

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W114	8/19/2004	Gary Danielson, Land Use Consultant	Sierra Land Use Group P.O. Box 1849 Jamestown, CA 95327-1849	<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 ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times 	W114-1	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"> ▪ 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, GARY W. DANIELSON, Executive Director SIERRA LAND USE GROUP, UNA/NGO</p>		
W115	8/19/2004	Wendell Anderson, Retired	200 Estates Dr. Apt. A Roseville, CA 95678-2342	Cost-benefit analysis vs negative impact	W115-1	A cost-benefit analysis is beyond the scope of this program EIR/EIS process. However, a cost-benefit analysis was included as part of the Authority’s Business Plan (June 2000) and is available on the Authority’s website.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W116	8/19/2004	Christina Wong	5130 S Land Park Sacramento, CA 95822	No comment received.		
W117	8/19/2004	Alan Craig, Wildlife Biologist	PO Box 16361 Portal, AZ 85632	<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>Is the California High Speed Rail Authority going to do a new EIS/EIR giving full consideration to the Altamont Pass alternative alignment? I strongly urge you to do so!</p> <p>Although I am living temporarily in Arizona, I lived in California for 42+ years, I graduated from U.C. Berkeley, and I visit family in Sacramento, Davis and the Bay Area as often as possible.</p> <p>The Altamont Pass alignment seems much more logical from the standpoint of cost to taxpayers and its potential to relieve traffic congestion.</p> <p>Many thanks for considering my comments, and for your work on this critically important project.</p> <p>Best regards, Alan Craig</p>	W117-1	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
W118	8/19/2004	Casey Coates Danson, Env Designer/ Activist,	Global Possibilities 1955 Mandeville Canyon Rd. Los Angeles, CA 90049	No comment received.	W118-1	
W119	8/19/2004	Edh Stanley	Box 247042 S'o, CA 95824	Consider, too, that the Altamont Pass route will decrease highway traffic on I-205.	W119-1	Please see standard response 2.18.1.
W120	8/19/2004	Edh Stanley	Box 247042 S'o, CA 95824	<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>	W120-1	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>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 ▪ Traffic congestion on I-205 and I-5 ▪ 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>		

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, Edh Stanley		
W121	8/19/2004	Pete Holloran, student at UC Santa Cruz	350 Oxford Way Santa Cruz, CA 95060	<p>The DEIR/S is flawed because it neglects to consider 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.</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 ▪ 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>	W121-1	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
				Thank you for your consideration.		
W122	8/19/2004	Mark Newhouser	4277 Wake Robin Dr. Glen Ellen, CA 95442	Gen: High speed rail is fine if developed to improve air quality and decrease automobile use and oil consumption. However, it should not be developed where it will cause environmental degradation or spawn real estate speculation in previously uninhabited areas. Controls must be put in place to prevent the birth of new towns along new corridors, especially in environmentally sensitive areas.	W122-1	Please see standard response 2.1.12.
W123	8/19/2004	Howard Kastan, Retired	3085 Twin Oaks Road Cameron Park, CA 95682	No comment received.		
