

My name is Walter Strakosch and these are additional comments on the Draft EIS/EIR on the San Joaquin Valley (SJV) to Bay Area California HSR project that I previously submitted.

I029-1

At the last HSR meeting on September 26th I submitted a statement on the Program EIS/EIR in regard to the Bay Area/Valley preferred routing. In that statement I submitted what I felt were close to accurate cost figures via two routings: One via the Pacheco Pass (PP) (Table 7.2-12) and one via the Altamont Pass (AP) (Table 7.2-8), but I did not submit ridership figures the way I believe they should be.

I029-2

The annual ridership via the PP is shown as 93,300,000. This would be a direct routing from the SJV via the PP to San Jose and thence San Francisco via the Caltrain corridor alignment. The timing between LA and SF would be 2:38 minutes and LA and San Jose as 2:09 minutes. The running time for the SF to Sacramento routing (via the PP) would be 1:47 minutes, despite the fact that you would have to go almost halfway to LA to travel between these two points.

The annual ridership via the AP is shown as 90,700,000. This would be a routing from the SJV (near Stockton) thru the AP, over the Bay via a Dumbarton Bridge and then North to SF or South to SJ. The running time between LA and SF is shown as 2:36 minutes and LA and SJ as 2:19 minutes. The running time between SF and Sacramento is shown as 1:06 minutes.

The running time between SF and Sac. via the PP is shown as 1:47 minutes vs. 1:06 minutes via the AP. The distance (SAC/SF) via the PP is about 255 miles vs. 135 miles via the AP. The schedule in Table 4.3-1 allows only 41 additional minutes to travel that additional 120 miles (as well as the additional wear and tare on the equipment and the rails). This doesn't sound reasonable. In which case neither does the ridership figures. *It is folly to believe that most riders will travel halfway to LA to travel between Sac. and SF.*

If the more direct Sac. to SF routing via the AP is chosen it will also be, as well, a direct shot for passengers from Merced, Modesto and Stockton to travel to SF which is not possible via the PP. With the AP routing the market between SF and Sac. (now the 3rd largest in the State) can also be expected to expand as will the total ridership over

I029-3

the AP. Therefore the ridership figures as shown on Table S.5-1 that shows a lower ridership via the AP as opposed to the PP are not reasonable and I believe to be understated.

1029-3
Cont.

I also do not believe that ridership between LA and SJ would be damaged as the travel time (AP vs. PP) is only 10 minutes longer, but still very competitive with air and certainly not the end of the world for San Jose although the kids from San Jose act like it might be.

A saving of close to \$2,000,000,000 plus the added ridership from the northern SJV cities and Sacramento say that the AP routing is a wiser and more prudent choice. It just makes good sense.

1029-4

Walter Strakosch
415 388-6206

DEISHSR1.doc