

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W146	8/24/2004	Rick Jali	Box 1717 Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546	High Speed Rail is an important transportation element which should have been looked at and started long ago. This is especially important in the urban corridors of Southern California and the Bay Area, but applies to certain other areas as well (e.g., the Valley between Sacramento and Bakersfield).	W146-1	Acknowledged.
W147	8/24/2004	Richard Morrison. Retired	1414 Eagle Point Court Lafayette, CA 94549	No comment received.		
W148	8/25/2004	Margaret Petitjean, former legal secretary to then Congressman Paul McCloskey	H.A.L.T. (Homeowners Against Loud Trains) 489 Waverley St. Menlo Park, CA 94025	As the occupant owner of rental units along the S.F. to San Jose Peninsula and the owner of 13 acres of land in the E.Mission Valley area of San Diego I am particularly concerned with impacts of the HST. One might say that I'm between a rock and a hard place. (Would you like to buy my land just off Hwy.15 in so.Cal? I recognize the purpose and need objectives since I was born and raised in London, England and appreciated the greater train transit there and throughout Europe. My concern would be in adding HST to the present illegally loud, diesel spewing, blasting horns of the Caltrain which has seriously injured many residents. Adding to this system, as is, would be even more disastrous. We need quiet, non-polluting trains. if any running	W148-1	Please see standard responses 6.1.5 and 6.2.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>alongside residences and back yards 5' from the tracks. We have petitioned for "quiet zones" allowed by the amendment to the Swift Act to halt the blasting horns which assault us day and night</p> <p>Must be quiet, modern, non-polluting, completely grade-separated to reduce congestion and noise now present at the crossings.</p> <p>We are subjected to noise and vibraton from the present system of Caltrain diesels and Union Pacific freights which have increased without any environmental impacts (culminating in an illegitimate Baby Bullet without an EIR/EIS. The HST would not be as injurious but its cumulative effects must be considered</p> <p>This is of concern in that there is already a power line running alongside my property and I have electrical boxes for the building behind my bedroom. Would HST a few feet the other side increase any danger of EFMs?</p> <p>A few \$1-3m homes are along the tracks in Atherton and Menlo Park. Most, however, are condos and apartments along the Caltrain Corridor. The present noise of the Caltrains, blasting horns and freights are already unlivable and require us living like rats</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>with closed windows, no air conditioning and no noise reduction windows. There should be a moratorium on new housing anywhere near this present system of diesel Caltrain and heavy freights. The Federal Railroad Administration has published a Noise Assessment of the Horns that shows there is a "severe" impact 660' from the tracks and a "serious" impact over 1,000'. These must stop by establishing "quiet zones" as a number one priority. Grade separations would accomplish this.</p> <p>It would be irresponsible to add any further service along the Caltrain Corridor without extensive mitigation measures taken at the outset of HST. Recognizing that there would be some adverse environmental impacts, there must be, initially, Triple-paned noise-reduction windows for those within a couple of hundred feet from the tracks. Sound walls are necessary unless all systems are electrified and quiet, although we understand that people move away from Bart due to that low-frequency noise which can become a health hazard.</p>		
				<p>Our City staff of Menlo Park has written a comment asking for answers to quetions regarding the EIR. It's recommendation to the council was to</p>	<p>W148-2</p>	<p>Please see standard response 6.3.1.</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>oppose the consideration of an Altamont Pass route although I do not see that as an option. Two or three residents asked the council to oppose any route through Menlo Park and then the "executive director", a little upstart named Margaret Okuzumi attended the councilmeeting asking for an EIR of the Altamont Route and rejection of Henry Coe Park route. Following her was the activist all the way from Sacramento with the glossy brochures (these two are at every meeting with their persuasive misstatments) demanding that the HST take the Altamont Route. These are not residents of our City but the Council then changed the Resolution prepared by staff to be sent to you.</p> <p>It appears that the mayor had also been swayed by the Town of Atherton who does not want HST through their affluent area although they, nor Menlo Park has had a public hearing to hear the opinions of the general public. Since the staff who had read the Draft EIS/EIR and recommended your chosen route, it would seem proper to discount the mayor's Resolution. She is a novice first-time councilperson never having served on even the planning commission. Blonde's do get more votes!</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>One more experienced councilman/attorney, Nicholas Jellins, opined that the city should not get into questioning the route or the subject of Henry Coe Park. Perhaps you could get the tape of that councilmeeting? It is in our library. The four councilpersons present (with one absent) then voted unanimously to follow the mayor’s suggestions. I have not seen the final resolution but in the local Almanac newspaper of today 8/25/04 it states “Council: High Speed rail report insufficient”</p>		
