CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

HYBRID VIA IN-PERSON AND REMOTE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2022 10:00 A.M.

Reported by:

Martha Nelson

APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS

Tom Richards, Chair

Nancy Miller, Vice Chair

Lynn Schenk

Martha Escutia

Anthony Williams

Ernesto Camacho

Henry Perea

Margaret Pena

Joaquin Arambula

STAFF

Brian P. Kelly, Chief Executive Officer

Brian Annis, Chief Financial Officer

Alicia Fowler, Chief Counsel

Moe Ramadan, Board Secretary

LaDonna DiCamillo, Southern California Regional Director

Natalie Murphey

PRESENTER

Jeanet Owens, L.A. Metro

INDEX PAGE Election of Board Chair and Vice Chair 7 1. 2. Consider Approving the August 17-18, 2022, 13 Board Meeting Minutes 3. Consider Approving the Proposition 1A Funding Plan 15 Southern CA Update 21 4. 5. CEO Report 68 6. Finance and Audit Committee Report 73 75 Adjourned

1 PROCEDINGS 2 10:00 a.m. 3 THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2022 4 CHAIR RICHARDS: Good morning, ladies and 5 This is the California High-Speed Rail gentlemen. 6 Authority's Board of Directors meeting for September 15th 7 of 2022. 8 We are located in Sacramento today. However, we 9 do have some members joining us by telephone, as per the 10 executive order for roughly the next fiscal year. And so 11 it'll be a little more convoluted than it would be if we 12 were all here, but if you'll bear with us? They'll be on 13 landlines, so we'll not have an opportunity to know when 14 they wish to speak. And I'm going to encourage any of our 15 Board members who are joining by telephone to just weigh in 16 if you want to make a statement, when you do want to do so, 17 and you'll be recognized as soon as we're able. 18 With that, I'd like to ask our Secretary to take the role. 19 20 BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Thank you, Mr. 21 Chairman. Director Schenk? 22 23 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Here. 24 BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Chair Richards? 25 CHAIR RICHARDS: Here.

1		BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Camacho?
2		BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: Here.
3		BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Vice Chair Miller?
4		VICE CHAIR MILLER: Here.
5		BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Assemblymember
6	Arambula?	
7		BOARD MEMBER ARAMBULA: Aye.
8		BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Was that aye?
9		CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.
10		BOARD MEMBER ARAMBULA: Here.
11		BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Perea?
12		BOARD MEMBER PEREA: Here.
13		BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Ghielmetti?
14		Director Escutia?
15		BOARD MEMBER ESCUTIA: Here.
16		BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Williams?
17		BOARD MEMBER WILLIAMS: Here.
18		BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Pena?
19		BOARD MEMBER PENA: Here.
20		BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Senator Gonzalez?
21		Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum.
22		CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.
23		And do we have a flag this morning? We do. It's
24	right behi	ind us.
25		So, Director Pena, if you'd like to lead us in

the Pledge of Allegiance?

(The Pledge of Allegiance is recited in unison)

3 CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you.

Before we start the agenda today, I'm going to ask the Board Secretary to explain to the public how you may address us, whether you are in the chamber here or you are calling in.

So, Moe, if you'd please provide that information to those with us here or listening.

BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Thank you, Mr.

11 Chairman.

Good morning, all. Before we begin public comment, I would like to go over some important information. For members of the public who have joined us in person and wish to provide public comment, you will be called in the order we have received your green public comment card. If you have not provided me your public comment card and wish to provide your public comment, now would be your time to provide that card to me. Please slowly and clearly say and spell your first and last name, and if applicable, state the organization you represent.

We're also allowing members of the public to provide comment remotely by telephone. That will occur after in-person public comment.

Does anybody wish to provide public comment in

person at the moment? 1 2 Alan, can we queue up our public commenters over 3 the phone? 4 OPERATOR: If you wish to ask a -- pardon me. If 5 you wish to ask -- or register for public comment, please press one, then zero at this time. You'll hear an 6 7 indication you have been placed into queue and may remove yourself by repeating the one-then-zero command. 8 9 For speakers, we have no one queuing up for public comment at this time. 10 11 BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Thank you, Alan. 12 Mr. Chairman, we can move forward. 13 CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Ladies and gentlemen, we have a reasonably short 14 15 agenda today, but an important one. 16 So we will start with our agenda item number one, 17 which is the Board Officer Elections. 18 I'm going to ask Chief Counsel Fowler to take us 19 through that. 20 MS. FOWLER: Thank you, Chair Richards, and good 21 morning Board. 22 We will take two separate votes this morning for 23 the Chair and for the Vice Chair positions. 24 I will start by taking nominations for the 25 position of Chairperson for the Authority Board. Do I have

any nominations? 1 2 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yes, Miss Fowler. This is 3 Member Schenk, if you can't see me. I would like to 4 nominate as Chair, Tom Richards, our current Chair. 5 BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: I will second the motion. MS. FOWLER: Do I have any other nominations for 6 7 the Board Chairperson position? 8 Okay. Do any of the members want to comment on 9 this nomination before we vote? 10 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Well, as the maker of the 11 motion, I would like to take the opportunity to thank Chair 12 Richards for his devotion to and countless hours that he 13 has given to making this project a reality. And I know I 14 speak for all Board members when I say thank you, and your 15 punishment is a renomination. 16 BOARD MEMBER WILLIAMS: This is Director 17 Williams. This is Anthony Williams. 18 I just wanted to echo those remarks and just say 19 that I am strongly, strongly in support of his nomination, 20 and encourage my fellow Board members to support it, as I 21 believe we will. We are thankful and appreciative for your 22 willingness to step up, so thank you. BOARD MEMBER ESCUTIA: This is Martha Escutia. 23 24 I just wanted to, you know, concur with all the

statements that have been made already. But I also want to

25

1 personally thank Tom Richards for his patience. It takes 2 an incredible amount of patience to deal with this type of 3 a position. 4 But also, Tom, just thank you so much for your 5 patience in dealing with me and my incessant questions and my pushing and pushing and pushing, and you have always 6 7 just been a gentleman, so I definitely look forward to seeing you again as our Chairperson. 8 9 Thank you. 10 CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you, Director Escutia. And it's been a pleasure working with you and will continue 11 12 to be so. 13 MS. FOWLER: Okay, Board Secretary, can you please call the roll to elect Tom Richards as the Board 14 15 Chairperson of the High-Speed Rail Authority? BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Schenk? 16 17 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yes. BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Chair Richards. 18 19 CHAIR RICHARDS: I'll abstain. 20 BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Camacho? 21 BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: Yes. 22 BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Vice Chair Miller? VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. 23 24 BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Perea? 25 BOARD MEMBER PEREA: Yes.

1	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Ghielmetti
2	or apologies.
3	Director Escutia?
4	BOARD MEMBER ESCUTIA: Yes.
5	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Williams?
6	BOARD MEMBER WILLIAMS: Yes.
7	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Pena?
8	BOARD MEMBER PENA: Yes.
9	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Mr. Chairman, the
10	motion carries. Congratulations.
11	CHAIR RICHARDS: Go ahead, Chief Counsel.
12	MS. FOWLER: And now we'll move to nominations
13	for the Vice Chair position.
14	Are there any nominations for this position?
15	BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to
16	place a nomination. Nancy Miller, our current Vice Chair.
17	BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: And I will second that.
18	MS. FOWLER: Thank you.
19	Are there any other nominations for the Vice
20	Chair position?
21	Okay. Do any members of the Board wish to
22	comment on the nomination?
23	BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: Yes, I'd like to make just
24	a couple of comments.
25	Nancy has been able to bring to the Board a

1	balance from her legal background to help us balance out
2	some of our business perspectives and a legal perspective.
3	But, certainly, her hard work, I've certainly learned a
4	great deal from her and appreciate all that she brings to
5	the board.
6	Thank you.
7	BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Ditto on that.
8	And thank you, Nancy, for your willingness to do
9	this and to step in and be there as a support that, not
10	just to our chair, but to all of us. Thank you.
11	CHAIR RICHARDS: And I would echo both of those
12	comments and appreciate very much the great partnerships
13	that we have as Chair and Vice Chair.
14	Thank you, Nancy.
15	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you all. That's very
16	kind. Appreciate it.
17	MS. FOWLER: Board Secretary, can you please call
18	the roll to elect Nancy Miller as Vice Chairperson for the
19	Authority?
20	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Schenk?
21	BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yes.
22	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Chair Richards?
23	CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.
24	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Camacho?
25	BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: Yes.

