to Table 7-54 on page 7-47 in Appendix G).

As described in Section 3.3.4.3, the project would incorporate standardized HSR features to avoid and minimize air quality impacts. These IAMFs would substantially reduce emissions from the project.

For example, AQ-IAMF#4 requires the use of Tier 4 engines to reduce criteria exhaust emissions from construction equipment. AQ-IAMF#5 requires the use of newer-model-year on-road construction trucks. TR-IAMF#7 requires the use of construction truck routes away from sensitive receptors.

Long-term health consequences of the project are not anticipated based upon the air quality analysis and health risk assessment prepared for the project. No revisions have been made to the Final EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

## Response to Submission 755 (Ana Suarez, July 8, 2020) - Continued

### 755-1145

The commenter states that children who attend schools in the Lincoln Heights community come from low-income families who rely on local community resources, such as parks within Lincoln Heights. The commenter states that these resources provide recreational activities. The commenter states that the HSR project would require closing down these facilities. Therefore, the affected families should be given more time to get better informed and share their concerns and opinions.

The Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section of the HSR project does not propose the closure of any parks. As described in Section 3.15.6, of this Final EIR/EIS, although construction of the HSR Build Alternative would result in the permanent use of land within some Rio de Los Angeles State Park and Albion Riverside Park, the area of permanent use within each of these parks is minimal in size and would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the recreational resources.

In advance of the publication of the Draft EIR/EIS, many public meetings were held with members of the public, elected officials, community groups, stakeholders, businesses, and local governments. Refer to Chapter 9, Public and Agency Involvement, for information about these meetings, notifications, comments received, as well as a complete list of all meetings.

The Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section Draft EIR/EIS was originally made available for a minimum 45-day public review beginning on May 29, 2020, and ending on July 16, 2020. The three volumes of the Draft EIR/EIS were posted on the Authority's web page, and free electronic copies were available upon request to the Authority's Southern California Regional Office in Los Angeles. The Authority extended the original comment period to end on July 31. The comment period was extended again to August 31, 2020, in response to agency and stakeholder requests in consideration of limitations caused by the novel coronavirus pandemic. In total, the duration of the 45-day public comment period was extended to a total of 94 days (from May 29, 2020, through August 31, 2020) so that interested parties would have sufficient time to review the Draft EIR/EIS and submit written and email comment letters. Virtual townhall and public hearing meetings also were held during the comment period and people were able to submit verbal comments.

### 755-1145

The commenter also expresses concern for the safety of school children in the vicinity of the HSR project. The potential for construction of the HSR Build Alternative to result in impacts on children's health and safety is evaluated in Appendix 3.12-C, Children's Health and Safety Risk Assessment. While the HSR Build Alternative would be constructed and operate primarily within an existing railroad corridor in urban areas of Burbank, Glendale, and Los Angeles, as described in Section 3.12.7, IAMFs and mitigation measures would be implemented to address impacts on children's health and safety from the HSR project. Construction impacts that could affect children's health and safety (e.g., traffic hazards, air emissions, noise and vibration, and use of hazardous materials near schools) are described in Section 3.12.6.3, Impact SOCIO #14, Temporary Impacts on Children's Health and Safety from Construction. Implementation of IAMFs would avoid and/or minimize impacts related to temporary changes in access, increases in noise and dust, and visual changes.

Additionally, Impact SOCIO#18, Permanent Impacts on Children's Health and Safety from Operations, addresses permanent impacts to children's health and safety from operation. Refer to Section 3.2, Transportation, for information on the location and nature of permanent impacts on access and circulation. Out-of-direction travel distances required due to road closures would not result in long detours, and the Authority would work with the local jurisdictions to provide additional access as needed. The HSR Build Alternative would be grade-separated from the existing roads, so there would be no conflict between school buses and the HSR trains. The HSR Build Alternative would provide new grade-separated crossings, which would remove roadway conflicts with the railroad corridor and improve safety and access for buses, bicyclists, and pedestrians, resulting in a beneficial effect related to children's health and safety. Section 3.11, Safety and Security, also evaluates safety risk to sensitive land uses such as schools that could occur due to train accidents, accidents due to seismic events, and fires.

Therefore, the Final EIR/EIS addresses the commenter's concerns regarding safety in the vicinity of schools.