				<p>Why should Menlo Park residents care about plans for a statewide high-speed rail train system? Because there could be critical impacts on the city, members of the City Council agreed August 17. With the California High Speed Rail Authority circulating a draft environmental ipact report on the project, the council decided to pass a resolution with comments on the report. The council agreed unanimously, with Paul Collachi absent, that the report is so general that it doesn’t sufficiently look at many possible impacts to cities the high-speed trns could run through, including increased noise, local traffic ciculation, aesthetic concerns and tree removal. The council suggests that the authority</p>	<p>W148-3</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>look into not running the new trains up the Peninsula, instead having them stop at a connection with BART in the East Bay or Caltrain. This could cut costs and reduce impacts on cities, said Councilwoman Mickie Winkler after the meeting." Of course, they haven't read, nor do they understand the draft or the concept of HST and went against the original resolution to oppose further study of the Altamont Pass route.</p> <p>Additionally, it would take over another hour from San Jose to S.F. and be completely counter-productive to a continuous system which we understand is already being planned to meet up with a Trans-Bay Terminal. We can only hope that the incompetents will be ignored and that the mischief makers such as BayRailAlliance will not defeat your purpose. They, incidentally, are trying to run Caltrain and have ensconded themselves in the Samtrans headquarters in San Carlos for their meetings. Radical activists and environmental extremists should not be given special privileges not available to others. Our taxes should not accommodate them and their bicycles, each one taking up 3 spaces. They should pay for three spaces that could be used for other passengers. We are</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				sick of their demands for transit and routes "their way" and the undue influence they have upon transit boards just because they have nothing better to do than attend meetings and lobby to serve their own self-serving agendas. These holier-than-thou should also be ignored together with city councils who do not do their homework but thwart the efforts of their staff and the majority of residents without public hearings required by law.		
W149	8/25/2004	Sylvia Cardella	4570 Blufftop Hydesville, CA 95547	<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 	W149-1	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, Sylvia Cardella</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W150	8/25/2004	Charles Malarkey	212 Illinois Street Vallejo, CA 94590	<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 inherently defective because it fails to consider an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. 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>The discarding of the Altamont Pass alternative based on after-the-fact, paid-for experts' letters (see "Bullet Train to Nowhere," by Sean Holstege, Oakland Tribune, August 22, 2004) is not merely questionable process. It is also based on a shortsighted view of intra- and inter-urban mass transit and political reality. The Altamont Pass alignment is the only alternative that makes full use of Bay Area mass transit</p>	W150-1	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>connections. Oakland, which is 15 min. on BART from San Francisco, does not require an HSR stop. Your assertion in the Draft Program EIR/EIS that implies otherwise ('Altamont' alignment requires three lines in Bay area') is nonsense.</p> <p>As for political reality, if you really want a bond to pass, you can't afford to lose the support of the more transit-conscious Bay Area. I don't believe you will get this when people realize that Central Valley real estate interests and others decided in favor of promoting sprawl and their private interests (see "Bullet Train to Nowhere," by Sean Holstege, Oakland Tribune, August 22, 2004) over maximizing the public benefit of a major infrastructure investment.</p> <p>An Altamont Pass alignment includes 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>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, Charles Malarkey</p>		
W151	8/26/2004	John Carpenter	905 W. Middlefield Road, #915 Mountain View, CA 94043	<p>Attn: California High-Speed Train Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments 925 L Street, Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814</p> <p>Mr. Joe Petrillo, Chair:</p> <p>As this document serves to fulfill legal requirements for Federal funding of the California High Speed Rail (CA HSR), and is based upon ongoing documents for the Program, my comments for this document would only be general in</p>	W151-1	This is a repeated copy of Comment Letter I116 (sent as both a letter and an e-mail). Please see responses to Comment Letter I116.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>scope.</p> <p>There needs to be more of a scope statement so that it may be clearer to those who may be reviewing (or commenting) on this document. It seems to me that at this Program level, we are talking about Corridors that may be needed for running high speed trains of the sort that are to provide scheduled high speed rail service and nothing else. So the input of this process should be a selection of viable corridors and the product of this should be a subset of these corridors that can be carried over to the various Project levels.