1	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Vice Chair Miller?
2	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'll abstain.
3	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Perea?
4	BOARD MEMBER PEREA: Yes.
5	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Escutia?
6	BOARD MEMBER ESCUTIA: Aye.
7	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Williams?
8	BOARD MEMBER WILLIAMS: Aye.
9	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Pena?
10	BOARD MEMBER PENA: Yes.
11	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Mr. Chairman, the
12	motion carries.
13	CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you, Mr. Secretary, and
14	thank you, Alicia, for taking care of that.
15	Ladies and gentlemen
16	BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry.
17	CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes. Yes, please.
18	BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Would now be an appropriate
19	moment for me to make a request, I guess it is
20	CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.
21	BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: having to do with
22	elections?
23	Since the years seem to come by more quickly now
24	than in the past, or maybe it's just my getting older, but
25	in any event, could we have a review of our bylaws to see a

1 potential amendment to make the terms two years instead of 2 one year? I know it doesn't take up a lot of time, but just the continuity for two years would seem to be more 3 4 efficient than having to do this every year. 5 And I know we can't discuss or debate that now. 6 But if we could maybe ask you to appoint a subcommittee to 7 take a look at the bylaws and to agendize this for a future 8 meeting? 9 Thank you. 10 CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you. 11 Alright, we'll move on to agenda item number two, 12 which is the approval or modification of the minutes for 13 the August 17-18 Board meeting. If there are no changes or 14 additions, deletions, et cetera, do we have a motion for 15 approval? 16 BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: Move approval. 17 CHAIR RICHARDS: Director Camacho. ESCUTIA MILLER: Second. 18 CHAIR RICHARDS: Director Miller -- excuse me. 19 20 Vice Chair Miller, was that you? 21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: No, it was not. 22 CHAIR RICHARDS: Okay. Who was it? Oh, there's 23 Martha. 24 BOARD MEMBER ESCUTIA: Okay. Second. 25 CHAIR RICHARDS: I'm sorry I didn't see you over

1	there. Oh, okay.
2	BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: It's Escutia.
3	CHAIR RICHARDS: I think that was Director
4	Escutia then on the second.
5	Okay, we have a motion and a second.
6	All in favor?
7	BOARD MEMBER ESCUTIA: (Indiscernible.)
8	CHAIR RICHARDS: I'm sorry. We're not going to
9	do that.
10	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Thank you Mr. Chairman.
11	Director Schenk?
12	CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you.
13	BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yes.
14	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Chair Richards?
15	CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.
16	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Camacho?
17	BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: Yes.
18	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Vice Chair Miller?
19	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.
20	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Perea?
21	BOARD MEMBER PEREA: Aye.
22	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Escutia?
23	BOARD MEMBER ESCUTIA: Yes.
24	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Williams?
25	BOARD MEMBER WILLIAMS: Aye.

1 BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Pena? 2 BOARD MEMBER PENA: Yes. BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Mr. Chairman, the 3 4 motion carries. 5 CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Ladies and gentlemen, agenda item three is 6 7 consider approving the Proposition 1A Funding Plan. 8 I'm going to ask our CEO to provide the 9 introduction, and then turn it over to our CFO Brian Annis. 10 MR. KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 11 Annis, our CFO, will do the presentation on the adoption of 12 what we call the Subdivision (d) (phonetic) Funding Plan 13 for the Proposition 1A Bond appropriation. 14 And just to give the Board a little bit of 15 background about why we're back here on another funding 16 plan, in February of 2021, I think it was about 18 months 17 ago, we brought to you what we called the Subdivision (d) 18 Funding Plan. And that is a requirement under the Bond Act 19 itself that, before we go to the legislature to seek an 20 appropriation of bond funds for this project, we have to 21 submit a funding plan that is reviewed by an independent 22 entity, and then we submit that to the Department of 23 Finance and the legislature, and we did that in February of 24 2021. Now that the budget deal was concluded this year

25

and those bond dollars are appropriated, the requirement on the Subdivision (d) Plan is, before we spend those dollars, we adopt what we call the Sub (d) Plan. Ad it's not going to vary much or be much different from what you saw in the Sub (c) Plan in terms of our path and what we're doing going forward. But once you appropriate, before you spend, we come back and do another funding plan, and that's what Brian is going to present to you today.

And so the Sub (d) Plan, upon your approval, we'll then submit to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the Department of Finance for their review as well. So that's why we're here today on this item.

Okay. Thanks, Brian.

MR. ANNIS: Good morning, Board members.

As Brian mentioned, I come to you today with an action item for adoption of the final Funding Plan. And also bring to you an independent consultant report, which is a requirement of the Bond Act, as well. So in this presentation, I'm going to provide an overview, talk about the statutory requirements of the funding plan and how we've met them in our report, talk about the findings of the independent consultant, and finally get to the requested Board action item.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible.)

MR. ANNIS: Sure.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Chair, this seems like a 1 2 non-contentious item. Is it possible to -- do we need to 3 approve this Or is this just for us to --4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible.) 5 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. CHAIR RICHARDS: Yeah. 6 7 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I don't know how the rest of the Board feels about this item but --8 9 BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: I agree with you. 10 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Unanimous consent. 11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. I feel like this is --12 we're just so happy about this and I --13 CHAIR RICHARDS: I think that if that's the preference of the Board, certainly we can do that, and with 14 15 the knowledge, also, that it's very similar to what we've 16 already seen. 17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. 18 CHAIR RICHARDS: So it's not like we're seeing 19 this for the first time. In my reading of it, other than 20 perhaps numbers occasionally, I saw no changes from what we 21 had looked at before and acted upon. 22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Right. 23 So, I don't know, my colleagues on the phone, 24 it's just information we've heard and don't know if you 25 want the presentation or not.

CHAIR RICHARDS: Is there anything specifically that you'd like to -- given what I think the Board's preference might be, is there something that you'd -- or any items you'd like to specifically point out, Mr. Annis? MR. ANNIS: Sure. Well, just a couple of things 6 to note is that we would intend, with Board approval, to 7 move this fairly rapidly to the legislature. There's a 60day review period in statute. And we're trying to keep on a timeline to allow the treasurer to sell bonds in November so we can access the cash as early as November. CHAIR RICHARDS: And the Board is trying to give you a few more minutes to do that. MR. ANNIS: There you go. There you go. There's one more point to make. The Department of Finance does submit a letter saying the plan meets the 16 requirements. They did ask us to make one amendment to the plan to further clarify the ability to use cap and trade 18 funds to cover any inflationary impacts. 19 So the action that's requested by the Board is 20 for the CEO to finalize and submit the Funding Plan. would intend to add one sentence just, again, clarifying 22 the ability to use cap and trade to cover any costs. VICE CHAIR MILLER: 23 I second. BOARD MEMBER PEREA: Mr. Chairman? I do have --

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

21

24

25

CHAIR RICHARDS: I guess I cut you off, Brian.

1 BOARD MEMBER PEREA: Mr. Chairman? 2 CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes, go ahead, I'm sorry. 3 think we've got a member on the phone. Go ahead. 4 We have a motion and a second. Discussion? 5 BOARD MEMBER PEREA: Yeah. This is Henry. I 6 just have one quick question, Mr. Chairman. 7 I was reading the executive summary of the --8 connecting the executive summary to the to the funding 9 report. And really my question for you as our Chair is, 10 11 you know, what is your confidence level of us meeting the 12 2025 deadline to complete CP 1, the first 119-mile segment? 13 CHAIR RICHARDS: Well, I think that I don't want 14 to theorize what I think it's going to be. 15 I think that I can say, and I think that we are 16 aware, that management and staff are working on both 17 schedule and budget. And I know that it will be coming to us in the near term. I don't know if -- I don't want to 18 19 commit October but it's, I believe, is it fair to say, it's 20 certainly going to be before the end of this year? 21 MR. KELLY: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, in October, and 22 I'll cover this in the CEO report. We will talk about 23 the -- what's got to be in the project update report due to 24 the legislature in 2023. That includes schedule updates as 25 well. So we'll be talking about that with the Board at the

1	October hearing.
2	CHAIR RICHARDS: Yeah.
3	So Director Perea, I think that rather than me
4	trying to answer that on documents that I've not yet had an
5	opportunity to look at, or none of us have, I think that we
6	will be able to start seeing all of that in the October
7	meeting.
8	BOARD MEMBER PEREA: Okay. Thank you.
9	CHAIR RICHARDS: You're welcome.
10	Are there any other questions or comments from
11	any of our members who are not here but are on the
12	telephone?
13	Hearing none, then we do have a motion and a
14	second.
15	Mr. Secretary, please call the roll.
16	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Thank you, Mr.
17	Chairman.
18	Director Schenk?
19	BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yes.
20	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Chair Richards?
21	CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.
22	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Camacho?
23	BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: Yes.
24	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Vice Chair Miller?
25	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

1	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Perea?
2	BOARD MEMBER PEREA: Yes.
3	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Escutia?
4	BOARD MEMBER ESCUTIA: Yes.
5	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Williams?
6	BOARD MEMBER WILLIAMS: Aye.
7	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Director Pena?
8	BOARD MEMBER PENA: Yes.
9	BOARD SECRETARY RAMADAN: Mr. Chairman, the
10	motion carries.
11	CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Thank
12	you, colleagues.
13	Moving on to item number four today is the
14	Southern California Update. And I don't know if you want
15	to did you want to introduce this at all?
16	MR. KELLY: I'm sorry?
17	CHAIR RICHARDS: Did you want to introduce
18	anything on this?
19	MR. KELLY: Yeah, just to remind the members that
20	there was a request some time ago that we provide roughly
21	quarterly updates on the different regional advancements
22	that we have in the project.
23	This is an informational item only, and from our
24	Southern California areas, our Regional
25	Director, LaDonna DiCamillo, is here to update you on the

```
status of some of our work in Southern California.
 1
 2
              So with that, LaDonna, the floor is yours.
              MS. DICAMILLO: Thank you. Good morning, Board.
 3
 4
    I'm happy to be here to provide an update on what's
 5
    happening in Southern California.
 6
              Today we're going to talk generally about our two
 7
    project sections that are still in the environmental
 8
    process, Los Angeles to Anaheim, and Palmdale to Burbank
9
    which hit a major milestone this month. And then we also
10
    have Jeanet Owens from L.A. Metro who's available, and
11
    she's going to provide a status update on our bookend
12
    investments.
13
              So diving right in on our first slide, just a
14
    reminder of the four project sections in Southern
15
    California: Bakersfield to Palmdale, Palmdale to Burbank,
16
    Burbank to Los Angeles, Los Angeles to Anaheim. Two of
    those projects have completed our Record of Decision,
17
18
    Notice of Determination. Bakersfield to Palmdale and
19
    Burbank to Los Angeles are done.
20
              So we'll talk today about Los Angeles to Anaheim
21
    and --
22
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: Excuse me.
23
              MS. DICAMILLO: -- Palmdale to Burbank.
24
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: Can you move closer to the
25
    mic so that --
```