W124	8/19/2004	Jeffery Garcia	PO Box 1166 Mendocino, CA 95460	Mr. Joe Petrillo Chair, California High Speed Rail Authority 925 L St., Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814 Dear Mr. Petrillo: 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	W124-1	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>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 comparison to other alignment options</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				for public comment. Sincerely, Jeffery Garcia		
W125	8/19/2004	Clayton Mansfield	217 15th Ave. #4 San Francisco, CA 94118	<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 	W125-1	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>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, Clayton Mansfield</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W126	8/20/2004	Scott Plambaek, Associate Planner	City of Morgan Hill 17555 Peak Ave Morgan Hill, CA 95037	<p>The City of Morgan Hill would like to provide comments on the High-Speed Train Draft Program EIR/EIS in relation to the potential impacts to the City of Morgan Hill.</p> <p>The City requests the Authority further study the following potential impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Right-of-Way acquisition. According the Draft EIR, the HST will require 5'-70' of additional right-of-way acquisition along the CalTrain corridor. The Draft EIR does not discuss the location of the right-of-way acquisition or the impact the acquisitions would have on adjacent land uses. The Draft EIR states that the Monterey Highway corridor north of Cochrane would need to be realigned to the east and reconstructed. The Authority needs to further study the impact the right-of-way acquisition will have on adjacent land uses. 	W126-1	The location of right-of-way acquisition and the impacts of acquisitions are beyond the scope of this program EIR/EIS process, but would be studied in future project-level documents. The potential impacts of proposed right-of-way acquisition on adjacent land uses would be determined in future project specific studies should the HST project move forward.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct Tunnel Routes. The City opposes all routes that go through or impact Henry Coe State Park. 	W126-2	Please see standard response 6.3.1.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise. As describe in the Draft EIR additional trains on the tracks will cause more noise. Further, if sections of the HST right-of-way are elevated. the noise impact will 	W126-3	A more detailed study of potential noise impacts from the proposed HST system on the City of Morgan Hill is beyond the scope of this program EIR/EIS process. but would

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				be greater than grade level right-of-way. A noise study detailing the impacts the HST will have on the City should be conducted if the Pacheco Route is chosen.		be included in future project specific studies should the HST project move forward.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Downtown HST station. The Draft EIR states that a downtown station would be a two or three story aerial structure. Although the City's General Plan encourages transit stops in the downtown an aerial structure would have significant impacts to the downtown. Impacts included visual, traffic, parking, growth inducing impacts, and impacts to adjacent land use. If a station is built in the downtown, additional environmental study will need to be completed for the downtown station. 	W126-4	Additional project specific studies and environmental documentation would be required before a HST station could be constructed in Southern Santa Clara County.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visual/Aesthetic. If sections of the HST is elevated there is potential for visual/aesthetic impacts throughout the City. If the Pacheco route is chosen, these impacts need to be studied further. Historic/Cultural Resources. The existing CalTrain right-of-way is adjacent to existing and potential significant historical and cultural sites. The realignment of Monterey Highway has a high probability to 	W126-5	Please see standard response 6.3.1. Should the HST proposal move forward, the Authority and the FRA will continue to work with the City of Morgan Hills as part of future, more detailed studies.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>impact potential and existing cultural sites in the Madrone area of Morgan Hill. The Madrone area is a historic area of the City bound by the CalTrain right-of-way to the west, Highway 101 to the east, Cochrane Road to the south, and the City Limits to the north.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In addition, the realignment of Monterey Highway will impact the historic Walnut Trees along Monterey Road, which Santa Clara County has listed in their historic inventory. If the Pacheco route is chosen, the potential impact to historic and cultural resources will need to be further studied. ▪ Biological/Natural Resources. The City of Morgan Hill has a burrowing owl mitigation plan. The purpose of the plan is to protect existing owls and mitigate the lost of habitat. The City’s burrowing owl mitigation applies to projects on lands that are below 600 feet elevation above sea level that support any grassland and/or mixed herbaceous vegetation upon which an activity is proposed that defined as a “project” by CEQA and is not statutorily or categorically exempt. Depending on the location of the future HST right-of-way 		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>acquisition, there could be a taking of burrowing owl habitat, thus triggering the mitigation listed in the mitigation plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Significant trees are protected and defined in section 12.32 of the Morgan Hill Municipal Code. The future HST right-of-way may impact significant trees. Once the alignment is chosen, the impact to trees will need be further studied. <p>If you have any questions, please feel free to contact, Scott Plambaek, Associate Planner with the City's Community Development Department at (408) 779-7247 or scottpl@morgan-hill.ca.gov.</p> <p>Please add the City to your mailing list for future information.</p> <p>Sincerely, James B. Rowe Interim Community Development Director</p>		