## Response to Submission 755 (Ana Suarez, July 8, 2020) - Continued

### 755-1146

The commenter requests an extension of the public comment period. Refer to response to comment 755-1143. Additionally, the commenter asks that the Authority reach out to community members and families. Chapter 9 of this Final EIR/EIS provides a comprehensive list of newspapers in which the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS was advertised, pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and NEPA. In addition to the publication in newspapers, the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR/EIS and public hearings were distributed by direct mail to members of the public who subscribed to the project mailing list, attended project events or meetings, or submitted comments or questions via email or on the Authority's website. Occupants and property owners within 500 feet of the alignment, one-half mile from each proposed HSR station location, and one-half mile from each proposed grade separation were mailed a notice as well. In addition, the Authority also provided a variety of forums for the public to engage directly with the project team to ask questions and discuss concerns, including virtual "office hours" meetings throughout the public review period; information meetings with the Taylor Yard community on July 20 and the Lincoln Heights community on August 25. Telephone town hall meetings were held on June 29 and August 19. These meetings were in addition to the required public hearing held on July 8.

## Submission 752 (Dawn Tien, July 8, 2020)

1 I do see another hand raised from a member of  
2 the public. I want to recognize Dawn Tien to speak  
3 next. Dawn, if you can please spell your name for the  
4 benefit of the transcriber, and to state any  
5 affiliation you might have, and to please proceed. You  
6 have three minutes.

7 MS. TIEN: Hi. Yes. I'm Dawn Tien, T-I-E-N,  
8 and I am a homeowner in the Taylor Yards community  
9 here, along with the neighbors that have just spoken,  
10 and a member of our community actually put together a  
11 succinct e-mail outlining some of our concerns. So I  
12 just wanted to take this time to go over each and every  
13 point, because I know some have been said. Some have  
14 been missed. But I'll go ahead and read what he had  
15 prepared.

16 "My home, along with several others, either  
17 face or are in close proximity to the Railroad Row.  
18 Our home is presently 100 feet away from the nearest  
19 rail track. The HSR project would require moving the  
20 Amtrak and Metrolink tracks 30 feet closer to our  
21 community in order to accommodate the HSR.

22 "After reviewing the noise and vibration  
23 chapter of the Draft EIR, I was shocked to realize that  
24 the report concluded that the project will only cause  
25 moderate impacts to our community. Therefore, CHSRA is

80



752-1125

1 proposing their own mitigation measures to reduce noise  
2 or vibration impacts from this project.

3 "I understand that the forecasted noise levels  
4 and vibration levels will be lower than the current  
5 decibel and vibration decibel levels. We find that  
6 conclusion lacking in common sense and logic. It is  
7 hard to believe that the shifting of the train tracks  
8 30 feet closer to our homes will not be to an increased  
9 noise and vibration level.

10 "We believe that the high-speed train and the  
11 shifting of the track will significantly and  
12 permanently increase the levels of noise, dust, and  
13 daily interruptions beyond what we currently endure.

14 "We also are concerned about the structural  
15 damage to the buildings that will occur over time due  
16 to the increased vibrations and request that an  
17 assessment be made of potential damage, along with a  
18 remedy to mitigate the long-term impacts.

19 "We believe the noise and vibration studies  
20 carried out in our community to be inherently flawed,  
21 and I would request the CHSRA direct staff to reanalyze  
22 the noise and vibration studies in our community.

23 "We are also fearful that the approval of the  
24 DEIR, without factoring any mitigation measures, will  
25 lead to an immediate impairment of the property values.

81



752-1125

752-1128

### Submission 752 (Dawn Tien, July 8, 2020) - Continued

752-1128

1 I don't believe the DEIR factored this analysis into  
2 their report, and I would like to get a written  
3 response on what compensation will be provided to  
4 property owners who will most -- very likely -- very  
5 much -- experience a reduction in their property  
6 values.

752-1129

7 "Please note that the Taylor Yard community  
8 includes four low-income housing and developments.  
9 That houses 305 homes for extremely low-income, very  
10 low-income, and low-income families. These affordable  
11 homes comprise over 76 percent of the total number of  
12 residential units in Taylor Yard. However, no  
13 environmental justice impacts to this community have  
14 been analyzed. I request that the HSRA direct staff to  
15 study the environmental justice impacts upon Taylor  
16 Yard."

752-1130

17 As many speakers have previously pointed out,  
18 you know, in today's COVID environment, no one seems to  
19 be aware of this project or that the DEIR is on the  
20 street and what impacts their community will  
21 experience. Therefore, in closing, I request the HSRA  
22 to carry out better outreach to our impacted community  
23 and extend the public comment period beyond July 31st.  
24 Thank you.