</p> <p>Corridors should be represented as a swath where routes and then alignments can be located and should not look like a particular alignment.</p> <p>For example, the Pacheco Pass would be a corridor about 5 to 10 miles wide and thus would allow for choosing an route within the median of CA-152 as well as to being along one side of Henry Miller Road. Another example would be the East Bay that is so developed that the corridor would be represented as being split in two with each split being no wider than one of the two possible routes. This should allow those who are concerned about environmental issues to realize that</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>sensitive areas can be avoided to the greatest extent possible if the swath provides for several route options or consider mitigations if the swath is too narrow as to be more like a singular route option.</p> <p>These Corridors should be those necessary to provide rail service that not only takes demand away from the highway but also from airline services. It should be clear that addressing proposed rail service that only reduces the demand from the highway is outside of the scope of this Program even though this may be funded from either the approximately \$1 billion of residuals of the CA HSR ballot measure and/or from CA HSR operational proceeds. For example, the accumulation of corridors to provide rail service between San Jose and Los Angeles would be within the scope, but any corridor that serves only to best provide service between the San Francisco and Sacramento would be outside the scope. The latter corridor, nevertheless, can be developed at a Project level in its own right and would be eligible to use the resources of the CA HSR measure or proceeds.</p> <p>It would be good for Corridor evaluations to have concurrences with those who have designed and/or are</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>operating existing and successful high-speed rail systems such as in Germany, France, and Japan.</p> <p>These should be in writing with CA HSR Authority responses in an appendix to this Program document. An important item for concurrences is, for example, the dropping of the Altamont Corridor (Would these other entities do the same thing if they had the same type of problem?).</p> <p>Respectfully, John D. Carpenter</p>		
W152	8/26/2004	Joseph Steinberger	353 Prospect Avenue San Francisco, CA 94110	<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</p>	W152-1	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>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,</p>		
W153	8/26/2004	Elizabeth Doty	926 Madison Street Albany, CA 94706	<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 of all, I would like to say I strongly support any program to create effective and timely public transportation. Having lived and traveled the Boston-Philadelphia corridor, I can attest to the appeal of high-speed rail as an alternative to driving.</p> <p>Secondly, I am concerned that the DEIR/S 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</p>	W153-1	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>High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA) -- and is attractive due to its proximity to current residential communities.</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>I believe this Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>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, Elizabeth Doty</p>		
W154	8/26/2004	Emily Hall	165 Brown Drive, Unit B Pacheco, CA 94553	<p>How can a supportive, forward-thinking Californian with ambition to see this project to fruition before years or, more likely, decades of bureaucratic stagnation drives the projected costs ever higher? Willing to be a proactive force for the California High-Speed Rail system.</p> <p>Sincerely, Emily Hall</p>	W154-1	<p>The proposed HST system would not be built in California until financing for construction is secured and environmental laws and regulations have been complied with in order to obtain any needed permits and entitlements. Completion of the program EIR/EIS is the first step; however, project-specific documents will be required to obtain the permits needed to proceed with the project. Funding to prepare project specific documents has also not yet been provided. The Governor and Legislature have placed a bond measure [SB1169(Murray) amending SB1856 (Costa)] on the November 2006 ballot that, if approved by the voters, would provide \$9 billion towards the construction of HST in California and \$1 billion for improvements to other existing conventional rail services that would compliment and provide feeder</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
						services to the HST system.
W155	8/26/2004	Patricia Walker	300 Arlington Way Menlo Park, CA 94025	The point of public transportation is to locate them where the population is. Failure to consider the Altamont Pass route is failure to avoid and mitigate environmental impacts. The Altamont alignment will avoid impacts to the Henry Coe park wilderness and other protected lands, induce less sprawl and provide better links to public transit systems. Henry Coe Park is a wonderful wilderness area, much bigger than most of the Bay Area parks. We are so lucky to have it and we should do everything we can to protect it. I urge you to consider an alternative rail route over Altamont Pass.	W155-1	Please see standard response 2.18.1.