1 MS. DICAMILLO: Alright. 2 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Sorry. 3 MS. DICAMILLO: Can I move the mic closer to me? 4 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: (Off mic.) You have to 5 just speak right into the microphone. 6 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I think you have to --7 MS. DICAMILLO: Okay. VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. 8 9 MS. DICAMILLO: Sure. 10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you. 11 MS. DICAMILLO: I'll move over a little bit. 12 That should help. 13 Okay, so we're going to start with Los Angeles to 14 Anaheim. 15 First slide. 16 Just a reminder of what we've proposed for Los 17 Angeles to Anaheim, on our first slide, it's a nice summary 18 with -- that will connect Los Angeles Union Station to 19 Anaheim ARTIC Station in a 30-mile project section. 20 proposed four stops, including the two I mentioned, as well 21 as one at Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, and Fullerton Station. 22 It would be a four main-line track corridor. 23 It's an existing freight corridor, so our 24 proposal is to electrify two of the tracks and use them for 25 passenger rail, and we'd have two tracks dedicated to

freight rail. And our proposal, as envisioned, would accommodate passenger volumes that are outlined and envisioned in the 2018 State Rail Plan. With that, we'd be doing a number of grade separations, or proposing some grade separations in this corridor.

To the next slide.

CHAIR RICHARDS: Ms. DiCamillo, could you maybe do us a favor? Because we're not looking at the screen, when you say, "Go to the next slide," would you just let us know which page that is?

MS. DICAMILLO: Sure.

CHAIR RICHARDS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. DICAMILLO: I'm on slide six.

CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you.

MS. DICAMILLO: So this particular corridor from Los Angeles to Anaheim is owned by BNSF Railway. It is a primary corridor for their freight operations, and a very busy corridor.

What we have proposed to do to create capacity within that corridor is remove ten trains per day from the corridor, ten freight trains, and we would -- BNSF would then process those trains in the Inland Empire rather than at their Hobart Yard in the Commerce area. So this map that's on the right shows that the Colton component, which we have proposed, would be an intermodal facility in the

Inland Empire that would process those ten trains, so it'd be five coming in and five going out.

We've also proposed a Lynwood component, which is up in the Barstow area. It's the green on the top-right of the map. And that would be just staging tracks. Those would be tracks for BNSF Railway to hold trains while there's construction or congestion within the corridor.

We are still working on this Environmental Document, and there's a lot of data that we're collecting as a result of the freight components. Our schedule would be to -- currently is to release a draft this next fall or winter, so about a year from now, at the earliest, I think we could get that draft done.

So I'm going to move to Palmdale to Burbank. And the substantive slide, slide eight --

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: No. Could we pause, please, here?

MS. DICAMILLO: Of course.

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: So if all of this came to pass, I'm looking at L.A. to Anaheim with three stops in between, or two stops, two or three stops. How fast is the train going? It's not high speed; right?

MS. DICAMILLO: It's not high-speed. We are at the same speeds that the other passenger carriers are operating.

```
BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: So is this basically
 1
 2
    replacing the Pacific Surfliner?
 3
              MS. DICAMILLO: No. Different ridership.
                                                          Ιt
 4
    would be a different ridership.
 5
              BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: How so?
              MS. DICAMILLO: Well, we would be offering the
 6
 7
    one-seat ride for passengers that are coming from somewhere
    north to Anaheim. Pacific Surfliner is serving more of the
 8
9
    San Diego community, and we're stopping at Anaheim and not
10
    serving further south.
11
              BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yeah.
                                            Unfortunately, I
12
    know that.
13
              So we're just talking about traditional rail
    speed in this quarter?
14
15
              MS. DICAMILLO: Correct. Our infrastructure,
16
    though, will accommodate the other passenger carriers and
17
    make it more fluid for all, with ours electrified.
18
              MR. KELLY: The idea is to expand capacity for
19
    all the passenger rail on that route. With the two tracks
20
    being electrified, the speed increases in that section will
21
    allow for 110-mile-per-hour speeds. And that, complemented
    by what we're doing outside of that region going north,
22
23
    will allow for a more efficient passenger train.
24
              BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: I'm sorry, Brian, you said
25
    110-mile --
```

1 MR. KELLY: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: -- between -- in what segments here?

MR. KELLY: I think the L.A. to Anaheim segment right now on the traditional route is capped at something like 79 miles per hour --

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yeah.

MR. KELLY: -- passenger speed. But when it's electrified and the freight are off of it, you can, as a technical matter, you can go faster. I think our speed cap there is 110 when we electrify and we add some grade separations.

And so I think you can achieve higher speeds, although there will be a lot of passenger services in that corridor. So I'm just saying that electrifying it and moving the freights off of the two -- right now, the freight and the LOSSAN service and Metrolink all share tracks.

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Right.

MR. KELLY: What this is proposing to do is leave two tracks essentially for freight, and then electrify two tracks only for passenger. And so you're getting a greater efficiency and an ability to go a bit faster by doing that. But again, the Anaheim --

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: If you say so.

1 MR. KELLY: -- to L.A. route, it's fairly 2 minimal. 3 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yeah. 4 MR. KELLY: But it is a more -- it's definitely a 5 more efficient use of the corridor for passenger, and it will increase the number of passenger trains, not just for 6 7 us but for Metrolink and LOSSAN in that corridor. 8 CHAIR RICHARDS: And I think it's also the projected speeds in that corridor, in combination with the 9 10 speed requirements that we have from San Francisco through 11 the first phase, will still meet the requirements of our 12 two hours and 40 minutes under Proposition 1A. 13 MR. KELLY: Yeah, and I think -- correct me if 14 I'm wrong, but just to be very clear, I think the speed 15 requirements in Prop 1A are limited to San Francisco to 16 L.A. 17 MS. DICAMILLO: Union Station --18 MR. KELLY: Yeah, Union Station. 19 MS. DICAMILLO: -- specifically. 20 CHAIR RICHARDS: Yeah, that's right. 21 MR. KELLY: Yeah. 22 MS. DICAMILLO: Yeah. 23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And just one other point. 24 Isn't it at Union Station, we're changing the 25 configuration there, so it can be a throughway instead of a

```
1
    back-out situation?
 2
              MS. DICAMILLO: Yes. And you'll he'll hear more
 3
    about that from Jeanet Owens.
 4
              VICE CHAIR MILLER:
                                  Okay.
 5
              MS. DICAMILLO: Yes.
              VICE CHAIR MILLER:
                                  I'm sorry.
 6
 7
              MS. DICAMILLO: She's going in detail with those
 8
    improvements.
9
              Yeah, so the corridor is occupied by a number of
10
    different carriers. And even though we're only proposing
    the four stops for our stations, the other passenger
11
    carriers will have more stations that they serve, which
12
13
    will kind of limit how fast we can go, as well, so --
14
              BOARD MEMBER PEREA: Mr. Chairman, would those
15
    trains be our trains or the Metrolink trains?
16
              MS. DICAMILLO: They would be our trains. One-
17
    seat ride is our proposal.
18
              BOARD MEMBER PEREA:
                                    Okay.
19
              And I know this isn't your segment, but along the
20
    similar lines, Brian, in 2025, when the 119 miles are
21
    operational, my understanding is those will not be our
22
    trains, those will be Amtrak trains running on the system.
23
    And if so, who will be purchasing those trains for
24
    operation?
25
                              In the Central Valley, I don't
              MS. DICAMILLO:
```

1 know. 2 CHAIR RICHARDS: Brian, I think that Director 3 Perea was addressing a question to you. 4 Ernie -- or excuse me. 5 Henry, would you go ahead and restate your question for Brian? 6 7 BOARD MEMBER PEREA: Yeah. 8 Along the similar lines for our Central Valley 9 segment, I understand that Amtrak will be operating the 10 system once it becomes operational until we connect to the 11 Bay Area. 12 Who will be purchasing those trains, the High-13 Speed Rail or the San Joaquin Valley Authority? 14 MR. KELLY: If I heard the question right, by the 15 time we're in operations in Southern California, it would 16 be High-Speed Rail direct operations. 17 BOARD MEMBER PEREA: I'm sorry, Brian. MR. KELLY: That would allow --18 19 BOARD MEMBER PEREA: I meant --20 MR. KELLY: -- the shared corridor here will 21 allow three different operators to operate on it: LOSSAN, 22 which is the current Amtrak service; Metrolink, which runs 23 a commuter service; and then our service, which at that 24 time would be an interregional, intercity service, all 25 electrified, from Anaheim north to, you know, Palmdale,

Bakersfield, Fresno, Merced, into the Bay Area. And so we would be the operators of that service.