25 MS. ARELLANO: Thank you very much. We

82



## Response to Submission 752 (Dawn Tien, July 8, 2020)

### 752-1125

The commenter's concern is regarding the future noise and vibration impacts at Taylor Yard as described within this Final EIR/EIS.

It is correct that some of the existing tracks will be moved closer to the existing residences. This adjustment has an inherent understanding that noise and vibration have the potential to increase. However, it has been confirmed by the project engineer that the number of switches in the area close to the Taylor Yard residences is being reduced from three to two. The existing crossover provided for movements between tracks at higher speeds and the existing left-hand turnout allowed movements to a siding track at similar speeds. However, this siding track (Glendale Slide) has since been relocated north between SR 134 and Chevy Chase Boulevard on the east side of the corridor, so the Taylor Yard community would not be exposed to noise from this siding track (refer to the updated plans provided in Volume 3 of this Final EIR/EIS).

Additionally, based on the proposed design, the existing UPRR trains would no longer use turnouts in this area, so there would no longer be noise exposure from UPRR trains. These changes in track design, along with the improved track bed and track underlayment, will offset the increases in noise and vibration due to distance reduction. The discussion under Impact N&V #4 and Impact N&V #5 has been updated in Section 3.4.6 of this Final EIR/EIS to reflect the design changes described above.

### 752-1126

As discussed in Impact N&V #5 in the Draft EIR/EIS and this Final EIR/EIS, it is expected that the noise level at the Taylor Yard residences would increase with the implementation and operation of the HSR project. This increase is classified as a moderate impact instead of a severe impact because the noise levels generated by HSR train operation and other modifications to existing trackwork would not elevate the existing noise environment to a level which would cause a severe effect to the nearby sensitive receivers. Mitigation is being considered for residences that would be severely impacted by the future HSR project operations.

### 752-1127

The commenter expresses concern regarding potential damage to structures due to vibration. As discussed under Impact N&V #5 in Section 3.4.6 of this Final EIR/EIS, the vibration levels generated by all types of trains are well below the thresholds of damage for even the most sensitive buildings. No changes have been made to the Final EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

### 752-1128

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Section 3.12 SOCIO-02: Impacts to Property Values.

The commenter expresses concern regarding reductions in property values.

As detailed throughout this Final EIR/EIS, the project incorporates project features referred to as IAMFs that will be implemented during project design, construction, and operation to avoid or reduce project effects. These features are considered part of the project, and the EIR/EIS explains how they will work and describes their effectiveness. If significant impacts are determined to occur even with the implementation of the IAMFs, feasible mitigation measures are identified and would be implemented as required under CEQA. As such, project impacts to any properties affected by the HSR project would be avoided, minimized, or mitigated, as appropriate.

Property owners who believe they have suffered a loss may file a claim with the State of California Government Claims Board. More information may be obtained online at <https://www.dgs.ca.gov/ORIM/Services/Page-Content/Office-of-Risk-and-Insurance-Management-Services-List-Folder/File-a-Government-Claim>

## Response to Submission 752 (Dawn Tien, July 8, 2020) - Continued

### 752-1129

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Chapter 5 EJ-01: Environmental Justice Communities.

The commenter states that no environmental justice impacts to the Taylor Yard community have been analyzed.

The EJ analysis in Chapter 5 of this Final EIR/EIS includes the census tracts where the Taylor Yard community is located.

### 752-1130

The commenter requests an extension of the public comment period. In response to agency and stakeholder requests and in consideration of limitations caused by the novel coronavirus pandemic, the Authority elected to extend the initial 45-day public review period for 15 days to July 31, 2020, and then for another 30 days to August 31, 2020. Therefore, the comment period provided was a total of 94 days, which is twice the minimum requirement, pursuant to CEQA and NEPA, of 45 days.

The commenter also states that the community is not aware of the project. Chapter 9 of this Final EIR/EIS provides an updated list of all of the meetings and stakeholder outreach that has been ongoing for the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section since 2014. Chapter 9 also provides a comprehensive list of newspapers in which the availability of the Draft EIR/EIS was advertised. In addition to the newspaper advertisements, direct mail was sent to occupants and property owners within 500 feet of the proposed alignment.

## Submission 741 (Zennon Ulyate-Crow, July 8, 2020)

1 could be a community-based decision. Thank you.

