

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|--|--------|---|
| | | | | helped fund that effort, and has identified the same area as a potential addition to the National Wildlife Refuge System. | | |
| | | | | <p>The proposed high-speed train system includes options for stations in Los Banos and Merced, which are located adjacent to the Grasslands. It also proposes a station in Gilroy, another fairly small, agriculturally-based community. However, the focus of the "Estimated Total Travel Times 'Door-to-Door' Between Cities", as indicated in the table on page 2 of the document, is on Los Angeles, San Francisco, Fresno, San Diego, San Jose, and Sacramento; there is no mention of these smaller communities. In fact, the focus of the entire Draft Program EIR/EIS is on these major cities and their transportation needs. Yet, the severe growth-inducing and environmental impacts of these three proposed stations are nearly ignored in this EIR/EIS – Los Banos is not even listed under "List of cities where libraries will have document available".</p> <p>If the proposed stations in these small communities are constructed, the small communities will bear the brunt of explosive growth due to the quick and easy commute to major metropolitan areas. Any such long-distance</p> | W087-6 | <p>The co-lead agencies respectfully disagree with the contention that small communities were overlooked in the Draft Program EIR/EIS. The potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of system alternatives, HST alignment options, and HST station options were explicitly analyzed and reported in the Draft Program EIR/EIS. In particular, the assessment of growth inducement and indirect impacts in Chapter 5 of the Draft Program EIR/EIS considered potential program-level impacts around every station, and the hectare grid scale of analysis for indirect impacts allowed a fine-scale review of conditions in small communities. The co-lead agencies acknowledge that in the presentation of background data items, greater attention was given to examples for California's larger cities. This attention is due to the fact that larger cities (Sacramento, San Francisco, San Diego) are the terminal points for the services or serve as a major transition point between alignment options (e.g. San</p> |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|---|--------|---|
| | | | | <p>transportation improvements result in explosive growth. This is clearly evident from recent history. When Pacheco Pass was widened from two lanes to four lanes in the late 1980's, the population of Los Banos jumped from 12,000 to nearly 30,000; there are now an estimated 5,000 people commuting daily to the San Jose area. Further widening Highway 152, as suggested in this document, would clearly aggravate this issue. In light of this near-tripling of the population of a small town due to a single transportation system improvement, the minimal population growth attributable to the high-speed train – as projected in this EIR/EIS does not appear to be valid.</p> <p>"Increased suburban sprawl" is identified as a negative environmental impact under Alternative 2, the "Modal Alternative". However, it is highly likely that the high-speed train system will have even greater negative impacts in this regard. "Some route alternatives diverging to avoid impacting communities" is mentioned in the EIR/EIS; yet, again, no mention of environmental and growth-inducing impacts to small towns. The table on page S-14 indicates that the Modal Alternative will encourage urban sprawl</p> | | <p>Jose, Los Angeles), and it therefore makes sense to report summary system statistics between these cities. This focus within Chapter 2 in no way affected the analysis methodologies for direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts, and the Draft Program EIR/EIS includes all relevant information for all system alternatives, alignment options and station options.</p> <p>The co-lead agencies concur with the commenter's contention that transportation access can be an important influence on growth patterns, although it is one of many influences. Travel demand model results that were used for the growth inducement analysis indicate that the accessibility barriers that exist between Northern Central Valley housing and Bay Area jobs is largely overcome with the highway improvements included in the No Project Alternative. Hence, as shown in Tables 5.3.1 and 5.3.2, the Northern Central Valley experiences population and employment growth from 2003 to 2035 that is two to three times higher than the Bay Area for all alternatives. These results mean that the Northern Central Valley is an attractive housing</p> |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|--|--------|--|