W156	8/26/2004	James Fujita	28512 Vista Madera Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275	I highly support the idea of building a TGV-style high speed rail line between Los Angeles and the Bay Area.	W156-1	Acknowledged.
				However, I hope the the High-Speed Rail Authority will consider using Altamont Pass. Altamont Pass would be faster with less of an impact on undeveloped areas.	W156-2	Please see standard response 2.18.1.
W157	8/26/2004	Wendy Constantine , Manager	1118 Garden Lane Lafayette, CA 94549	High speed rail between LA and SF is a fabulous idea, and will place CA on the map internationally as technologically advanced and environmentally friendly.	W157-1	Acknowledged.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				But impacting one of the Bay Area’s best parks is a huge step backward. Please route the train down existing transportation corridors instead. Many generations of Americans will thank you!	W157-2	Please see standard response 6.3.1. Acknowledged.
W158	8/27/2004	Mike Toney	6747 Heathfield Drive San Jose, CA 95120	<p>California High Speed Rail Authority Draft EIR/EIS Comments for the Proposed California High-Speed Rail Train System</p> <p>Dear California High Speed Rail Authority,</p> <p>These are these comments concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Proposed California High-Speed Rail Train (HST) System; please place my comments in the public record for this report/statement. The draft EIR/EIS is badly flawed because it fails to meaningfully consider the impacts that two of the alternative alignments would have on Henry Coe State Park. It also fails to consider a hybrid alternative alignment that would greatly mitigate environmental impacts. The draft EIR/EIS needs to be rewritten to more fully consider the impact on Henry Coe Park and to seriously consider the hybrid alignment.</p>	W158-1	Please see standard response 6.3.1. 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>Several of the options in the draft EIR/EIS will pass through Henry Coe State park both at grade and through tunnels. This will create a severe disruption to a California State Park and a California Wilderness Area and will have significant impact on the environment of this park. Despite these severe impacts, the draft EIR/EIS lacks meaningful detail when discussing potential environmental impacts to the park; indeed, it does not even consider that the alignments will pass through the Orestimba Wilderness Area. Hence, the public has inadequate information concerning the impact of the HST system on Coe Park. The draft EIR/EIS needs to be rewritten to adequately consider the impact of the HST system on Henry Coe Park.</p> <p>The "Tunnel under Park" alternative is misleadingly titled and falsely described. On Page 6-16, this alternative is stated to pass "under Henry Coe State park completely in a tunnel". In actuality, this alternative only tunnels under a portion of Henry Coe Park; this is shown in Fig. 6.2-3, where it is apparent that the alignment is at grade through much of the Orestimba Wilderness –a part of Coe Park. This alternative must be given a title that is more descriptive of the</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>actual alternative and must be accurately described.</p> <p>Another alternative alignment for the HST system could go through Merced and proceed first west and then southwest to Pacheco Pass. Such an alignment would significantly reduce environmental damage to the Diablo Range (and Coe State Park) and to the floodplains, wetlands and streams near Los Banos. This alternative provides some significant advantages over the alternatives described in the draft EIR/EIS, and hence, a new draft EIR/EIS needs to be written to seriously consider this potential alternative alignment.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dr Michael F Toney 6747 Heathfield Drive San Jose Ca, 95120</p>		
W159	8/27/2004	Adrian Brandt	257 Grand St. Redwood City, CA 94062-1633	<p>The DEIR/S is unacceptably deficient in that it fails to thoroughly and co-equally study and consider the improperly rejected Altamont Pass alignment. As you are well-aware, 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's wholly unjustified</p>	W159-1	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>elimination from further study is a gross disservice to the taxpayers of this state and to the future success and utility of any future resulting high-speed rail project.</p> <p>An Altamont Pass alignment roughly follow the existing highly congested Dumbarton Bridge / I-680 / I-580 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 ▪ Vastly faster, shorter and more convenient service between the Bay Area and the greater Sacramento/Stockton areas. ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay, "Tri-Valley" and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project. ▪ Urgently needed traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 ▪ Much faster travel times between 		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>the Bay Area and Sacramento</p> <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>As a long-time (early) supporter of a California high-speed rail system, I again urge you in the strongest terms possible to do what's right and fair on behalf of citizens of this state and do what I believe is obviously the right thing: fully and fairly study the Altamont Pass alignment.</p> <p>Sincerely, Adrian Brandt</p>		
W160	8/27/2004	Russell Weisz	319 Laguna St. Santa Cruz, CA 95060	<p>Reconsider the Altamont Pass alignment option.</p> <p>The Altamont Pass Alignment option may avoid impacts to wilderness, induce less sprawl, reduce project costs by up to \$2 billion, attract more riders and provide better links to other public transit systems. It would also provide</p>	W160-1	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
				much faster service between Sacramento and the Bay Area than the options included in the EIR/S.		
