

To: California High Speed Rail Authority
From: Dana Dillworth
September 9, 2020
RE: DEIR San Francisco to San Jose Project Section

I am a resident of Brisbane, having reviewed records in the Schlage Lock to Kinder Morgan, Bayshore Childcare/Midway Village to San Francisco's unregulated dump and toxic issues since the state endangerment orders of the 1980's. Initially we were part of a network of Bay Area residents affected by toxic contaminants in our soil, water, and air, both at home and work. I'm the founder of Brisbane Baylands Community Advisory Group where we have viewed and commented on remediation efforts from fuel spills at Kinder Morgan Tank Farm and three or four phases of TCE cleanup on the SF Schlage Lock site. I think it is interesting that no member of our group was considered in your stakeholder meetings. My recommendation is the no-project alternative (back to the drawing tables) or a modified "A."

It was March 2006 Mr. Lenny Siegel of Center for Public Environmental Oversight (www.cpeo.org) and I reported active Bunker C oil leaks on the former rail yard which required the interim drainage measure. I also reported the negative tide leachate seeps along Visitation Creek and the lagoon to the Regional Water Board which resulted in the interim hydrostatic leachate pumping program. In both cases, in spite of numerous biological assays, no consultant had been present to observe these special conditions.

There are a few matters that I would like to draw your attention to which seem to be ignored or unknown to the consultants. I will speak about the groundwater and Brisbane's Open Space Plan.

The hydrological dynamics of this 600+ acre mounds of rubble, shipyard and medical wastes, and chemical dumps from 1906 to present, called the Baylands, has demonstrated that anyone who interrupts the underground water flow to the Bay, has problems with slumping if it is pumped and mounding if it's contained. How and where you anchor your building in this fluid waste heap is important. My recommendation is for placing the LMF on solid ground, no fill, no toxic fill in particular.

The concern for placing your 100+ acre operation, needing an industrial designation, means that parts of the Baylands will not be cleaned up to a standard that protects public or environmental health. We would hate for future HSR employees to have illnesses associated with a solvent UST sump in their basement, (below slab,) like the workers of Pacific Litho or miscarriages due to VOC contact and inhalation of that "mysterious odor at low tide" or at night.

You must be aware that the Baylands fill matrix is high in chlorine, representing Bay saltwater intrusion. Metals used in supports will decay. Wells at Kinder Morgan show tidal influence (compare the tide charts to the study) and areas of the Baylands are known to flood, or exceed groundwater height. During future harsh storm events, you don't want your employees trapped because they can't get to their cars or wonder what they are breathing because some sump pump didn't operate.

Are there NO other places from Morgan Hill to downtown San Francisco that are solid land, not fill subject to liquefaction, to place the maintenance yard? Maybe smaller train storage areas all along the peninsula corridor and multiple smaller maintenance sheds along the way? Why is Brisbane getting the full brunt of this operation?

I concur with many of the environmental reasons to not take down Ice House Hill, thus rejecting Alternative "B." It speaks of people that only look at the map as square inches, not beloved

features and an environmental opportunity to connect the mountain habitat to the bay. I don't think you understand the importance of Ice House Hill in protecting citizens from a potential blast if there were to be an accident at the tank farm. In addition to noise and vibration concerns by other residents, Ice House Hill buffers westerly winds. Hurricane-force winds are known to ignite fuel tank farms (Galveston, Texas.) It is best to leave this natural feature in place or include the cost of moving the tank farm in your summary. The tank farm and LMF are not compatible uses.

Have you looked at what impact removal of the hill would have on the integrity of Bayshore Boulevard? The west side of the tunnel going into Crocker Park shows Bayshore to be fractured and crumbling. Along with changing the entry to our town and relocation of our fire station you are STEALING our Open Space— what other community is being asked to accept such impacts?

I cannot imagine Kinder Morgan wanting faster-moving metal-to-metal sparks near their operations, nor the greater chance of derailment because of increased speeds. They would also not like the potential for accidents during demolition of the hill. Does it make any difference to HSR that Kinder Morgan only has one retardant foam pumper truck it shares between their Brisbane and San Jose operations? Alternative "B" is not a good idea.

Which brings up my "modified Alternative "A" idea... Straighten out the rails at Sierra Point, (whose entrance needs to be made legal anyway), hug 101 on the east side of the Lagoon and place the LMF in the Beatty, Heavy Industrial Subarea, in the north east area. Both Recology and HSR would have to modify their plans, but taking the rails out to 101 would reduce the vibration and noise FOR THE ENTIRE TOWN OF BRISBANE the full length of the lagoon. The un-used rail on the west side of the lagoon could become a Public walkway or a more natural shore. We already experience amplified noise due to our bowl-like shape. Moving the rails east could be a "win-win" because Recology plans cogeneration facilities too. They may either share or reduce the number of garbage burners needed rather than add to an already unacceptable level (overriding considerations) of density in a polluted environment. With all the soil out there, we have the chance of creating berms to shield from noise and light-pollution. Some mitigations can happen in the final design.