| | | | | <p>throughout the Central Valley, and the high-speed train only around Merced. This does not make sense – there will be urban sprawl anywhere there is a train station and there is room to grow. The EIR/EIS claims that the high-speed train will “result in denser development...on less land”. This would not be the case in these small communities. The table on page S-11 lists under Land Use that the train would result in “controlled growth around stations, urban in-fill; compatible with transit-first policies”. This model may fit for major metropolitan areas, but does not fit for small towns. Under Mitigation Strategies, there is discussion of sound walls, visual buffers/landscaping, etc. This is extremely narrowly-focused and misses the “big picture” negative effects. The study results cite “improved travel options in parts of the state with limited bus, rail and air transportation service”. However, it was not identified in the EIR/EIS that certain communities desire “improved travel options”. Under Section S.4.4. Areas of Controversy, the EIR/EIS states that “the Authority would take into account potential impacts on natural resources, cost, effects on travel time and ridership, and public and agency input”. However, social impacts and growth-</p> | | <p>location for Bay Area job seekers under all system alternatives, and the major differential effect of the HST Alternative is to shift housing location for a few long-distance commuters from San Joaquin and Sacramento Counties (under the No Project and Modal Alternatives) to Stanislaus and Merced Counties (under the HST Alternative). This net effect would be a housing shift within the San Joaquin Valley rather than a housing shift from the Bay Area to the Central Valley.</p> <p>The co-lead agencies would like to note that divergence of an HST route around some communities would not likely result in significant growth inducement nor related indirect impacts since it would be predominantly station location, rather than alignment location, which would influence transportation accessibility and result in related growth inducement potential. The influence of alternative station locations on growth inducement potential was assessed and summarized in Section 5.3.5 of the Draft Program EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The co-lead agencies believe that the summary Table S.6-1 accurately reflects the fact that the Modal</p> |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|--|--------|---|
| | | | | <p>inducing impacts to small towns and urban sprawl could very well be the most damaging negative impact of this high-speed train.</p> | | <p>Alternative increases accessibility, and therefore increases growth inducement potential, throughout the Central Valley. These summary conclusions are supported by analytic results that show that the urban footprint increases in all areas where the Modal Alternative provides increased highway capacity. The commenter is correct in noting that growth patterns for the HST Alternative will differ from the other system alternatives wherever an HST station exists. However, the analysis presented in the Draft Program EIR/EIS and the technical report on economic growth effects demonstrated that, under normal market forces, HST services would lead to a slight development densification in the immediate station area even in the absence of targeted land use and zoning regulations. Please see standard response 5.2.1 for further information related to development density assumptions for this analysis.</p> <p>Please see standard response 5.2.1 for issues related to measures to address potential for growth inducement and indirect impacts. Furthermore, the co-lead agencies recognize that growth can present</p> |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------|--|---|--------|--|
| | | | | | | challenges for small communities. However, the analysis results indicate that the HST Alternative would not lead to adverse indirect impacts from growth inducement at a program-level of analysis. Please see Section 6B of the Final Program EIR/EIS in regards to design principles for transit-oriented development around high-speed train stations. |
| W088 | 8/10/2004 | Robert Ringland | 12957 Caminito del Canto Del Mar, CA 92014-3756 | The EIR/EIS Brochure and Summary show a 20% improvement (HST over existing) in travel time between LA and SD by 2020 with ill-defined (but no electrification) improvements to the "LOSSAN corridor" (CalTrans responsibility) with which the high speed train (HST) system would connect either in LA or Orange County. And when the traveler gets to San Diego from LA (or vice versa) he/she still needs local transportation. With this small time advantage most people will still choose their car over the HST option unless maybe fuel costs go up by, say, an order of magnitude. And for this benefit Caltrans proposes to spend the kind of money required (and as yet not quantified) to tunnel under I-5 or Camino Del Mar. This doesn't seem to be a reasonable return on investment. | W088-1 | Please see standard response 6.42.1 and standard response 2.9.4. In addition, conventional freight services could not operate over the steeper gradients (up to 3.5%) needed to make HST tracks practicable along the I-15 corridor. Future project specific studies will address issues related to more specific impacts should the high-speed train proposal move forward. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|---|--------|----------|
| | | | | <p>The Summary contains two sentences pertaining to concerns in the San Diego area: "And concerns have been raised regarding potential impacts from double tracking (adding a second track adjacent to an existing track) sensitive coastal lagoons for non-electric service in San Diego County." (Page 9 under C. Impacts on Public Parks, Wildlife Areas, and Recreational Resources) and "In addition, there are concerns regarding the design options under Camino Del Mar or I-5 to bypass the Del Mar coastal bluffs" (Page 9 under D. Impacts on Coastal Communities). This reflects the study's relative neglect of issues in the southernmost part of the state and in particular, San Diego County's coastal communities.</p> <p>Map 12 shows LOSSAN improvements considered from Solana Beach to Mira Mesa to be 1) tunnel under Camino Del Mar and aerial through Penasquitos Lagoon, or 2) grade level through San Dieguito Lagoon and tunnel under I-5. Neither alternative is acceptable to locals because of visual and noise impacts (heavy and more frequent freights use the same tracks) not to forget wetland environmental degradation. There is no consideration of using I-5 from Carlsbad (Cannon</p> | | |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|--|--------|----------|