W161	8/28/2004	Kevin Holsinger	190 E. O'Keefe St. #9 Menlo Park, CA 94025	<p>The EIS/EIR must consider the Altamont pass alignment.</p> <p>That alignment follows an existing transportation corridor, has the least environmental impact, is closest to the most potential riders, and would reduce travel time from San Francisco to Sacramento (compared to the "South Bay" routes). This alignment has the fewest miles of track, leading to reduced maintenance costs. It requires the least tunnelling.</p>	W161-1	Please see standard response 2.18.1.
				<p>The Hamilton/Diablo option is completely unacceptable. There is no reason to put any high-density transportation corridor through these mostly undeveloped regions -- especially not through state park lands. The environmental impact of this alignment is unmitigatable.</p> <p>The Pacheco Pass alignment also has significant environmental impact -- of all the options, it impacts water resources the most. Furthermore, it does not serve an existing large population base and would result in longer travel times from the Peninsula to Sacramento. The goal is not just to get from the Peninsula to Los Angeles</p>	W161-2	Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>as quickly as possible -- the goal is to serve as many people as possible, optimizing the overall travel times.</p> <p>Putting a railroad in a relatively unpopulated area means that fewer people can use it. This would be a waste of money. The EIS/EIR must be rewritten to include the Altamont pass option.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention.</p>		
W162	8/29/2004	Ed Fernandez	6000 Scenic Meadow Lane San Jose, CA 95135	<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>	W162-1	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 ▪ 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, Ed Fernandez		
W163	8/29/2004	Richard Allsop	975 Nora Way, Apt. 201 South San Francisco, CA 94080	The California High Speed rail project has the potential to reshape the state the way the Interstate Highway system or the California Aqueduct did. In the case of the highway system and aqueducts, Californians are living now with the consequence, both good and bad, of decisions made decades ago, and we will live with the consequences of our decisions on the High Speed Rail project forever.	W163-1	Acknowledged.
				The DEIR/S is not adequate for making decisions about a project of this scale and permanence. In particular, the discussion of the route connecting the SF Bay Area to the Central Valley is totally inadequate.	W163-2	Please see standard response 2.18.1.
				It doesn't include one viable alternative (the Altamont Pass route) and the discussion of the remaining alternatives doesn't cover some significant problems. The discussion of the Northern Diablo alternatives ignores problems of construction access, tunnel ventilation, and the potential impact on biodiversity in northern California. The Pacheco Pass routes follow an existing transportation corridor, but they will also exacerbate sprawl in the Central Valley and the Sierra foothills and	W163-3	Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				worsen the associated problems of energy waste, habitat loss, and fire suppression.		
				The Altamont Pass route has its own problems, including potential impacts on wetlands near the San Francisco Bay, but it should not have been eliminated at this step in the process. It certainly should not have been eliminated when two routes through a State Park wilderness area were included.	W163-4	Please see standard response 2.18.1.