CHAIR RICHARDS: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR RICHARDS: Any other questions?

Alright. Go ahead, please.

MS. DICAMILLO: Okay. We're going to move to Palmdale to Burbank. We've hit a major milestone this month, so excited to share with you what's happening from Palmdale to Burbank.

It is approximately a 31-to-38-mile connection, depending on which route is measured. There are six alternatives. Our design speed is to a 13-minute nonstop design speed. We are connecting two stations, and these -- both of these stations have been approved in previous environmental documents that have been before you. So the Palmdale Station was approved in Bakersfield to Palmdale, and the Burbank Station approved in Burbank to Los Angeles.

So we have these six alternatives in our Draft Environmental Document that was released on September 2nd. Our preferred alternative is -- did I tell you what slide number? I'm on slide eight. It is the second from the top, and there is a little flag that says, "Preferred Alternative."

I've been here about two years and I did ask, "How did we end up with six alternatives?" So I'm going to

go to the next slide and give a little history of how we got here.

Starting in, specifically, in 2010 to 2014, at that time the Palmdale to Los Angeles was one section. And the team realized that there are really unique issues with different components of the geography. And so in 2014, we divided the one section into two, Palmdale to Burbank and Burbank to Los Angeles. And then those were scoped as two independent sections.

And then the Palmdale to Burbank team continued to look at three primary routes. There are three routes, one that parallels and kind of hugs the SR 14, State Route 14, and then there are two more easterly routes that go through the Angeles National Forest. In 2018, we refined SR 14 and shortened it a bit, and that was adopted as the state-preferred alternative. We continued to vet those routes with the public. And the Corps of Engineers specifically expressed concerns about our proximity to Una Lake, which is up in the Palmdale area, and asked us to look at some routes that would avoid being so close to Una Lake.

So at the northern part, you'll see that we swing out and around Una Lake and then reattach into the three primary routes. And so in 2020, we actually adopted SR 14A, which is the SR 14 route which swings out at the

1 northern part, and that is our preferred alternative. 2 (Clears throat.) Excuse me. 3 And then in 2022, on September 2nd, we released 4 our Draft Environmental Document. So I will dive a little 5 bit more into those specifics, but that is how we've carried forward all six alternatives into our Draft 6 7 Environmental Document, with SR 14A as our preferred 8 alternative. 9 Next slide. A lot of the input, and why we have these 10 11 alternatives, is a result of a lot of outreach and 12 stakeholder engagement, and we've heard concerns from 13 various groups which have led us to these alternatives and 14 to the selection of our preferred alternative. 15 Next slide. 16 SR 14A, by comparison to the other alternatives, is most constructible from a standpoint of, even though we 17 18 have the most tunneling miles, they are not as deep as some 19 of the other, the east, the E alternatives. 20 Yes, Brian? 21 LaDonna, just for our members on the MR. KELLY: 22 phone, you're now on slide 11. 23 MS. DICAMILLO: I'm on slide 11. Thank you for 24 reminding me.

So slide 11 summarizes the benefits to SR 14A.

25

It's the shortest amount of tunneling within the Angeles Forest. In the Angeles Forest, there have been concerns expressed about hydrology and pressurization when we start tunneling, the pressurized water that we might run into in the E sections. So SR 14A has the shortest amount of tunneling in the Angeles Forest, lowest impact on surface and groundwater and wildlife, because we're avoiding Angeles Forest, and then, of course, we avoid Una Lake. And we also are able to be in tunnel under the Pacific Crest Trail, so there would not be impacts to the Pacific Crest Trail.

Okay, so moving to slide 12.

This is a dive into the Una Lake avoidance alternatives on the northern end. And as you know, in most sections, we try to utilize existing transportation corridors. We are in an existing transportation corridor in the Palmdale area, so Avenue S would be a new grade separation, and that's about where we start to split away from the existing corridor that's occupied by Union Pacific and Metrolink.

And so our proposal then is these routes that are shown, SR14A, again, is our preferred alternative, swinging out around Una Lake, and then being in tunnel through the community of Acton.

The next slide is slide 13.

We're going to dive into the south end. And we are utilizing an existing corridor on the south end of our proposed preferred alternative, SR 14, and we'd be rejoining the existing Metrolink corridor for a time. There is one grade separation that we've proposed that would be new, that is shared with Union Pacific, and that is at Sheldon.

And then after that it's a little bit of threading a needle, which is why we developed the graphic on the right, because we're then having to go to lower, depress our alignment to get into the tunnel at the Burbank Station. So we'll be within the corridor but we won't necessarily be at the same elevation as Metrolink. So it does create a little bit more of a complex plan there as we're going under I-5 and into our tunnel for the Burbank Station.

Okay, with that, as I said, we'll go the next slide, which is slide 14.

We've released our Environmental Document to the public September 2nd. It's available at public libraries that are listed here on this slide. It's also available on our website, or upon request at records@hsr.ca.gov. So we're encouraging the public to review our document and provide comment.

On our next slide, slide 15, we show an

interactive map which has been very popular with constituents who want to see where the alignments are in relation to their property. So this is just a snapshot, a screenshot, of our online page where people can go and type in their address or their APN number and see the alignment and how it is in proximity to their property.

Slide 16 are important dates for the public to remember.

We have an open house where we'll give a presentation and have our experts available to answer questions on October 6th. It will be virtual. And information about that is on our website. There will be an English and a Spanish presentation available that evening.

And then public comment will be taken at an online public hearing, which is October 18th, and we will have a court reporter available. People can call in and give their comment at any time during that open online public hearing. We are, of course, also taking public comment in other ways, and I'll cover that next.

So far, our official meetings are all virtual, because we had to plan these in advance and notice them, and we didn't know what was happening with COVID. We are scheduling working on two in-person meetings, one for the community of Acton, and that is early October, where we'll have a small group meeting up in in Acton. They have some

internet connectivity issues and prefer in-person. 1 2 then we're also looking at one in Southern California in 3 the Pacoima-Sun Valley area. Both of those maps that I 4 showed you as the dive-in would be where we'd host 5 something in person. 6 CHAIR RICHARDS: Will the virtual meetings be 7 audio only or will there be audio and visual? 8 MS. DICAMILLO: The virtual meetings will be 9 audio and visual. 10 CHAIR RICHARDS: They will be both? Okay. 11 MS. DICAMILLO: Yeah. And --12 CHAIR RICHARDS: Natalie --13 MS. DICAMILLO: Go ahead. 14 CHAIR RICHARDS: -- would you make sure that the 15 Board members -- is Natalie around? Would you make sure 16 that the Board members get all the information so that they 17 can not participate but at least be on board with regards 18 to the virtual meeting that's going to occur on October 6th? 19 20 Thank you. 21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: If I could? 22 CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes. 23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Are you taking public comment 24 on October 6th? 25 MS. DICAMILLO: We are not taking public comment

```
1
    on October 6th. That is when people can ask their
 2
    questions, and we'll provide answers. But public comment
 3
    will be taken on our website, they can send an email.
 4
    have a 24/7 phone number which is at the bottom of this, so
 5
    people can call in comments. But at that particular
 6
    hearing, we won't have a court reporter to transcribe
 7
    comments.
 8
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: Is there a way that you can
9
    take comments online?
10
              MS. DICAMILLO: Yes, all of that. Yes.
11
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: So will you allow for that on
12
    October 6th?
13
              MS. DICAMILLO: Yes.
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: I just think sometimes
14
15
    people, they can't make every meeting.
16
              MS. DICAMILLO: Of course.
17
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: So if they're at the October
18
    6th meeting and they want to make a comment, there should
19
    be a way for them to do that.
20
              MS. DICAMILLO: Yes. And in our presentations,
21
    there's links to where people can go type in their
22
    comments, yeah.
23
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.
24
              MS. DICAMILLO: Well there are, in our
25
    presentations for the public, which are much longer than
```

```
1
    what I've done today, there are a number of links. And our
 2
    team puts in chat links to where people can automatically
 3
    go to type in their comment.
 4
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. I just think at the
 5
    6th, you need to have a way for people to comment.
 6
              MS. DICAMILLO: Yes.
 7
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay.
 8
              MS. DICAMILLO: At that point, we just --
9
              VICE CHAIR MILLER:
                                  Thank you.
              MS. DICAMILLO: -- it won't be verbal, they'd
10
11
    have to type it in.
12
              VICE CHAIR MILLER:
                                  They'll have to type it in or
13
    you'll give them a link about where to send it?
14
              MS. DICAMILLO: And we'll give them --
15
              VICE CHAIR MILLER:
                                   Okay.
16
              MS. DICAMILLO: -- all the instructions to do
17
    that.
18
              VICE CHAIR MILLER:
                                   Thank you.
19
              MS. DICAMILLO: Yes. And it is very important.
20
    We want their comments. We definitely want their comments.
21
              Moving to slide 17, it's a summary of our
22
    schedule. This graphic you've seen before as our staged
23
    process delivery and we are in stage two, about midpoint.
24
    We've analyzed alternatives, we've put out our draft.
25
    following this, we'll take public comment through November
```

2nd. Let me -- I got that wrong. November 1st, we'll take public comment. That's an important date to get right.