2 MS. ARELLANO: Excellent. Thank you, Anais.

3 Next, Zennon Ulyate-Crow, followed by Robert  
4 E. And then we have an additional speaker, Christine  
5 Nash.

6 And it looks like we've resolved our Spanish  
7 interpretation simultaneously, so thankfully that is  
8 proceeding.

9 And Zennon, you have the floor. If you can  
10 spell -- completely spell your name so we have that for  
11 the record. And you have three minutes.

12 MR. ULYATE-CROW: Hi. My name is Zennon  
13 Ulyate-Crow, spelled Z-E-N-N-O-N, U-L-Y-A-T-E, hyphen,  
14 C-R-O-W. I know it's a mouthful.

15 So I'm a resident over here in L.A., and I'm  
16 just going to raise the whole climate crisis and  
17 everything. And I've been looking at the station plans  
18 for the Burbank station, and I just would like to  
19 provide some input that I think even just having a  
20 station in -- at Bob Hope Airport is not the correct  
21 decision at this moment, especially considering the  
22 fact that this is a station that will be surrounded  
23 with 4,000 parking spots, which would just completely  
24 encourage other people to -- it's going to encourage  
25 people to drive to the airport, and it's going to

24



741-1092

1 encourage people to drive to the train, which is really  
2 defeating the whole purpose of the high-speed rail,  
3 which is to kind of help reduce carbon emissions; and  
4 especially considering the fact you have Metro, which  
5 is building and constructing many, many local and  
6 regional transportation projects, which will make the  
7 whole entire L.A. region, including Burbank, including  
8 all of the Valley, more connected to Union Station,  
9 which is the other proposed station in the second  
10 corridor.

741-1093

11 I think it is actually not a wise use of funds  
12 to create this fully underground expensive station  
13 serving a primarily local airport that -- you know,  
14 because if you look at the flights going out of Bob  
15 Hope Airport, they're going to, typically, Sacramento.  
16 They're going to San Francisco. They're going to  
17 Oakland. These are, you know, intrastate flights that  
18 California high-speed rail is designed to be competing  
19 for, is designed to be replacing.

20 So I think serving the airport and kind of  
21 helping make it easier for people to end up taking the  
22 plane, when, in fact, we should be disincentivizing  
23 people from taking the plane, especially given the  
24 carbon footprint that planes have on the environment --  
25 I feel that spending over a billion dollars building

25



741-1092

Submission 741 (Zennon Ulyate-Crow, July 8, 2020) - Continued

741-1093

1 this underground station surrounded in parking is  
2 probably less than a wise investment compared to not  
3 having the station at all and, instead, having the  
4 tracks run straight from Palmdale into Union Station.

5 And with that money saved from building a  
6 costly underground station, you could spend that money  
7 to extend the Red Line from North Hollywood to Bob  
8 Hope, thereby actually helping achieve your goals of  
9 improved mobility to the airport, but at a much -- at a  
10 fraction of the cost, while also helping improve  
11 intraregional transportation, as you're allowing this  
12 whole -- the airport finally to be connected to the  
13 Metro rail.

14 So I think my public comment -- public  
15 comment, long story short, is don't build the Burbank  
16 station. Instead, reinvest those funds in other  
17 places; and, instead, focus on making the Union Station  
18 the best station it can be. Thank you.

19 MS. ARELLANO: Thank you. I appreciate that,  
20 Zennon.

21 Next, our speaker is Robert E., followed by  
22 Christine Nash. Robert, you're on for three minutes.  
23 And if you can please state your name, any affiliation  
24 fully, and please spell your name for the benefit of  
25 the record. Thank you.

26



## Response to Submission 741 (Zennon Ulyate-Crow, July 8, 2020)

### 741-1092

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Chapter 2 Alt-01: Alternatives.