W127	8/20/2004	Dennis Jackman	504 Laurel Avenue Modesto, CA 95351	High Speed Rail in California can be an improvement for transportation and agricultural needs. The paradox of ease of access versus the need to protect the most productive agricultural area the world has ever known is before us. A transfer of travelers from private automobiles on existing	W127-1	Acknowledged. The development of a document or policies that seek to prevent the elimination of productive farmland from urban development throughout the Central Valley of California is beyond the scope of this document. The authority has adopted objectives for the system to

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>freeways to a rail mass transit system will improve capacity for the movement of goods from the Great Central Valley to world markets. The ease of access to more affordable land may result in the reduction or elimination of significant farmland acreage near rail terminals and could result in a loss of economies of scale for production agriculture in local arenas.</p> <p>At present no document or policies exist that prevent the elimination of productive farmland from urban development throughout the Central Valley of California. The productive ability of land and the value of the products it can produce is not factored in the determination of change of use of the land. Local land use policies are subject only to short term criteria based on general plans that can and have historically urbanized at the direction of urban developers. Long term society desires need to be established and the value of those choices granted to the property owner. Until it is determined where we are not going to build the tentative condition of productive agriculture will not provide a food security that is critical to our national security.</p>		<p>maximize the use of existing transportation corridors and rights-of-way (to the extent possible) in order to reduce impacts to agricultural lands and natural resources, to locate stations in developed areas in order to connect with local transit and airports, and to be sensitive and protective of California’s unique natural resources. If the HST proposal should move forward, further analysis as part of future project level studies would be needed to further define agriculture design practices and to determine appropriate mitigation measures from specific segments of the proposed system. Please refer to Section 6B of the Final Program EIR/EIS in regards to design principles for transit-oriented development around HST stations.</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				Location of HSR terminals in downtowns and the use of existing rail corridors could minimize negative growth-induced impacts.	W127-2	Please see standard response 2.1.12. The BNSF rail corridor has been identified as the preferred alignment between Bakersfield and Stockton, and the UP rail corridor between Stockton and Sacramento. However, some segments of new alignments are necessary to maintain high-speed operations throughout the Central Valley. In the Central Valley, downtown stations have been recommended at Sacramento, Stockton, Fresno, and Bakersfield. The Modesto Amtrak station site, and Castle Air Force Base to serve Merced have also been selected as preferred HST station locations and are multi-modal transportation hubs. Please also see standard responses 6.12.1 and standard response 6.15.4.
W128	8/20/2004	Martin Engel, Ret.	PF III HOA 1621 Stone Pine Lane Menlo Park, CA 94025	20 August 2004 CHSR Program Draft EIR/EIS Gentlemen: My wife and I object, in the strongest terms, to the contents of the CHSRA DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT. The document fails on the grounds of	W128-1	The Authority and the FRA respectfully disagree with your assessment.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>full disclosure.</p> <p>It enters economic domains (train ridership, profitability, development and construction costs, etc.) that are beyond its jurisdiction.</p>		
				<p>In rejecting the Altamont alternative, it accepts inappropriate political decisions beyond its jurisdiction.</p>	W128-2	Please see standard response 2.18.1.
				<p>It fails to address ALL the significant implications for and consequences of HRS on the Peninsula from SF to SJ. These include environmental factors such as private property acquisition and imposed easements, right-of-way expansion, aesthetics, noise pollution, residential quality impact, tree loss, and protracted construction.</p>	W128-3	<p>Determining private property acquisition and imposed easements, tree loss, etc. is beyond the scope of this program level EIR/EIS process. If the HST proposal moves forward, more detailed project-specific analysis will be required. The design option for the proposed HST service along the Caltrain corridor considered in the Program EIR/EIS assumes and integrates infrastructure that would be fully grade-separated and electrified, and would increase trackage on the right-of-way (4 tracks between San Jose and San Francisco).</p>
				<p>It fails to assess the environmental/ecological impact of ALL alternative routes.</p> <p>It is an advocacy, promotional document reflecting the interests of the HSRA and its interests at the expense</p>	W128-4	Please see response to Comment W128-1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				of both urban and rural consequences throughout California, and totally fails on grounds of objectivity and neutrality.		