And then we'll analyze those comments, review them, make sure that we respond to all comments, and hope to have a Final Environmental Document released next year, late next year. So we would have our Final Environmental Document to the Board in the fourth quarter of 2023.

Okay, with that my closing slide is a summary of where people can go to make comment. That 800 number there is where people can call in anytime, 24/7. Our Palmdale_Burbank@hsr.ca.gov is a good place to go to submit written comments. Our team has linked it to our main website, hsr.ca.gov. We have a MeetHSR SoCal website, as well, that provides additional information for people that can kind of walk through some detailed information. So we're doing everything we can to put it out in the public and have comments received.

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Excuse me, LaDonna. So all of this is on our website, did you say?

MS. DICAMILLO: This is on our website? Yeah. They're nodding back here.

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: How else are we getting this out? Because being sensitive to being a member of the transitional generation, there are people, and I suspect a fair number, who don't go to the website. It's not -- you

1 know, they're not native, digital natives who automatically 2 go to a website. They still, I don't know, hear the local 3 news on radio, TV. They look at local little neighborhood 4 newspapers. 5 Are we reaching out other than electronically --MS. DICAMILLO: Absolutely. 6 7 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: -- to people? 8 MS. DICAMILLO: We --9 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: And especially with the 10 phone number, by the way, because as a follow-up to Nancy's 11 question about whether people can give comment, and you 12 said, yes, there'll be live chat, but that would be the 13 time to also make sure people have the 800 number so that 14 they can call in a comment and not have to type one or be 15 online. 16 MS. DICAMILLO: Absolutely, and we'll put that. 17 I mean, we put it in our slides for the public, we put it 18 in the chat so that they can do a quick link. 19 This information was put in advertisements in 20 local newspapers --21 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Okay. MS. DICAMILLO: -- La Opinión, and I don't 22 23 remember the name of the other one, but I know it was at 24 least one or two other publications. And then we've sent 25 out over 40,000 mailers, and some households got more than

one. So we at least know that they were received, but we sent over 40,000 notices within a certain proximity of zip codes around our alignment.

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Good. Thank you.

MS. DICAMILLO: Yeah.

Okay, transitioning a bit to our bookend projects. As you know, we've invested in the bookends, including Link Union Station. We've put \$441 million as a state into Union Station improvements. And Jeanet Owens is going to talk about Union Station, as well as Rosecrans/Marquardt, which is the second picture on slide 19, showing a grade-separated intersection at Rosecrans/Marquardt and Santa Fe Springs.

And so we're going to highlight those bookend investments in the next presentation, which hopefully Jeanet is online. She's not in-person, but you should have her presentation. And I think Justin's been coordinating with her to start her overview.

MS. OWENS: Good morning, Chair Richards, Board members, Senator Gonzales, and CEO Kelly. My apologies for not being able to be there in person. And I want to thank you for the opportunity to call in and give you an update on our California High-Speed Rail bookend investments in Southern California, the Link Union Station project, which is to the right of your screen, the right picture, and then

on the Rosecrans/Marquardt grade separation to the left.

I do want to thank Justin, who will be assisting me with the slide presentations. I apologize in advance for any hiccups as this is my first time presenting without seeing you or the presentation, so I will do my best.

And the next slide.

This is the Rosecrans/Marquardt grade separation project. This is in existing conditions of the diagonal crossing at the intersection of Rosecrans Avenue and Marquardt Avenue in the city of Santa Fe Springs.

In 2016, it was ranked as number one of the most hazardous grade crossing by the California Public Utilities Commission with 26 incidents, 5 fatalities, and 6 injuries. One of the rail tracks, as you can see here, are sliced diagonally through the intersection. The train and automobile crossing is longer and particularly dangerous, because drivers and pedestrians can always -- can't always see the oncoming train, especially on a heavily congested intersection with over 120 passenger and freight trains that go by, in addition to 40,000 vehicles daily.

Next slide.

The Rosecrans/Marquardt key stakeholders are
California High-Speed Rail, the City of Santa Fe Springs,
the City of La Mirada, the Federal Railroad Administration,
the FRA, the BNSF Railway, our California Public Utilities,

our Caltrans Division of Rail, and our Metrolink Southern California Regional Rail Authority.

Next slide. I'm on page four.

This is the Rosecrans/Marquardt funding plan at approximately \$156,439,000. It comprises roughly of 17 percent local Measure R, six to eight percent of state between California High-Speed Rail Prop 1A, STIP, our Transit Corridor Enhancement Program, and as well as our CPUC Section 190. It also consists of ten percent federal, with our TIGER now known as RAISE, and five percent BNSF.

Next slide.

The Rosecrans/Marquardt benefits comprises of improved safety with the elimination of the train-to-vehicle pedestrian accidents, enhances the rail efficiency and goods movement with time savings of up to 21 hours per week with the elimination of the grade crossing, and supports a third mainline track that enables BNSF to provide additional 32-passenger train slots in the BNSF corridor, and as well as accommodate the future high-speed rail.

Next slide.

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Wait, excuse me, this is
Member Schenk.

MS. OWENS: Sure. Sure.

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yeah. So looking at

This -- how did we come to agreement that Prop 1A would pay the lion's share of this? What was the negotiation whereby we came up with having to put in \$76 million-and-change?

MR. KELLY: Let me just try to provide some context for that.

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Okay.

MR. KELLY: Back in 2012, there was an agreement worked out with the legislature on funding for bookend projects in both Northern California and Southern California. The Southern California total was \$500 million, the Northern California total was \$600 million at that time, for \$1.1 billion, roughly, in bookend projects.

We then worked with the regions on the highest-priority projects and where those dollars would go. And in Southern California, roughly \$78 million is dedicated to the Rosecrans/Marquardt grade separation which, as Jeanet noted, was at that time the most dangerous grade separation in California. And so \$76 million of the Prop 1A dollars went there, and the other \$423 million is for the LA Union Station project.

So it went through a process of an MOU, I think entered into around 2012, between the Authority and Southern California parties. And the top two projects that came out as the highest priority were the L.A. Union Station, that upgrade, and this grade separation.

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Well, it's all done, I know. I fully understand and support Union Station.

This one -- and I don't in any way take away how dangerous this intersection is, I've driven there, I know how dangerous it is -- but it's been dangerous for a long time, pre high-speed rail. It's been there pre any of us. And I know there's not much we can do about it now but going forward, on these areas where there has been great danger long before there was high-speed rail, for us to pay half of this is -- to me, it just doesn't sit well. You know, I think the communities, the other sources of funding, should have come up with more. I don't say that we shouldn't have participated, of course we should, because it will ultimately have some benefit to us.

But again, just my common sense, sense of right and wrong, it seems like we've been used a little bit here in having to pay half of this. And I hope in the future on these negotiations that we are a little tougher on protecting our Prop 1A monies that are so limited.

20 Anyway --

CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you, Director Schenk.

I think that certainly, as things come up in the future, these things of course come to the Board for discussion and ultimate decision. So I think that we can certainly address concerns of all of the members as they

```
come before the Board.
 1
 2
              BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: I know. It's zero.
 3
              MS. OWENS: Should I proceed to slide six, or do
 4
    we want to go back to slides five or four?
              CHAIR RICHARDS: I think --
 5
 6
              MS. OWENS: Four, meaning the Funding Plan, five
 7
    is the benefits.
8
              CHAIR RICHARDS: Go ahead.
                                          I'm sorry, I
9
    interrupted you. You're still on page four -- or excuse
10
    me, page, yeah, page five, I think.
11
              MS. OWENS:
                          Yes.
12
              CHAIR RICHARDS: You're now on six?
13
              MS. OWENS: Yes. I'm now on six, Chair, yes.
14
              CHAIR RICHARDS: Okay. Page six?
15
              MS. OWENS: If that's okay? Okay.
16
              So the city, this is a -- the Rosecrans/Marquardt
17
    advanced utility relocation, commonly referred to as AUR,
18
    provided a cost savings of up to $18 million with the help
19
    of the City of Santa Fe Springs. The City of Santa Fe
20
    Springs authorized Metro to execute its franchise agreement
21
    to relocate or remove conflicting utilities at the
22
    utility's own cost.
23
              So, for example, with over 21 existing Southern
24
    California Edison poles within the project limits, 17 out
25
    of the 21 were either relocated or modified because it
```

conflicted with the grade separation. And the planning, design, and construction, including the communication lines, by working with these communication agencies and Edison, took five years. It was completed in May of 2022, in time for the general contractor to begin, significantly reducing overall project risks and saving the project more than \$18 million.

So this is a classic example of the cooperation that we have, the partnership and leadership of the City of Santa Fe springs.

Next slide.

So this is the overall project update on what we have accomplished to date, anticipated completion. We had completed the NEPA in November of 2018. For a grade separation, we've received a CEQA exemption for most, if not all, grade separations in California. The construction of advanced utility relocation took 28 months, which began in January of 2020 and was completed in May of 2022. Our right-of-way certification was completed in December of 2022, and we awarded construction in April of 2022. Our anticipated construction completion is Fall of 2025.

Next slide.

Our second high-speed rail bookend investment is the Link Union Station project, Phase A. This is a high-speed rail rendering of the Phase A improvements that

transforms our Los Angeles Union Station to a run-through station. So this is an interim run-through operation that shows only two run-through tracks. But as you can see here, the actual bridge will be built to accommodate nine run-through tracks in total.