				I've camped several nights at the mouth of Pinto Creek in the Orestimba Wilderness of Henry W. Coe State Park. The proposal of routes through an area set aside for Californians to enjoy and appreciate forever should cause all Californians to have serious reservations about the judgment of the people planning the High Speed Rail project. The DEIS/R needs to be done over again. The revised report must inventory all the resources that are going to be impacted by the project, especially in the Diablo North options, and it must include a discussion of the Altamont Pass alternative.	W163-5	Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W164	8/29/2004	Kimball J Cranney	2807 Regent Street Berkeley, CA 94705-2111	<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.</p> <p>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 	W164-1	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"> ▪ 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>		
W165	8/29/2004	Lisa Pampuch, Technical Editor, Columnist	735 Barrett Avenue Morgan Hill, CA 95037	Any route that would take the proposed bullet train through Henry W. Coe State Park, or through any protected lands, should be eliminated. Despite promises of "mitigation," the construction and presence of bullet trains in our dwindling and threatened protected lands would only cause harm. Let's honor the definition of protected and the intent of the legislation that set aside these lands. No bullet trains in Coe Park, or any other protected lands. Anything else is environmental blasphemy.	W165-1	Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W166	8/30/2004	James P Thompson, General Manager	Visalia Convention Center 303 E. Acequia Ave. Visalia, CA 93291	I believe that the best alignment for the high-speed rail line is through Visalia. I know that the City of Visalia is serious about controlled growth and that you would find them extremely cooperative in routing the alignment through Visalia and in finding suitable land for a maintenance facility.	W166-1	Please see standard response 6.15.4. and 6.21.1.
W167	8/30/2004	Russ Peterson	Citizens For Improved Rail 466 Felton Dr Menlo Park, CA 94025	To: High Speed Rail Authority Frm: Citizens for Improved Rail (CFIR) Dt: August 30, 2004 Re: Response to California High Speed Rail Draft EIR/EIS The members of CFIR take this opportunity to comment on the California High Speed Rail Draft EIR/EIS and project proposal ("The EIR"). We suggest that the EIR be rejected in its current form, and that any new EIR should take account of the following points:	W167-1	Acknowledged.
				The EIR is too vague to adequately describe the environmental impact of high speed rail ("HSR") in the San Francisco Bay Area. Greater detail needs to be provided regarding right-of-way acquisition (temporary and permanent), construction, noise, screening landscape, local traffic circulation, and aesthetics.	W167-2	Please see standard response 3.20.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>The EIR does not consider the Altamont Pass route, which has in the past been considered the best possible route for HSR through the Bay Area. The Altamont Pass route has an existing railroad right-of-way, while the two routes considered by the EIR cut through sensitive ecological areas where no train has ever traveled before.</p> <p>The EIR cites economic reasons for the exclusion of the Altamont Pass route. This assessment is misleading and based on poor analysis. The Altamont Pass route would make HSR accessible to nearly one million people in and around the communities of Livermore, Tracy, etc., while excluding only a population of perhaps one hundred thousand in the area of Los Banos. In any case, an economic analysis is of questionable relevance in a report designed to evaluate environmental impacts.</p>	W167-3	Please see standard response 2.18.1.
				<p>The various environmental impacts of HSR are addressed only individually, but in many cases these various impacts would add up to far more than the sum of their parts. The analyses of grade separation, electrification, and HSR overlay on existing commuter rail systems must be integrated to obtain a</p>	W167-4	Please see Section 3.17 "Cumulative Impacts Evaluation". Additional evaluation of cumulative impacts will be provided in the project level analysis, should the HST proposal move forward.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				picture of the true environmental impact.		
				The EIR provides no justification as to the need for two HSR systems running through the peninsula Caltrain corridor. As the two alignments proposed by the EIR run through San Jose, it would be practical and environmentally advantageous to use the current Caltrain system to reach San Francisco. This option is never explored by the EIR.	W167-5	Please see standard response 6.1.4.
				<p>The EIR does not address the specific environmental impacts that would affect any particular community or crossing. This prevents local residents from making an informative review of the EIR or from working with the High Speed Rail Association to resolve or mitigate particular impacts.</p> <p>Consideration of these six points would help to make the EIR into an effective document for understanding the environmental impact of HSR on the San Francisco Bay Area and Peninsula Caltrain corridor. Until these points are addressed, CFIR cannot support the EIR as a complete study.</p> <p>Regards, R. Peterson President, Citizens For Improved Rail</p>	W167-6	The program EIR/EIS is done at a conceptual level of detail. Should the HST proposal move forward, more detailed project specific studies will be required.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W168	8/30/2004	Keri Litchfield	303 E. Acequia Ave Visalia, CA 93277	I strongly believe that the High Speed Rail alignment should run through Tulare County with a station near the Highway 99/198 intersection in Visalia.	W168-1	Please see standard response 6.15.4.
				The City of Visalia is very supportive of the Rail, and I hope you take that seriously, and strongly consider running it through Visalia, Tulare County. Thank you. Keri Litchfield	W168-2	Please see standard response 6.21.1.