				It perpetuates the arbitrary and distorting separation of three environmental rail issues that need to be integrated to acknowledge their interaction and interdependence: Grade separations along the Peninsula and other urban areas. Electrification The overlay of rail multiplication (additional trackage) on the CALTRAIN/JPB right-of-way.	W128-5	Chapter 2 of the Draft Program EIR/EIS clearly described the HST Alternative and alignment option for the Caltrain corridor as being fully grade separated, electrified, and requiring additional tracks on the Caltrain corridor (pages 2-28, 2-51, & 2-52).
				It does not consider other alternative routes; for example, a route to Fremont/Sacramento with trunk lines south to San Jose and north, cross-bay, to San Francisco, and therefore without extending the highly damaging route through the totally urbanized Peninsula.	W128-6	Please see standard response 2.36.1. Available studies indicate that use of the Bay Bridge, or a new Transbay Tube would not be feasible or practicable options for the proposed HST service. Please see the findings of the following MTC studies, which provide substantial evidence to support this conclusion: Structural Assessment of Rail on the Bay Bridge, October 22, 1999; MTC Bay Bridge Feasibility Study, July 2000; and San Francisco Bay Crossings Study, July 2002. However, please also see standard response 6.2.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>On these, and numerous other grounds, we condemn and reject this DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.</p> <p>Respectfully, Martin and Judith Engel</p>	W128-7	Acknowledged.
W129	8/20/2004	Maureen Hill, Urban Planning Consultant	18813 Aspesi Drive Saratoga, CA 95070	<p>Please provide careful and thoughtful analysis for an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to the Pacheco Pass/Mount Hamilton alignment. The Altamont Pass, is within a high traffic corridor of the San Francisco Bay area and already serves as a connection to the Bay Area from the Central Valley and Sacramento. Fewer natural resources could be effected by this alignment and there is a potential for fewer growth inducing impacts to the area.</p> <p>The Altamont Pass alignment is a logical consideration, the Draft EIS/Eir is a flawed document without a thorough comparative analysis of this alignment with the preferred alignment and other project alternatives.</p> <p>Maureen Hill, Principal Owens Hill Consulting 18813 Aspesi Drive Saratoga, CA 95070</p>	W129-1	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
W130	8/20/2004	Martin Engel	1621 Stone Pine Lane Menlo Park, CA 94025	<p>20 August 2004 CHSR Program Draft EIR/EIS</p> <p>Ladies and Gentlemen:</p> <p>My wife and I object, in the strongest terms, to the contents of the CHSRA DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.</p> <p>The document fails on the grounds of full disclosure.</p> <p>It enters economic domains (train ridership, profitability, development and construction costs, etc.) that are beyond its jurisdiction, which is, ostensibly, Environment.</p> <p>In rejecting the Altamont alternative, it accepts inappropriate political decisions beyond its jurisdiction.</p> <p>It fails to address ALL the significant environmental implications for and consequences of HRS on the Peninsula from SF to SJ. These include environmental factors such as private property acquisition and imposed easements, right-of-way expansion, aesthetics, noise pollution, residential quality impact, tree loss, and protracted construction.</p> <p>It fails to assess the environmental/ecological impact of ALL alternative routes.</p>		Repeated comments from W128. Please see responses for Comment Letter W128.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>It is an advocacy, promotional, marketing document reflecting the interests of the HSRA at the expense of both the urban and rural consequences throughout California, and totally fails on grounds of objectivity and neutrality.</p> <p>It perpetuates the arbitrary and distorting separation of three environmental rail issues that need to be integrated to acknowledge their interaction and interdependence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grade separations along the Peninsula and other urban areas. ▪ Electrification ▪ The overlay of rail multiplication (additional trackage) on the CALTRAIN/JPB right-of-way. <p>It does not consider other alternative routes; for example, a route to Fremont/Sacramento with trunk lines south to San Jose and north, cross-bay, to San Francisco, and therefore without extending the highly damaging route through the totally urbanized Peninsula.</p> <p>It does not consider and assess the option of terminating the Bay Area "west leg" of the HSR at San Jose, which is connected to San Francisco by the Baby Bullet trains; i.e., an already existing local high-speed rail</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>connection.</p> <p>In other words, it supports the Bay Area Peninsula JPB/CALTRAIN agenda for reckless rail right-of-way expansion down the Peninsula, regardless of the destructive consequences to residential communities through which it passes.</p> <p>This document promotes pork-barrel politics at its most egregious. On these, and numerous other grounds, we condemn and reject this DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.</p> <p>Respectfully, Martin and Judith Engel</p>		
W131	8/20/2004	Steve Boland	970 Geary San Francisco, CA 94109	just wanted to put on record my strong preference for an altamont alignment.	W131-1	Please see standard response 2.18.1.