| | | | | <p>Road) to Mira Mesa (Carmel Mountain Road) or of an electrified continuation (not LOSSAN) of what is proposed for the rest of the state. Yet such a routing would better serve the local population while reducing the impact on coastal communities. Electrification would eliminate the need for transfers between HST and conventional (non-electric) trains.</p> <p>In the trade table we see that "relocation assistance during future project-level review" may be provided for people impacted by the routes ultimately chosen. Really? I doubt this applies in the event the Penasquitos Lagoon route is chosen. Elsewhere there are worries about impact on farmland 50 feet on either side of the tracks. What about urban areas? Presumably this is where the relocation assistance, noise barriers, etc. come in. The noise of heavy train traffic is significant well beyond 100 feet either side of the center of the right of way, particularly on elevated structures. Check it out on Carmel Valley Road just east of Camino Del Mar with existing rail traffic. "High visual contrast" is noted for the aerial sections. A great euphemism for "eyesore." This observer prefers the appearance of the old-style wooden trestles.</p> | | |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|---|--------|----------|
| | | | | <p>No attention appears to have been given to transition issues -- how we get from where we are today to the glorious future envisioned in this EIR/EIS. Leaving aside the disruption caused by construction, it would appear that we will be experiencing greatly increased freight traffic on the LOSSAN shared use corridor indefinitely, at least until an I-15 route becomes available for freight. And this will never be the case if the I-15 route is designed only for lighter weight passenger traffic envisioned in the study for the HST system.</p> <p>In particular, I would like to see a study of the alternative routing possibilities for increasing the freight carrying capacity between San Diego and Los Angeles; also the justification of need inasmuch as the freight trains this observer sees now on this route are largely empty. Then maybe one could evaluate the merits of joint (freight plus passenger) vs separate use (which might admit the possibility of alternate technologies to steel-wheel-on-steel-rail for passenger travel).</p> | | |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------------------------------------|---|---|--------|--------------------------------------|
| W089 | 8/10/2004 | John Bergmen, Farmer/ Banker | 4901 W. Modoc Ct Visalia, CA 93291 | I just want you to move forward with the project. Think of what is best for the people of this state and our country. Mother Nature has a way of equalizing inequities in the environment and I am a strong believer in a higher and greater power who is in charge of our destiny than the environmental issues that seem to stifle progress. Do not be discouraged in your work, keep the alignment where it serves the people who will use it. . . (i.e., the U.P.R.R. alignment). Let's let common sense overrule the few who would like to stop progress in the name of EIR's etc. Keep on chugging and Thanks for listening. John Bergman | W089-1 | Please see standard response 6.15.4. |
| W090 | 8/12/2004 | Juan Gallardo, Enlisted | 1443 N. Michael St Porterville, CA 93257 | I am a U.S. Marine assigned to Camp Pendleton CA. There are thousands of Marines from all over the central valley and cities north of Los Angeles stationed there as well. The current rail system provided by Amtrak makes it a nightmare to get to destinations like Fresno or Tulare county. There's a short train ride followed by a bus ride and another train ride, making the total commute time exceed 6 hrs at times. This new rail system would not only allow people such as myself to visit home more often but it would encourage more and more people stationed at San Diego are bases to | W090-1 | Acknowledged. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|--|--------|----------|
| | | | | <p>buy homes in places like Tulare County or Kern County. With a shortened commute and the prices of homes in the central valley it would make sense to do it. I think this is a great plan and you will find that many people are willing to back it.</p> | | |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|--|---|---|--------|--------------------------------------|
| W091 | 8/18/2004 | Lynn Wilson | 737 College Ave. Menlo Park, CA 94025 | <p>I hope you are considering MagLev, which is much cheaper to build and operate than light rail, carries its own electricity safely (no unightly overhead cables), is silent to operate, does not interfere with motorists (so no problems at rush hour), is much safer than rails (for passengers, pedestrians, and motorists) and is also safer from threat of terrorist attack. There are several systems in operation now, all over the world, and construction technology is very advanced; passengers and motorists love them, as do people who live near the guideways. It would be a shame to reject this better, safer, and cheaper technology.</p> <p>MgLev is a much better alternative thn light rail, reglar rail, or anything else available in the world.</p> | W091-1 | Please see standard response 2.10.3. |