Next slide.

This is our existing Union Station today, our beautiful, historic, iconic Los Angeles Union Station.

Refer to the bottom-left corner of the Union Station.

This is what we call our biggest star in the 2021 Oscars. It was built in 1939 as a stub-ended track station. And if you refer back onto the upper left-hand corner, you can see the seven new tracks, and you can see right adjacent to the south of that seven new tracks is the US 101 Freeway.

It's important to note the US 101 Freeway, is because they're on ramps and off ramps -- I'm not sure you can see it there -- as well as in what we call our El Monte Busway facility there. It's really our core point that we need to make sure that when we do build the run-through track bridge structure, we have to raise the railyard because of the freeway on-ramps and off-ramps right south of Union Station. So I wanted to point that out a little more in detail in the proceeding slides.

The picture to the right refers to the throat of

the railyard located north of Union Station. This is where all trains enter and exit the railyard, heavily congested during peak time, idling and waiting for each train to take turns as they either enter or exit the railyard.

There are a total of seven existing platforms at Union Station. The first platform to the left, where you see a little green kind of bungalow roof on top, a canopy, is our Metro Light Rail Station, our L Line Station, and then we have six regional rail platforms today. And then to the left, you'll see our Patsaouras Bus Plaza, and of course our Metro Headquarters.

Next slide.

This overall shows the Link to Southern

California. As the largest multimodal rail terminal and transit station in Southern California, it really links all the counties from San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara -- which is not shown -- Ventura County, San Diego, Riverside

County, Orange County, in addition to all our long-distance trains that are coming in. So it's really the heart of our overall network here on the regional rail system in Southern California.

Next slide.

The Link Union Station is implemented in two phases, Phase A and Phase B. Phase A's funding mainly consists of a signal upgrade, run-through track bridge

structure with two interim run-through tracks, and converting Platform 4 to a run-through track operation.

Phase B, which is not funded, includes raising the railyard up to 15 feet high, which enables the construction of a new shared track for high-speed rail, new platforms, new passenger concourse, and all the passengers' amenities of retail, escalators, elevators, that initiate the transformation for a world-class transit and terminal station.

Next slide.

So this is a good kind of depiction of our existing commuter and intercity rail services at Union Station pre-COVID. With a current stub-ended operations using six regional rail platforms, there are approximately a total of 178 daily weekday trains.

Next slide.

The proposed commuter and intercity rail services at Union Station with full run-through operation at the completion of Phase B show the power of what run-through operations can do. With the same number of platforms, you can accommodate a whole new high-speed rail service and increase capacity approximately 60 percent, from 178 to 500 daily weekday trains.

Next slide.

So as I summed up, our overall passenger benefits

of the Link Union Station project increases the passenger rail services with the same number of platforms from 178 trains to 503 trains. It also reduces dwell time, and overall reduces greenhouse emissions because of the reduction in dwell time.

It has basically improved our signal infrastructure system. When Union Station was built in 1939, the signal system there was pretty much -- aside from positive train control system, PTC -- the signal system was as old as the train -- as old as Union Station. And so modernizing the signal infrastructure system was very important.

Phase B also enables us to widen our platforms to accommodate future growth for the next 30 years, widening it from 21 feet to 28 feet, with all-new passenger amenities at Los Angeles Union Station.

Next slide.

This kind of gives you an overview of the phase data I mentioned earlier, with the signal work, the converting our existing Platform 4 to a run-through platform, and as well as the construction of the overall run-through bridge structure.

Next slide.

This is a rendering of our full build-out of the Link Union Station project that comprises the both Phase A

and Phase B, that shows all run-through track structures.

Now, again, this projection is the Rolls Royce version. It's just a concept of a dream of what Union Station could be.

Next slide.

And these are the various components of Phase B elements, which includes, as I mentioned before, raising the railyard, a new passenger concourse, raised lead tracks, as well as the new full run-through on the run-through track-bridge structure.

Next slide.

I think this is important to show. This is a cross-section of the railyard, as you can see here, and the passenger on the Phase B passenger concourse. This shows you that when we have to -- we have to raise the railyard in order to build the run-through. So in Phase A, the Phase A bridge structure will be raised to match this overall elevation because the Phase A run-through structure needs to be raised.

So with this, you can see that our passenger concourse is underneath the railyard. And if you're familiar with Los Angeles Union Station, we also have a subway system, what we call our Red Line/Purple Line, now referred to as our Lines B and D, underneath the passenger concourse. It's almost like three levels: railyard,

passenger concourse, and our existing subway system.

If you look to the left, that would be our historic Union Station. Platform 1 is our Gold Line light rail station line. And then Platforms 2 to 7 is our regional rail platforms that comprises of two platforms for high-speed rail on Platforms 2 and 3, and then 4, 5 and 6 and 7 are regional rail platforms for both Amtrak and Metrolink. Platform 3 is also shared with both Amtrak and Metrolink, as well. And then to the far right is our Patsaouras Bus Plaza connection.

Next slide.

So this is a depiction of a cross-section that we have where it was very important for high-speed rail to ensure that, with the future phasing of high-speed rail that may come in a little later, and if Link Union Station is fortunate to have Phase B funded, it was important to High-Speed Rail to making sure we minimize any construction costs to accommodate a fixed platform height with a fixed elevator and escalator.

So if you noticed, a high-speed rail train has a different floor height than a typical Metrolink commuter train and Amtrak intercity train. The difference is approximately 15 inches versus a high-speed rail train of 51 inches from the floor of the train to the top of the rail.

And so how we solved this, and we used it -- we also saw this at Denver Union Station, is we install retaining walls. So when, if high-speed rail -- when high-speed rail comes at a later date, everything remains the same and all we do is just change the track bed, elevate that a little, or lower it for the high-speed rail, so that it accommodates the future phasing of high-speed rail.

Next slide.

This is the Funding Plan for Link Union Station Phase A, totaling approximately \$950.398 million.

Next slide.

This is where we are on Link Union Station on the preconstruction phase. This is the CMGC lifecycle, project lifecycle, that shows the two phases: preconstruction and construction. It comprises of seven stages from project initiation to environmental clearance to right-of-way acquisition, final design, construction, testing, and project closeout.

As you can see here, the preconstruction phase work is ongoing. We completed the CEQA. We're working with NEPA. We're working with the High-Speed Rail as the NEPA lead agency to complete the NEPA and PE design. We're in CMGC procurements, and our real estate acquisition and final design of the third-party work.

Next slide.

So our overall next step is to complete the NEPA environmental work as early as Summer of 2023, continue on our work with our real estate acquisition, advanced engineering design, and our final design for our third-party work, the utility work that takes a little longer, and then procuring our CMGC and working with our engineers and stakeholders on our final design.

Next slide.

We thought this would be a good summary of project updates on both the high-speed rail bookend projects in Southern California: the Rosecrans/Marquardt grade separation with a Funding Plan of \$156.439 million, which is to your left; and the Link Union Station Phase A project Funding Plan of \$950.398 million, which is to your right.

Let me start with the Rosecrans/Marquardt Funding Plan. The planning and design initiated in April of 2015. I mentioned earlier our CEQA Notice of Exemption, all the way down to when our first California High-Speed Rail Project Management Funding Agreement was executed. I believe Rosecrans/Marquardt was the first, on May of 2018. And then our NEPA FONSI, Findings of No of -- of No Significant Findings, was completed by the FRA in November of 2018.

And then it just proceeded down to where we are

today. I mentioned earlier our construction groundbreaking occurred in June of 2022, and our anticipated construction completion is in Fall of 2025.

On the Link Union Station project, we -- giving you some background, the Link Union Station project was also known as Los Angeles Union Station Run-Through Station. And so it was first planned, bought, and led by Caltrans and Amtrak back in 2006. At that time, I think they were only looking at two to no more than four tracks running through across as run-through operation.

Since then, with so many projects coming in Union Station, in addition to the high-speed rail coming in, we initiated planning with accommodating and incorporating high-speed rail into Union Station. In Winter of 2016, where their engineering design is still ongoing, we completed 35 percent design. However, we are working on the NEPA. And so we want to make sure we continue to modify any preliminary engineering design to be consistent with our NEPA.

We completed our CEQA in July of 2018. We had a CEQA addendum, moving forward with the state vehicle miles traveled in October of 2021. And then we executed -- so thank you very much to our CEO and Chief Program Management Officer for the execution and your approval of the PMFA in June of 2022. And then our right-of-way acquisition is

ongoing.

We are working with our California High-Speed Rail NEPA team on concurrence with any of our early works. We anticipate to complete NEPA, as I mentioned before, as early as Summer of 2022. We do have some early track and signal work by Southern California Regional Rail Authority that is expected to be completed as early as 2023. And our CMGC procurement is ongoing.

Doing a comparison between the two, we did want to stress that a CEQA exemption and the NEPA FONSI, or Findings of No Significance, is definitely a much more abbreviated, expedited environmental clearance, compared to a full Environmental Document for both a CEQA and NEPA at Link Union Station.

Next slide.

And I'm here to answer any questions that you may have. This concludes my presentation. I apologize if it was a little lengthy. If I went too fast, please let me know. I'm happy to go over any slide that you may -- you would like to see.

CHAIR RICHARDS: Ms. Owens, this is Tom Richards.