W132	8/20/2004	Rajesh Krishnan	155 Gifford Ave., Apt. 1 San Jose, CA 95110	Consider Altamont. Bias towards the fastest routes. Learn from the Baby Bullet good story up in the Bay Area.	W132-1	Please see standard response 2.18.1.
				Keep the total travel time end to end below 2.25 hours by reducing stations. Don't turn this into a white elephant like San Jose VTA. Short travel time is the best way to ensure happy riders.	W132-2	The Authority agrees that it is critical to keep the end-to-end travel times between major markets as quick as possible and this is reflected in the performance objectives for the proposed HST system. The system is being designed so that intermediate stations would not impact the speeds of express service

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
						operations. The HST system could have a variety of levels of service, including non-stop trains between end points. Please also see standard response 2.31.4.
W133	8/20/2004	Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League 8424-A Santa Monica Blvd, #592 Los Angeles, CA 90069	<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 	W133-1	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>residents in Phase I of the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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>		
W134	8/20/2004	Bob Whitney, Conservation & Economic Planner	Golden State Land Conservancy 23801 Iris Terrace Willits, CA 95490	<p>An Altamont Pass alignment must be considered as an alternative. Tunneling through Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas is far more damaging to the conservation values of the region; as well as more expensive.</p> <p>The Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission. An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor. with the following</p>	W134-1	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>benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park ▪ 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. 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. 		
W135	8/21/2004	Linda Cain	1438 Everett St. El Cerrito, CA 94530	<p>I would like to express support for the development of High Speed Rail in heavily traveled urban and suburban areas of our state.</p> <p>As traffic gets worse and worse every</p>	W135-1	Acknowledged.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				year, driving has become a nightmare in areas like mine (the I-80 corridor from San Pablo to Berkeley). The rush hour lasts for up to 3 hours going into and leaving San Francisco. It frequently take over an hour to go 15 miles - even on the weekend! And the pollution from cars is very bad for our health. I am a regular BART rider so I am putting my money where my mouth is! I strongly support the development of High Speed Rail wherever feasible to give more commuters a viable alternative to driving (and polluting) on the roads and freeways.		
W136	8/22/2004	David Ewert	1785 Crestwood Cir Stockton, CA 95210	We need to set an example with the high-speed rail in California. Not only are we sadly behind the rest of the industrialized world as far as public transportation, we need to demonstrate that we will begin the transition from fossil fuel to electric power (or other types of energies). I vote a resounding 'Yeah' for the proposed high-speed rail system in California - the sooner the better. David Ewert	W136-1	Acknowledged.