The commenter states that the provision of parking at the Burbank Airport Station will encourage driving as a connection to the rail. The Authority acknowledges this viewpoint; however, it should be noted that the location of the Burbank Airport Station is the culmination of many years of technical analysis and evaluation. It should also be noted that, as stated in Section 2.5.2.3 of this Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS), the Burbank Airport Station would have up to 3,210 surface parking spaces in multiple lots by 2040. This amount of parking was determined using the 2040 high ridership forecast, as discussed in Section 2.6.3 of this Final EIR/EIS, and, as such, is intended to reflect the maximum potential environmental impact. Parking facility size was informed by multiple factors, including ridership demand, station area development opportunities, and availability of alternative multimodal access improvements. The use of the high ridership forecast in developing parking supply provides flexibility to change or reduce the amount of station parking needed as these factors become more defined over time. Also discussed in Section 2.6.3 of this Final EIR/EIS is research that suggests that the percentage of transit passengers arriving and departing stations by car (and therefore requiring parking accommodations) decreases as land use development and population density around the stations increase. The Authority is working with and will continue to work with regional planners to encourage high-density development in proximity to HSR stations, which will allow the Authority to attain its goals of supporting system ridership and reducing parking demand. However, local land use decisions and market conditions dictate the actual land use development that will occur. Further, as the HSR project proceeds, a multimodal access plan will be developed in coordination with local agencies prior to the design and construction of parking facilities at each HSR station, which will inform the final location, amount, and phasing of parking at each station. The commenter also indicates that other transportation projects in the region prioritize connections at Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS). Because LAUS is the southern station location for the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section of the HSR project, the HSR system will also connect to LAUS, as the commenter notes. The identification of station locations is summarized in more detail in Section 2.4.2.2, Development of Alignment Alternatives and Station Locations, of this Final EIR/EIS.

### 741-1093

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Chapter 2 Alt-01: Alternatives.

The commenter states that the Burbank Airport Station is unnecessary and providing connectivity to the airport would be in opposition to the stated goals of the project. The Authority acknowledges this viewpoint; however, it should be noted that the location of the Burbank Airport Station is the culmination of many years of technical analysis and evaluation as described in BLA-Response-Chapter 2 Alt-01: Alternatives. As discussed in more detail in Section 1.1.6 of this Final EIR/EIS, the establishment of an HSR system is not intended to replace air travel; rather, public transportation investment is intended to link all major forms of transportation and provide better access to airports, among other objectives. Further, Section 1.2.3 of this Final EIR/EIS outlines project objectives that have been defined under the California Environmental Quality Act, which include (but are not limited to) maximizing intermodal transportation opportunities by locating stations to connect with local transit systems, airports, and highways, and incorporate the HSR project Section into the intermodal transportation hubs at Burbank and Los Angeles, thereby providing interfaces with airports, mass transit, and highways, resulting in local and regional transit and transportation hubs. No revisions to this Final EIR/EIS have been made in response to this comment.

Submission 751 (Joanne Weidman, July 30, 2020)

1 MS. WEIDMAN: Can you hear me?  
 2 MS. ARELLANO: I sure can. Go right ahead,  
 3 Joanne.  
 4 MS. WEIDMAN: My name is Joanne Weidman. I am  
 5 a neighbor of Ana Dahan's from TY Taylor 41 in the  
 6 Taylor Yards neighborhood. Our home faces the tracks,  
 7 and, like Ana, we bought into the neighborhood knowing  
 8 that we were going to be living near train tracks.  
 9 We do feel vibration. We do hear noise. When  
 10 the windows are closed, the noise is not bad, but it is  
 11 extremely concerning to hear that these tracks may be  
 12 moved 30 feet closer. That is a significant percentage  
 13 closer to us, given that we already are very close to  
 14 these tracks.  
 15 And I am very concerned that the measurements  
 16 that have been taken do not -- I forget. The category  
 17 is either moderate or mild. Whichever -- whatever  
 18 rating was given to the impact to our community. That  
 19 just seems wrong, and I question -- I question those  
 20 measurements in those reports and would urge a wider  
 21 variety of measurements to be taken from different  
 22 locations at different times.  
 23 I'm further concerned that, as Ana mentioned,  
 24 we do have, I believe, 355 low-income units in this  
 25 development, and I -- I'm concerned about the impact on

751-1121

751-1122

751-1123



751-1123

751-1124

1 those residents as well, and I am further concerned, as  
 2 Ana also said, that because of the pandemic, because  
 3 libraries are closed, because some of the sources of  
 4 information about even these hearings and the public  
 5 comment time, availability has been limited because of  
 6 the pandemic. I would like to request, too, an  
 7 extension on the ability to make public comment on  
 8 this. Thank you.  
 9 MS. ARELLANO: Thank you, Joanne. We  
 10 appreciate you taking the time to share with us your  
 11 point of view. It has been recorded, and it will be  
 12 responded to. Thank you very much.  
 13 I do not see any other hands raised, but I  
 14 would want to encourage those of you online, if you  
 15 care to provide us a comment, to please do so anytime.  
 16 And a reminder to everyone that we are -- the panel is  
 17 available for this evening until 8:00 o'clock tonight  
 18 to hear comments.  
 19 Folks join us at different times during these  
 20 time periods. It's also the case, when we do in-person  
 21 public hearings, that people will come in and out  
 22 during a number of hours in order to be heard on the  
 23 comments, so -- or on the project, so we appreciate and  
 24 want to make sure that the team is available to do that  
 25 similarly online.