At the Authority, as I'm sure you're well aware, this is incredibly important to us, as it is to metro in Southern California.

But what I think I'm going to ask our CEO would

be to have his staff contact you. What we would appreciate very much would be to have -- make arrangements for you to be at one of our Board meetings in the near future to present this presentation with you here in the room, so that it's easier for us to understand. And if you would modify it, to whatever extent necessary, prior to that time for any changes from what you've said today or any additions, it would be appreciated.

But I can tell, I mean, I think we heard you as well as we could under the circumstances but -- and the presentation is very much appreciated and you've done a terrific job. We want to improve on the location so that we can really get a clear understanding of what you've been saying and we can appropriately ask questions that we may have.

But I wanted, primarily, to point out that it's incredibly important to you and very much important to us. So we are joined at the hip, so to speak on this, and we want to be a good and responsive partner, as you are and have been to us.

So Mr. Kelly, if you would arrange for that, even if it's early next year? But we don't want to, I think, delay beyond that.

MR. KELLY: Will do, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIR RICHARDS: Any other questions or comments

```
from members of this Board to Ms. Owens?
 1
 2
              VICE CHAIR MILLER: I just, when you -- thank you
 3
    for your presentation. It was just a little hard for us to
 4
    hear you at times, but it was very comprehensive.
 5
              I just would want, when you come back to us on
 6
    the Phase A, just a little bit more explanation of how that
 7
    runs. It looks like a single track running out. And I'm
    not sure if it's a single track or double track, back and
 8
9
    forth, I'm thinking, or a through-way, but just maybe a
    little bit more on that particular part of Phase A.
10
11
              Thank you.
12
              MS. OWENS:
                          Absolutely.
13
              CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you, Vice Chair Miller.
14
              LaDonna, you're up again.
15
              MS. DICAMILLO: I'm just here if you had more
16
    questions --
17
              CHAIR RICHARDS:
                                Okay.
              MS. DICAMILLO: -- but I think I'm done.
18
19
              CHAIR RICHARDS: Alright.
20
              MS. DICAMILLO: Alright.
                                        Thank you.
21
              CHAIR RICHARDS: Any questions for our Southern
22
    California Regional Director?
23
              Yes, Director Pena?
24
              BOARD MEMBER PENA:
                                   Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25
              Just wondering if you could talk a little bit
```

```
about feedback that you've been getting so far from the
 1
 2
    environmental justice community on the project. And maybe
 3
    this is it for this project.
 4
              MS. OWENS: Yes, absolutely.
 5
              MS. DICAMILLO: Are you talking about
 6
    environmental justice community around our alignment or
 7
    around Link Union Station?
 8
              BOARD MEMBER PENA: Actually, both.
 9
              MS. DICAMILLO: Okay, let's let Jeanet start.
10
              CHAIR RICHARDS: Ms. Owens, go ahead.
11
              MS. OWENS: Sure. Thank you. Let me know if
12
    you're not able to hear me. I'll try to speak a little
13
    louder.
14
              We have been receiving -- as you know, when we
15
    completed the CEQA environmental, we have received all
16
    support, pretty much full support, on the Link Union
17
    Station Phase A during our CEQA process. And our
18
    environmental justice overall, we have met all the
19
    requirements in our environmental justice, and the
20
    community's support on our environmental justice, so we
21
    don't have any particular issues on our environmental
22
    justice that we have right now.
23
              Are there any particular concerns that you may
24
    have that I can address?
25
              BOARD MEMBER PENA: No.
                                       Just generally, I wanted
```

to know what feedback you were receiving.

MS. OWENS: Well, because this is a regional rail project, and because, as you can see here, we made it -- it was very important for us not to impact the community.

Here, if you take a picture -- let me see if you can go back to -- see if you can go back -- let me -- that refer to a rendering so you can see it a little bit more.

If you go back to slide eight. Can you show slide eight up on the screen?

As you see here at slide eight, the surrounding communities of Los Angeles Union Station, we have our Chinatown. And here's our historic Union Station that you see in red, with a red roof. Our Chinatown is a little bit to the west of that. And then we have our Little Tokyo, which is further south, right by the run-through track structure and south. And then we have our historic Arts District right to the south of that, that's to the southeast. And then our Boyle Heights around the area on the eastern end of this community.

Overall, because of the -- the surrounding communities understand the importance of the needs of the transformation of the Los Angeles Union Station to a runthrough track operation. We have received a significant amount of support in the surrounding area. We have apprised them on every phase and every change through the

Phase A. So we have not -- overall, there's very limited impacts that we are acquiring.

If you recall, when I did a cross-section of the railyard and I mentioned that the Red Line/Purple Line tunnel is underneath the passenger concourse, that Red Line/Purple Line tunnel actually comes right across -- when I say right across, it comes in from Union Station and is diagonal -- all the way across the freeway. A diagonal goes all the way across the freeway underneath.

So we were very careful. HER (phonetic) was very careful in its design to straddle that subway system and really minimize our overall impact to the community at large. So as you can see, some, most of -- we have three full real estate acquisition takes. One of them is an empty area right adjacent to the US 101 Freeway.

So we have nothing but garnered support for the Link Union Station Phase A.

BOARD MEMBER PENA: Thank you.

MS. DICAMILLO: And moving to the project sections, I'll start with Los Angeles to Anaheim.

Our team has been meeting with communities along the existing rail corridor over the years, and especially with a focus on the Colton component, because we know that there is an EJ component to that. And I'd say we're in the dozens of meetings now. As we get more information and

more definition to our project, it will definitely be a focus.

More recently, Serge Stanich and I and others on the team have been meeting with some environmental justice groups that are from the Inland Empire that have experience with freight and have some concerns, generally, with freight. So we've been meeting more with them to understand what their concerns are and where we might be able to find ways to work together.

On the Palmdale to Burbank section, it was one of my concerns with needing to be virtual and having this, are we going to be able to be in-person or not? So we went with officially everything is virtual, but we are going to make sure to have an in-person meeting, a workshop, where people can go from station to station — and that would be in the Sun Valley/Pacoima area — people can go from station to station and talk to our experts, and that's an option for them. And we'll make sure that everybody has an opportunity to comment. So we're trying to do a specific outreach in that particular area to make sure that they have opportunity to learn more about our project and to comment.

BOARD MEMBER ESCUTIA: This is Martha Escutia.

I'm assuming that, with regard to all these sections, that you are giving the proper notice of these

meeting to the legislators that represent those areas?

MS. DICAMILLO: Absolutely. Last week, we had a briefing. We called it a legislative briefing. It was for staff of the legislative representatives, as well as senior city, county, local staff, so that they had the same information that we'll be presenting to the public. And I don't think we've sent them out the PowerPoint yet, but we will. We'll make sure that they have the PowerPoint so they know when those meetings are upcoming.

BOARD MEMBER ESCUTIA: And then, just as a follow-up, I would just like to respectfully suggest that once you're finished with the meetings that you need to have, you know, as a result of all these sections, that you compile a list of the meetings and separate it section by section, and separate it by legislators, and send them copies of all the meetings that you met, with whom did you meet with, on what date, you know, so that the legislators are keenly aware that you are doing the necessary outreach, and you have it in writing, and just give it to them. You know, therefore --

MS. DICAMILLO: Sure.

BOARD MEMBER ESCUTIA: -- you know, it's just a good thing to just inform everybody of what you're doing.

MS. DICAMILLO: Sure. Thank you. Thank you for that. We usually do it by request but I think it is a good

```
1
    idea to let them know what we've been doing.
 2
              BOARD MEMBER ESCUTIA: Just pre-empt the
 3
    question. Just go ahead and do it.
 4
              MS. DICAMILLO:
                              Okay.
 5
              CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you, Director Escutia.
              Yes? Go ahead.
 6
 7
              BOARD MEMBER PENA: Just one follow up.
              On your 800 number that people can call into, is
 8
9
    there an opportunity on that line or another line where
10
    they can like leave -- actually leave a message with their
11
    comments?
12
              MS. DICAMILLO: I believe that's what that 800
13
    number is.
14
              BOARD MEMBER PEREA:
                                  Okay.
15
              MS. DICAMILLO: It's just a matter of recording
16
    the message, and then it gets transcribed and put into our
17
    official record. Yes, that's my --
18
              BOARD MEMBER PEREA: Is there --
              MR. SWARTZLANDER: I don't know if there's a
19
20
    greeting or not. I haven't called it.
21
              BOARD MEMBER PENA:
                                  Is there an opportunity?
22
              MS. DICAMILLO: There is, they say.
23
              BOARD MEMBER PENA: Okay. Is there an
24
    opportunity on that line to get -- for someone to get a
25
    callback if they want?
```

1 MS. DICAMILLO: Yes. They all get transcribed 2 and then sent to our team. And if they're asking for 3 additional information, we'll make sure to follow up. 4 we're also offering office hours for some of the interested 5 people who want to spend maybe a little extra time with some of our technical staff on a specific issue. 6 7 do that and request that through the 800 number. 8 BOARD MEMBER PENA: Okav. 9 And you can accommodate multiple languages? MS. DICAMILLO: Yes, especially English and 10 11 Spanish. We've written the public -- the printed 12 materials, have gone out, I think, in six languages. Does 13 anybody know? It was in multiple languages. Our open 14 house will be in two. 15 BOARD MEMBER PENA: Okay. 16 CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you, Director Pena. 17 MS. DICAMILLO: Sure. 18 CHAIR RICHARDS: Any other comments or questions 19 from members of the Board? 20 None from the people on the phone? Alright. 21 Well then, Ms. DiCamillo and Ms. Owens, thank you 22 both very much. 23 MS. DICAMILLO: Thank you. Okay. 24 MS. OWENS: Thank you, Chair. I appreciate your 25 time today.