| W092 | 8/18/2004 | Jim Reese, Assistant City Manager | City of Newark 37101 Newark Boulevard Newark, CA 94560 | <p>On behalf of the City of Newark, I would like to express strong opposition to the alignment referenced on page 1-8 of the EIR/EIS entitled "Hayward Branch through Niles Junction to the Mulford line. We feel that the rail should follow the right-ofway of I-880 between Oakland and San Jose.</p> <p>On behalf of the City of Newark, I would like to express our strong opposition to the alianment referenced</p> | W092-1 | Please see standard response 6.2.2. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|---|--------|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | on page 1.8 of the EIR/EIS entitled "Hayward Branch through Niles Junction to the Mulford Line. We feel that the rail should follow the right-of-way of I-880 between Oakland and San Jose. | | |
| W093 | 8/19/2004 | Lois Wright, Gov't & Community Affairs | 1150 Glen Aulin Ct. Carmichael, CA 95608 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS. ▪ The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA). ▪ An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits: ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness ▪ Less overall growth inducement in | W093-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|--|--------|----------|
| | | | | <p>wilderness and undeveloped areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Less impact on wetlands ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project. ▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento ▪ Cost savings of up to \$2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record. ▪ This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment. ▪ Thank you for your consideration of these comments. ▪ Sincerely, ▪ Lois Wright | | |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|--------|--------------------------------------|
| W094 | 8/19/2004 | Alan Gordon, Senate Consultant | 965 54th Street Sacramento, CA 95819 | <p>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).</p> <p>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness ▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas Less impact on wetlands ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project. ▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 ▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento | W094-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost savings of up to \$2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record. <p>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p> <p>Sincerely, Alan Gordon</p> | | |
| W095 | 8/19/2004 | James Israel | POB 162429 Sacramento, CA 95816 | <p>Mr. Joe Petrillo Chair California High Speed Rail Authority 925 L St., Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814</p> <p>Dear Mr. Petrillo:</p> <p>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended</p> | W095-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|---|--------|----------|
| | | | | <p>preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).</p> <p>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness ▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas ▪ Less impact on wetlands ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project. ▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 -Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento ▪ Cost savings of up to \$2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record. <p>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful</p> | | |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|---|--|--------|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>comparison to other alignment options for public comment.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p> <p>Sincerely, James Israel</p> | | |
| W096 | 8/19/2004 | Matthew Peak | 2181 East Foothill Blvd Pasadena, CA 91107 | <p>Mr. Joe Petrillo Chair California High Speed Rail Authority 925 L St., Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814</p> <p>Dear Mr. Petrillo:</p> <p>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).</p> <p>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:</p> | W096-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|---|--------|----------|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness ▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas ▪ Less impact on wetlands ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project. ▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 ▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento ▪ Cost savings of up to \$2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record. <p>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p> <p>Sincerely, Matt Peak</p> | | |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|-------------------------------|--|--|--------|--------------------------------------|