## Response to Submission 751 (Joanne Weidman, July 30, 2020)

### 751-1121

The commenter's concern is regarding the future noise and vibration impacts at Taylor Yard as described within this Final EIR/EIS.

It is correct that some of the existing tracks will be moved closer to the existing residences. It is an accurate assumption that this adjustment has the potential to result in noise and vibration increases. However, it has been confirmed by the project engineer that the number of switches in the area close to the Taylor Yard residences is being reduced from three to two. The existing crossover provided for movements between tracks at higher speeds and the existing left-hand turnout allowed movements to a siding track at similar speeds. However, this siding track (Glendale Slide) has since been relocated north between SR 134 and Chevy Chase Boulevard on the east side of the corridor, so the Taylor Yard community would not be exposed to noise from this siding track (refer to the updated plans provided in Volume 3 of this Final EIR/EIS).

Additionally, based on the proposed design, the existing UPRR trains would no longer use turnouts in this area, so there would no longer be noise exposure from UPRR trains.

These changes in track design, along with the improved track bed and track underlayment, will offset the increases in noise and vibration due to distance reduction. The discussion under Impact N&V #4 and Impact N&V #5 have been updated in Section 3.4.6 of this Final EIR/EIS to reflect the design changes described above.

As it relates to the overall increase in noise at the Taylor Yard residences, it is expected that the noise level would increase with the implementation and operation of the HSR project. However, this increase is classified as a moderate impact instead of a severe impact because the noise levels generated by HSR train operation and other modifications to existing trackwork would not elevate the existing noise environment to a level which would cause a severe effect to the nearby sensitive receivers. Mitigation is being considered for residences that would be severely impacted by the future HSR project operations.

### 751-1122

The commenter has expressed concerns regarding the measurements taken in the vicinity of the Taylor Yard community. The commenter has also requested that additional measurements be taken.

The noise measurement locations were chosen based on proximity to sensitive uses and ability to be taken within public right-of-way while also remaining within the noise resource study area. While the commenter is correct in noting that specific measurements were not taken within the Taylor Yard community, there were specific reasons for the locations chosen. During the noise monitoring for the HSR project, construction was prevalent in the area surrounding Taylor Yard, which would have artificially elevated existing noise levels and reduced the margin for impact.

Measurements were taken at various distances from the existing operations to establish the expected noise environment without construction activities. Furthermore, the noise monitoring locations are valid due to their consistency with the FRA's High-Speed Ground Transportation Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (FRA 2012), which suggests that a variety of measurements at different locations be gathered as representative noise levels.

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

### 751-1123

Refer to Standard Response BLA-Response-Chapter 5 EJ-01: Environmental Justice Communities.

The commenter states that she is concerned about impacts to low-income residents. The Authority shares the commenter's concerns on the HSR project's impacts to low-income residents and has rigorously addressed impacts to these populations in Chapter 5, Environmental Justice, of this Final EIR/EIS.

## Response to Submission 751 (Joanne Weidman, July 30, 2020) - Continued

### 751-1124

The commenter requests an extension of the public comment period. In response to agency and stakeholder requests and in consideration of limitations caused by the novel coronavirus pandemic, the Authority elected to extend the initial 45-day public review period for 15 days to July 31, 2020, and then for another 30 days to August 31, 2020.

Therefore, the comment period provided was a total of 94 days, which is twice the minimum requirement, pursuant to CEQA and NEPA, of 45 days. The commenter also states that, because of the pandemic, availability of the Draft EIR/EIS was limited. As stated on the published Notice of Availability (NOA), electronic copies of the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section Draft EIR/EIS and electronic copies of associated technical reports were available upon request. Printed copies of the Draft EIR/EIS were also available for review at the Authority's offices in Los Angeles and Sacramento. In July 2020, print copies were also made available for review at the Caltrans District 7 office in downtown Los Angeles. The NOA also provided five ways in which the public could provide comments: by mail, through the Authority's website, by email, verbal comment via the direct line for the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section, and/or oral testimony at the virtual public hearing held on July 8, 2020.