CHAIR RICHARDS: We will now move on to item number five on our agenda, our CEO Report.

Mr. Kelly?

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I know that last bit took a while, so I'm going to move quickly on this. There are really three items that I want to update the Board on in the CEO report, and then just a quick announcement of some good news for us.

But the quick items are, first, we are doing some work. Once we advance the Environmental Document in corridors, we're able to get in and dig a little bit deeper and do more work with our partners on how the corridors will actually operate. And I just flagged this because recently I and the managing director for Caltrain sent a note to their board about work we'll be doing on updating the project management finance agreement, shared-use agreements we'll have with Caltrain in that corridor. And it's important that we continue our partnership for how we'll actually implement the two services through that corridor.

So there's a series of plans and programs and agreements we have with them now, and more that we'll be working on as we go forward. So I flagged this for you now because it's an important part of our partnership in that corridor, and the operational benefits of both services in

that corridor and how we'll accommodate both services, and so I just flagged that for you now.

I'll be coming back to this Board with more detailed updates on various elements of those agreements as we go forward. But again, we are engaging with the Caltrain group on updates we have to make to some of the agreements we've had in place, and so I just want to flag that for you and say that's something I'll be coming back to the Board on routinely.

Second item is in the F&A Committee this morning there was a report about the change order that we executed. And this is what we call "the missing two-and-a-half miles," is what it's referred to as. When we relocated the Highway 99 element just north of Fresno to accommodate the high-speed rail service, we then have to build the railroad component of that. Initially, that was going to be a part of that original Caltrans contract. It was taken out of that contract in favor of using the existing contract. It was already mobilized on the site and already had done similar work around the two-and-a-half miles.

So we just executed that contract, and we reported that to the F&A this morning and I'm reporting it here. That's \$101.5 million to complete all of the work associated with what we call "the missing two-and-a-half miles" of the initial contract. That involves some

guideway subgrade, some intrusion protection barrier work, railroad access roads, fencing, drainage, and all the civil works necessary for the track and systems to come through that section, so we just completed that work.

And then I wanted to just give -- the third issue is to give you a sense of what's coming up at the October Board meeting, at least hopefully, we'll bring back to the Board in October, so you guys can start thinking about these issues.

You know that we entered an RFQ process for the design of these four Central Valley stations. We'll be coming back to the Board for the proposed award of that contract in October. We are continuing to do some work on the program delivery support contract, and we intend to come back to the Board with that, assuming all the outstanding questions had been answered.

Margaret Cederoth, Meg Cederoth, who addresses this Board every year or so on the sustainability report, that report is updated. We'll be bringing that back to the Board in October, as well.

And then I'm looking forward to having a very important discussion with this Board in October on the 2023 Project Update Report. As you know, every even-numbered year we do a business plan that we submit publicly and give to the legislature. In every odd-numbered year we do a

Project Update Report where we update our activities, what we know, anything that's changed, and how we're managing risk going forward.

This year's Project Update Report will take on a little bit more emphasis and meaning because of the budget deal that we passed with the legislature. In that budget deal, they're asking for additional information to be in that Project Update Report, including probability and risk for all manner of things, including schedules and costs and budget and where we are.

And so I want to just say to you that, with the new requirements in statute, and the report's broader focus this year, it's not due to the legislature until March of '23, but my intention is to be talking to the Board about it all through fall and into the winter as we get to that March date, because there's so much that's going to be in that report.

So in October, I'm going to come back and do a presentation about what that budget deal requires in the Project Update Report and share with you information as we develop it and as we go. Again, the idea is no surprises by the time we get to March. We'll have a lot of conversations about it leading up to that time, so I'm going to start in the October hearing with a broad conversation about that.

And then we also want to open a conversation, or at least come back to the Board members, with a recommended schedule for the 2023 calendar year for all of our meetings. We'll talk about that initially in October, too. And I do want to get some feedback from Board members about how we space the meetings apart. As you know, we meet once a month right now. There have been some recommendations to extend the in-between period from four weeks to six weeks, and so we want to have a conversation about that, and we may propose what that will look like for the Board's consideration in Calendar Year 2023, as well.

So these are the issues I want to come back to you all with in October. So that will be the basis of a very substantive hearing I think we're going to have in October.

And then just a couple of good news notes for you. You may recall that several months ago, High-Speed Rail was named the Employer of the Year by the Sacramento Chapter of the Women in Transportation Seminar. I think just yesterday, we were notified by the Los Angeles Women in Transportation Seminar that we were named their Employer of the Year, as well, so we're very pleased about that, and just got that recognition yesterday.

And the other thing, I'm going to butcher this, I'm sure, but I do want to acknowledge Melissa Figueroa,

Annie Parker, and their communications team. There's an association in California of public information officers. And once a year they review various messaging campaigns that were done and provide awards to state agencies that have done superior work in that area. And I think we brought home three different awards from that, and so I want to acknowledge our team on that.

I would just say, too, I got to, I do think that the work we're doing, particularly with drone footage and other things on social media, and sharing what's going on and how we're advancing this project through technology and social media, is really the best I've seen in the state.

And so I'm really proud of the work that Melissa and her team are doing and I want to just acknowledge them.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I'm done, unless there's any questions.

CHAIR RICHARDS: Thank you, Mr. Kelly.

Any questions for our CEO?

Seeing none, good job. Thank you.

Let me just take a couple of quick minutes on item number six, which is the Finance & Audit Report.

We met this morning at 8:30. Currently, these numbers are as of July of this year, 2022, and primarily for Fiscal Year '22-23, we have cash. The Authority has cash right now, or at that time, of about \$2.1 billion, of

which \$2 billion is cap and trade proceeds. We mentioned last month that the August 17th sale, cap and trade sale, appeared to generate what is now estimated at being about \$161 million to the Authority. The administrative budget for the fiscal year '22-'23, that's important because it's limited by the statute, but it is at \$93.4 million for administration. Our capital outlay budget, that is the budget for '22-23, is reasonably flat with what we had for '21-22, and that's about \$2.3 billion.

Total expenditures for this project from its outset, that is the very beginning of cap and trade -- or, excuse me, High-Speed Rail Authority to the July -- the end of July of '22 is \$9.9 billion, most of which has been spent on construction.

With regards to contingency, the Authority currently has, remaining, \$2 billion dollars in contingency funds, of which that amounts to 40 percent of what was originally allocated at \$5.2 billion. Brian just mentioned the contingency drawdown a few moments ago, so I'll not hit that again.

Our number of workers on the job for July was slightly less than the month before, down by six, to average daily workers at about 1,113 per day.

In terms of the progress on construction in the month of July, there has been no change in the number of

1 structures or guideways work that was reported the month before. 3 With regards to right-of-way procurement, three 4 parcels were delivered to the design-builders in July, 5 which brings the total that's been delivered at 92 percent of the 2,309 parcels that are required. 6 7 On utility relocations, eight relocations were 8 completed in July of '22. That makes the number that have 9 been completed or are in progress or approved at 70 percent 10 of the total, which leaves another 561 which have not been 11 approved or started. 12 And that gives you a real quick summary of 13 Finance & Audit for today. 14 Any questions on any of those items? 15 BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: Quick comment. 16 CHAIR RICHARDS: Sure. Go ahead. 17 BOARD MEMBER CAMCHO: The numbers that you're 18 reciting are numbers for July. 19 CHAIR RICHARDS: That's correct. 20 BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: So we still have August, 21 so we're not really taking advantage of really a true 22 number of where we are --23 CHAIR RICHARDS: Right. 24 BOARD MEMBER CAMACHO: -- in terms of dollars 25 spent or construction activity. I just wanted to note

that.

CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes. Thank you.

Any other questions or comments from my colleagues?

Anybody on the phone, our colleagues on the phone, any questions or comments? Alright.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, hearing none, I do want to mention one thing, that we're going to have an additional item on all of our Board meetings from this point forward. And as I was reminded by Director Schenk earlier, years ago we used to have an opportunity at the end of each meeting whereby each Board member could address his or her colleagues and the public with a comment. We held it at one minute, so it's not a long addition to our agenda, but we want to ensure that that's placed back on the agenda from now on. And it will be the last item in each Board meeting, and that will be for Director comments ,and we'll go right down to the dais and ask any -- ask members for anything that they'd like to make a statement on.

With that, ladies and gentlemen, that brings our agenda to a close, and we thank you all for being here.

And those of you in the public who joined us, thank you.

We will see everybody, or hopefully see everybody but certainly talk to people and listen to you, next month in

```
October.
 1
 2
               With that, ladies and gentlemen, the meeting is
    adjourned.
 3
          (The California High-Speed Rail Authority Board
 4
                        adjourned at 11:37 a.m.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 6th day of October, 2022.

MARTHA L. NELSON, CERT**367

Martha L. Nelson

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

MARTHA L. NELSON, CERT**367

October 6, 2022