W137	8/22/2004	Don Wood, Energy Programs Advisor	Pacific Energy Policy Center 4539 Lee Avenue La Mesa, CA 91941	Mr. Joe Petrillo Chair California High Speed Rail Authority 925 L St., Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814	W137-1	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>Dear Mr. Petrillo:</p> <p>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.</p> <p>I see a number of problems with the draft EIR/S.</p> <p>The DEIR/S is flawed because it ignores 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 		

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"> ▪ 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>Any new high speed rail projects should address the following key goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Avoid subsidizing new sprawl housing subdivision developments. ▪ Prevent any loss of existing agricultural lands or open space areas. ▪ Reinforce existing commuter transportation corridors, by removing single driver vehicles from existing freeways and roads and putting them on the trains. ▪ Enhance and widen green belts 	W137-2	<p>Acknowledged. The Authority has adopted objectives for the system to maximize the use of existing transportation corridors and rights-of-way (to the extent possible), locate stations to connect with local transit and airports, and be sensitive and protective of California’s unique natural resources. Please also see standard response 2.1.12 regarding the selection of preferred station locations.</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>through which the trains travel when they are outside urban core areas. Reinforce service to existing cities and towns, while helping limit sprawl development into rural areas.</p> <p>Of course, the new system should be designed to use the least energy possible. If you first design as energy efficient and clean a system as possible, you will reduce the amount of fuel needed and pollution generated over the life of the entire project. Keep in mind that electricity needed to move the trains will be generated by powerplants. Please make sure that the fuel used in those plants are as clean as possible. Look carefully into the possibility of building solar energy systems into the trains themselves, so that they generate their own energy as much as possible. New generations of amorphous silicon paint are being developed which could allow the trains to generate much of their own power as they do daylight runs.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>See above. If the new train system just becomes another excuse for generating more sprawl development. it will be</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				opposed my most Californians.		
W138	8/22/2004	Lawrence Garwin	718 El Granada Blvd Half Moon Bay, CA 94019	<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 	W138-1	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 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, Lawrence Garwin</p> <p>PS: Please make this form more usable by enlarging this text window so I can see what I have typed.</p>		
W139	8/22/2004	Peter Leaf, Owner	City Cabinetmakers 353 Winfield St. San Francisco. CA	Mr. Joe Petrillo Chair California High Speed Rail Authority	W139-1	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
			94110	<p>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 ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay 		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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, Peter Leaf</p>		
W140	8/23/2004	Sue Field, School district superintendent	4814 Comfrey Place Santa Rosa, CA 95405	<p>I am in favor of Bart-type rail from Santa Rosa or Cloverdale (or as north as practical) to San Francisco (to connect with Bart) that would utilize the existing transportation corridor to the extent possible. I am not in favor of impacting park land. To be utilized, there must be easy access on/off with convenient park and ride parking lots. I would use it as long as it had good interface with existing or new public</p>	W140-1	<p>Please see standard response 2.36.1 regarding a potential HST link to Santa Rosa. A "BART-type" rail system would be for local and regional commuter services and would not be able to achieve the speeds needed for longer distance intercity markets. Such a service would be the responsibility of local and regional transportation agencies. Please also see standard response</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				transportation options making it easily navigatable.		2.9.1. The Authority has adopted objectives for the system to maximize the use of existing transportation corridors and rights-of-way (to the extent possible), locate stations to connect with local transit and airports, and be sensitive and protective of California's unique natural resources.
W141	8/23/2004	Susan Belloni	202 La Jolla Dr. Santa Barbara, CA 93109	<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 existina I-580/I-680 corridor.</p>	W141-1	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>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 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
				Susan Belloni		
W142	8/23/2004	Debbie Hertz	31901 9th Avenue Laguna Beach, CA 92651	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the High Speed Railway.</p> <p>I am concerned about the alignment that is proposed for the Hamilton and Pacheco Pass. A new EIR/S should be obtained comparing the Altamont Pass alignment to the other alignment options and then open for public comment.</p> <p>We need to preserve our wilderness areas! Even though there are benefits to having a high speed railway, we don't need to counteract these benefits by having it travel through the Orestimba Wilderness area. The Altamont Pass alignment would not impact as much wetland area either. A very important part of conservation.</p> <p>So I hope you will take these comments into consideration before making your final decision.</p>	W142-1	Please see standard response 2.18.1.