| W097 | 8/19/2004 | Paul Rosenberg, Writer/Editor | 800 Pacific Ave #403 Long Beach, CA 90813 | <p>Based on my own experience as a journalist covering EIS/EIR processes in the LA Harbor area, I am most concerned about the proper consideration of alternatives, which has the greatest possibility of substantially improving the both the overall ratio of benefits to costs, and the equitable distribution of costs and benefits, not just to existing groups and individuals, but to those who will have to live with our decisions in the future.</p> <p>Although I have lived in Southern California for some time, I was raised in Northern California, in Davis and Campbell, and still return frequently to visit my mother in San Jose. Trips to the Lick Observatory atop Mt. Hamilton were always a special treat for me as a child. I still recall counting 416 turns on the road to the top. I am thus quite familiar with the different possible alternative routes, and their potential impacts, as laid out specifically below. I would also personally be far more likely to use this transportation if it were aligned through Altamont pass.</p> <p>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay</p> | W097-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|---|--------|----------|
| | | | | <p>Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).</p> <p>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness ▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas, with all the resulting environmental impacts this entails ▪ Less impact on wetlands ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project. ▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 ▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento ▪ Cost savings of up to \$2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record. | | |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|--|---|--------|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment. | | |
| W098 | 8/19/2004 | Shirley Schmelzer, Ret. | MERG, Audubon 4512 Varain Rd. Mariposa, CA 95338 | No comment received. | | |
| W099 | 8/19/2004 | Therese Tuttle, Attorney | 318 Brook Way Modesto, CA 95354 | <p>Dear Mr. Petrillo:</p> <p>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).</p> <p>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park. the second largest state park | W099-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|---|--------|----------|
| | | | | <p>in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas ▪ Less impact on wetlands ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project. ▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 ▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento ▪ Cost savings of up to \$2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record. <p>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p> <p>Sincerely, Therese Tuttle</p> | | |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------------------------------------|--|---|--------|--------------------------------------|
| W100 | 8/19/2004 | Elizabeth Patterson, Vice Mayor | City Council of Benicia 1215 West Second Street Benicia, CA 94510 | <p>Mr. Joe Petrillo Chair California High Speed Rail Authority 925 L St., Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814</p> <p>Dear Mr. Petrillo:</p> <p>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.</p> <p>First, I would like to note that I am a regular train commuter and also use the trains (to the extent they are available) for travel, especially to Southern California. Secondly, I am an urban and regional planner. Thus my comments are based on personal and professional standards.</p> <p>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).</p> <p>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:</p> | W100-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|---|--------|----------|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness ▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas ▪ Less impact on wetlands ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project. ▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 ▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento ▪ Cost savings of up to \$2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record. <p>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p> | | |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|---|--|--------|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | Sincerely, Elizabeth Patterson, AICP Vice Mayor City of Benicia | | |
| W101 | 8/19/2004 | M. Beitscher | 2105 Yacht Daphne Newport Beach, CA 92660 | I urge the creation of high-speed rail between San Francisco, L.A. and San Diegosuch line should be designed to impact uninhabited areas at a minimum. | W101-1 | Acknowledged. |
| W102 | 8/19/2004 | April Vargas | P.O.Box 370265 Montara, CA 94037 | Dear Mr. Petrillo: This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS. The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA). An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness | W102-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|--|--------|----------|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas ▪ Less impact on wetlands ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project. ▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 ▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento ▪ Cost savings of up to \$2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record. <p>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p> <p>Sincerely, April Vargas</p> | | |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|-------------------------|---|--|--------|--------------------------------------|
| W103 | 8/19/2004 | Max Chaplin, retired | 26250 Rinconada Drive Carmel Valley, CA 93924 | This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment. | W103-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |
| W104 | 8/19/2004 | Kari Smith | 1971 Hopkins Berkeley, CA 94707 | <p>Mr. Joe Petrillo Chair California High Speed Rail Authority 925 L St., Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814</p> <p>Dear Mr. Petrillo:</p> <p>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).</p> <p>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:</p> | W104-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|---|--------|----------|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness ▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas ▪ Less impact on wetlands ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project. ▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 ▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento ▪ Cost savings of up to \$2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record. <p>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> | | |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------------|---|---|--------|--------------------------------------|
| W105 | 8/19/2004 | Dale Means | 3417 10th Ave. Sacramento, CA 95817 | <p>Mr. Joe Petrillo Chair California High Speed Rail Authority 925 L St., Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814</p> <p>Dear Mr. Petrillo:</p> <p>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).</p> <p>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness ▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas ▪ Less impact on wetlands | W105-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|---|--|--------|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project. ▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 ▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento ▪ Cost savings of up to \$2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record. <p>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dale Means</p> | | |
| W106 | 8/19/2004 | Lilly Okamura | 2467 Country Lane Santa Maria, CA 93455 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dear Mr. Petrillo: ▪ This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS. ▪ The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to | W106-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|---|--------|----------|
| | | | | <p>tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits: ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness ▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas ▪ Less impact on wetlands ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project. ▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 ▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento ▪ Cost savings of up to \$2 billion. | | |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|---------------------------|--|---|--------|--|
| | | | | <p>according to documents in the DEIR/S record.</p> <p>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.</p> | | |
| W107 | 8/19/2004 | James Salsman | ReadSay 1910 Mt. Vernon Ct. #3 Mountain View, CA 94040 | <p>Reduced reliance on automobiles will encourage the use of public transportation in urban areas. Can this effect be quantified by examining the behavior of existing rail users?</p> <p>It is essential to quantify the extent that reduced reliance on imported oil provides cost savings for national strategic defence. I ask the Authority to estimate California's portion of national cost savings for oil-related defense expenditures, based on (1) the number of barrels of oil saved, (2) the total demand expected, (3) California's portion of the national tax burden, and (4) DoD estimates of annual expenditures associated with U.S. strategic oil interests. Neglecting to consider this quantity would be irresponsible.</p> | W107-1 | The number of barrels of oil saved (4.8 to 5.3 million fewer barrels of oil as compared to the No Project Alternative annually by the year 2020) and the total demand expected is presented in the Program EIR/EIS in Section 3.5. Although reduced oil consumption can be projected, it is beyond the scope of this EIR/EIS to predict how any related cost savings may be applied, the impacts on California's portion of the national tax burden and the impacts DoD estimates of annual expenditures associated with the U.S. strategic oil interests. |
| W108 | 8/19/2004 | Gary Patton, Executive | LandWatch Monterey County Box 1876 | Post Office Box 1876, Salinas, CA 93902 Website: www.landwatch.org | W108-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|----------|-------------------|---|--------|----------|
| | | Director | Salinas, CA 93902 | <p>August 19, 2004</p> <p>Mr. Joe Petrillo, Chair California High Speed Rail Authority 925 L St., Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814</p> <p>Dear Mr. Petrillo:</p> <p>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The DEIR/S is flawed, among other reasons, because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).</p> <p>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness ▪ Less overall growth inducement in | | |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|--|--------|----------|
| | | | | <p>wilderness and undeveloped areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Less impact on wetlands ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project. ▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 ▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento ▪ Cost savings of up to \$2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record. <p>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.</p> <p>In addition, there is not an adequate analysis of the terrific growth inducing impacts that the proposed project could have throughout the Central Valley and all along the route.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p> | | |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------------------|---|--------|--------------------------------------|