Do the consultants know where the current toxic waste burners are on the Baylands? Does that knowledge effect their sighting choice? I cannot imagine working in the "B" location. When Kinder Morgan's excess gas burner flares (usually at night) what a sight! Workers will be dazzled and wonder whether the soot encrusting their cars has anything to do with their job. You might be liable for the vehicle finishes as the airport did for the postal workers whose cars got covered with excess dumped jet fuel.

There's a burner on the north end of the Baylands for the accumulated toxic gases coming off the old dump. The dump's interim methane system needs to be upgraded, so the solution to combine all three "problems" (rail, waste, and closure of the dump) can come in one package. The soils on the Beatty end have had more years to off-gas and become compacted from use. Anything further south, you have concerns for radioactive materials (never fully studied) and younger fill needing more time to off-gas, greater settling issues.

Ask Universal Paragon for the methane charts that Barbara Ebel showed in one council meeting. They showed the concentrations of methane coming off the landfill internally as well as the perimeter. While the snake-oil salesmen will tell you to pick any place for your LMF, as long as it's not housing or commercially designated... please do your research, as the "safe" spots are few and not interchangeable.

In closing, I ask that you review Brisbane's Open Space Plan. You claim to have looked at regional plans, but not local plans. Please understand that as a community we want the cleanup mitigations to serve wildlife too, to make up for past environmental omissions. We have a program that allows greater than 1:1 mitigations, particularly for wetlands. We have the concept of a Wetlands River Park that maintains a connection of the tidally influenced wetlands WEST of Bayshore (at Main) and the watershed of Visitacion Valley to the Bay. Citizens have observed migratory fish at the Roundhouse, so know restoration of this connection will bring species we didn't know are part of our environment. The community chosen wetlands concept would daylight the "wooden" channel creek and widen, open up several detention ponds as it moves through the grade. It is our "Mountain-to-the-Bay" habitat corridor.

No matter where you place your facilities, we would request that you maintain or improve that habitat corridor with animal over- and/or under-crossings and not a fully fenced-in barrier or underground drainage system. Our community dream is to have a Rail museum as well, to PRESERVE the Roundhouse and connect with other educational opportunities associated with the Baylands, (remediation kiosks.). If you partner with us on the rail museum effort, we might not complain so loudly. The two don't have to be physically connected.

As an educator I could imagine the Baylands being a field trip for all ages. Tour Recology, be humbled about our wastefulness and travel to an energy producing zone (please include solar in your design,) and then visit the rail museum, the native plant nursery, lunch at the lagoon playground, etc.

If you want to locate in Brisbane, please be respectful. Contribute to the restoration of OUR National Trust asset, the Roundhouse (you have the State cred to make it happen.) Tread lightly... as some times things look good on paper-- but are disasters in reality. You have presented us with the latter.

We deserve better and hope you further reduce the impacts that you so cavalierly list. We would like to know where you live so we can share some ear-splitting squeally- wheely noise and bring a soil compactor to create vibrations in your neighborhood. If it were your neighborhood, you'd design and think differently... like rubber bumpers, or sails to break up sound, something.

From a Public Trust perspective, the Bay was filled for transportation uses, for the connection of communities' commerce. A train/transportation system is still a legitimate, highly responsive use on our filled former Bay. The place where the conflict begins is the landowner/State's adding housing to the mix which was never this land's purpose and short-sighted in my opinion. When the land was available in the 1980's, you should have grabbed it. Regardless, the cleanup is the responsibility of Universal Paragon and should not factor into your choices. Amazing how responsibilities get shifted when the Public isn't present in your stakeholder meetings. We warned the city that the new housing use will increase cost to HSR. Don't let that happen, place HSR where the industrial use is allowed.... The "Swing-wide Modified "A" alternative.

Thank you, if you need any additional information or clarifications, you may contact me at 415-468-8587.

This image is of the Baylands in 1995 when it supported vast populations of wildlife and migratory birds and were the rare and endangered Unarmored Three-spine Stickleback fish were found. Universal Paragon has dozed and altered the land continuously to remove the wetland features. Rail Yards are known to harbor a lot of wildlife in the fringes, Brisbane Baylands was no exception. You can also review the arial maps of the 1982 floods. Because you are proposing to remove our open space, you should consider the Wetlands River Park as a mitigation measure. I hereby incorporate by reference the 1994 Brisbane General Plan, the Brisbane Open Space Plan, and citizens' comments on the Baylands (minus Kinder Morgan) DEIR.