W143	8/24/2004	Lewis Lipton	426 W. Ocean View Ave. Del Mar, CA 92014	<p>I find the two proposed routes for double-tracking the LOSSAN corridor unacceptable. One route will significantly affect the Peñasquitos Lagoon and the other will do likewise for the San Dieguito Lagoon. Neither one of these lagoons can be replaced, and both offer habitats for a variety of birds and other life. Moreover, the Peñasquitos Lagoon provides a</p>	W143-1	Please see standard response 6.42.1. Please also see standard response 10.1.7 in regards to the phasing of the HST system.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>stunning visual panorama which helps define the southern border of Del Mar, and which frames the Torrey Pines State Reserve and Torrey Pines State Beach. Meanwhile, the San Dieguito Lagoon is undergoing a cleanup process, and promises to be as much an asset to the northern boundary of the Del Mar area as Peñasquitos is on the south.</p> <p>Given my objection to both proposed routes, it seems clear that the better choice is to align the tracks along the I-5 corridor, from southern Del Mar to as far north as practical. The best solution would be to align it to Cannon Road on the north. I recognize that would require creating a new station in Solana Beach, but I submit that the land on which the existing station is built could be sold for a sum far larger than the station and land originally cost, and the money received from the sale could be used towards the cost of replacing the station.</p> <p>If alignment to Cannon Road cannot be accomplished, the next best solution would be to align the tracks along the I-5 corridor on the south and then move back to the existing alignment on the northern side of the San Dieguito lagoon by passing through the Del Mar Fair Grounds. I recognize that the Fair</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>Grounds is owned by the State of California and administered by the 22nd Agricultural District. The Agricultural District may not be especially pleased at loosing some of its land for the railroad, but perhaps that problem could be overcome by offering a seasonal station in the Fairgrounds. Such a plan has the added advantage of possibly reducing the traffic flow on I-5 and through Del Mar during the peak fair and racing seasons.</p> <p>Barring a solution to double tracking in the LOSSAN corridor as outlined above, I would personally prefer the "No Build Option". Indeed, it seems to me that a case for the necessity of double tracking in the first place has not been made. The data I have shows that the Coaster carries about 4,500 passengers/day, an amount which could be accommodated on three full round-trip trains. If the number of passengers on Amtrak is comparable, you can add an additional three trains. But in fact, there are twelve combined trains (Coaster and Amtrak) in the morning and evening, each, meaning one every half-hour. That hardly amounts to a requirement for double tracking.</p> <p>Looking at the bigger picture, the CHSRA plan for high-speed rail through</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>the State of California currently ends the high-speed portion in Orange County. The official position of the planners is that a San Diego addition to the high-speed system would be built some unspecified number of years after the original line is completed, and that extension would go down the I-15 corridor. I submit that a high-speed link to the rest of California is something that must include San Diego in the first place; after all, San Diego is the second largest city in California, and a city which is continuing to grow rapidly. Moreover, the planners propose to place this extension where it belongs, namely, where the population lives, which is inland, nearer the I-15 corridor than the I-5 corridor. That is where this area needs rail transport, not along the coast, with its precious wetlands and limited population.</p> <p>So in the big picture, the "No Build Option" has a lot to recommend it: it saves money now by not building a double track where none is required, and allows the saved funds to be used in support of a high-speed transportation system sooner than now planned, and which might actually serve the needs of the San Diego area. What's not to like?</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W144	8/24/2004	Anthony DeRiggi, Physician	932 46th Street Sacramento, CA 95819	<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 	W144-1	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, Anthony De Riggi, M.D.</p>		
W145	8/24/2004	Charlie Cho	435 N. Second St. #326 San Jose, CA 95112	The Altamont alignment into the Bay Area must be studied. It appears to be a superior alignment which costs less to build and serves a much larger population along its route. What is the CHSRA afraid of?	W145-1	Please see standard response 2.18.1.