| W109 | 8/19/2004 | Darlene Berry | PO Boz 4815 Carmel, CA 93921 | <p>Mr. Joe Petrillo Chair California High Speed Rail Authority 925 L St., Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814</p> <p>Dear Mr. Petrillo:</p> <p>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).</p> <p>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness ▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas ▪ Less impact on wetlands | W109-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--------|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project. ▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 ▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento ▪ Cost savings of up to \$2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record. <p>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p> <p>Sincerely, Darlene M. Berry</p> | | |
| W110 | 8/19/2004 | Stephen Wathen, Research | 611 Lessley Pl. Davis, CA 95616 | <p>Please excuse me, but there is no excuse for not building more rapid transit paralleling our current transportation system.</p> <p>Please see the new film The End of Suburbia, available for sale on the web http://eos.postcarbon.org, to</p> | W110-1 | Acknowledged. While it is an objective of the Authority to “maximize the use of existing transportation corridors and rights-of-way, to the extent feasible” the Authority believes there may be some areas where alignment |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|--|--|--------|--|
| | | | | understand how drastically we need to build alternatives reduce energy use before our oil and natural gas reserves are gone. More information can be found at http://eos.globalpublicmedia.com . Thank you for doing this. | | constraints necessitate use of a new alignment in order to have a feasible and practicable HST system. |
| W111 | 8/19/2004 | John Schick, Attorney | San Joaquin Audubon 343 E. Main Street #901 Stockton, CA 95202-2990 | Mr. Petrillo, I am thrilled that the concept of high speed rail is being considered for the connection between the central valley and the Bay area. I am disappointed that the areas being considered are those where there is a great concentration of state parks, natural areas and good birding spots. Our Audubon group regularly uses the Pacheco pass area and the parks in that area are an asset of the state. I urge you to consider using an Altamont Pass route. This area is better suited for a rail, would not involve the extra work the tunneling in the Pacheco /Mt. Hamilton area would. I look forward to hearing that a high speed rail that does not seriously iimpact wildlife and state parks is on the drawing board. Thank you for listening to my concerns. John Schick | W111-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|--|--|--------|--------------------------------------|
| W112 | 8/19/2004 | Dana Michaels | 7356 Marani Way Sacramento, CA 95831 | <p>Mr. Joe Petrillo Chair California High Speed Rail Authority 925 L St., Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814</p> <p>Dear Mr. Petrillo:</p> <p>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The DEIR/S is flawed, because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas, to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA). It just makes more sense!</p> <p>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness ▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas ▪ Less impact on wetlands | W112-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|------|---------|---|--------|----------|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project. ▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/-680 ▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento ▪ Cost savings of up to \$2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record (and anyone with the common sense to compare the two proposals!). <p>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.</p> <p>I can't understand why it's taken so many ballot initiatives, bond sales, and studies to get a high-speed rail system in California. The idea has been around for decades, and it doesn't take a genius to realize that we need one. Stop the delaying tactics, and sneaky ways of funneling money into campaign contributors' pockets, and JUST DO IT!</p> | | |

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|--|--|--------|--|
| | | | | Thank you for your consideration of these comments. Sincerely, Dana Michaels Native Californian, sick of seeing my State wrecked by overpopulation! | | |
| W113 | 8/19/2004 | Ron Kilcoyne | 24001 Cape May Court Santa Clarita, CA 91355 | The High Speed Rail Program must not be sprawl inducing. It must support in-fill and intensification of existing urban areas. The stations should be located in existing urban areas to encourage in-fill development and not encourage sprawl. The alignments chosen should allow for minimal locating of station in greenfield areas. Stations should only be located where dense mixed use development exists or is zoned to be built. | W113-1 | Please see standard response 2.1.12. |
| | | | | The alignment should not zig zag to serve every community that seeks service. | W113-2 | Please see standard response 6.23.1. |
| | | | | The I-5 alignment should be built between LA and Bakersfield and Merced must be served direct because of UC Merced. | W113-3 | Please see standard response 6.23.1. Please see standard response 6.19.1. |