W169	8/30/2004	Teresa Villarrial	1432 N Giddings Visalia, CA 93291	Visalia is an excellent choice for a station for the High Speed Rail. The intersection of 99/198 highways is very accessible and you will find Visalia very willing to assist you in finding suitable land for a maintenance facility.	W169-1	Please see standard response 6.15.4, standard response 6.21.1, and standard response 2.35.1.
W170	8/30/2004	Kathy Fraga	4146 W. Iris Ave Visalia, CA 93277	Visalia is an excellent choice for a station for the High Speed Rail. The intersection of 99/198 highways is very accessible and you will find Visalia very willing to assist you in finding suitable land for a maintenance facility.	W170-1	Please see standard response 6.21.1.
W171	8/30/2004	Anil Chagan, President	Equitable Hotels 210 E Acequia Ave Visalia, CA 93291	Please make a stop in Visalia. We need the service. With Tulare County serving so many people and Visalia been the heart of the valley, I suggest that the High Speed Rail make a stop in Visalia. The need and difficulty of reasonable transportation to Los Angeles and San	W171-1	Please see standard response 6.21.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				Fransisco is a another major reason to stop here.		
W172	8/30/2004	Molly Bambl, General Manager	Tharaldson (Fairfield Inn) 140 S Akers Visalia, CA 93291	Gen: I think a tram would be great in Visalia	W172-1	Please see standard response 6.21.1.
W173	8/30/2004	Michael Handy	601 N. Encina St Visalia, CA 93291	Visalia is an excellent choice for a station for the High Speed Rail. The intersection of 99/198 highways is very accessible and you will find Visalia very willing to assist you in finding suitable land for a maintenance facility	W173-1	Please see standard response 6.21.1.
W174	8/30/2004	Robert Lee, Hospitality	Lamp Liter Inn 3130 W. Main Street Visalia, CA 93291	<p>Please run the High Speed Rail alignment through Tulare County with a station near the Highway 99/198 intersection. I believe that the best alignment for the high-speed rail line is through Visalia. I know that the City of Visalia is serious and you would find them very cooperative in routing the alignment through our fine City.</p> <p>Visalia is an excellent choice for a station for the High Speed Rail. The intersection of 99/198 highways is very accessible and you will find Visalia very willing to assist you in finding suitable land for a maintenance facility.</p>	W174-1	Please see standard response 6.21.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W175	8/30/2004	Mark Sweeney	20328 Ave. 344 Woodlake, CA 93286	i believe visalia is a good stop for the high speed rail, it is a growing community with lots of surrounding small towns. alot of these people cant afford to fly so are limited to greyhound and amtrak (where amtrak is available)	W175-1	Please see standard response 6.21.1.
W176	8/30/2004	Rochelle Tilton	8337 Quail Springs Way Sacramento, CA 95829	As a property owner in Sacramento County who would be extremely impacted by the use of the Caltrans Railroad lines, I want to voice my opposition to using the CCT route. Although I realize the importance of a high speed rail, it seems that the CCT would not only be a longer and less indirect route to downtown but it is also more expensive and impacts a great number of citizens. We moved into our home less than 2 years ago and were told at that time that the CCT was abandoned and would be used for a bike/ped trail. I fear that the EIR/EIS does not take into account the number of households that have been built in the past two years and the impact that the use of the CCT would have on these neighborhoods.	W176-1	Please see standard response 6.12.1.
W177	8/30/2004	Mike Hammes	10910 Northsky Sq. Cupertino, CA 95014	Mr. Joe Petrillo Chair, California High Speed Rail Authority 925 L St, Suite 1425 Sacramento CA 95814 Dear Mr. Petrillo: This letter presents comments on the	W177-1	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>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 recommendation of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to HSRA.</p> <p>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest park in California. ▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped land ▪ 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 1 of the project ▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 ▪ Much faster travel time between 		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>the Bay Area and Sacramento</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cost savings of up to \$2 billion , according to documents in the DEIR/S <p>The Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather please 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, Mike Hammes</p>		
W178	8/30/2004	David Clark	2355 Rancho Del Oro Rd., #52 Oceanside, CA 92056-1750	I believe this EIS is a technically sound document. I think it thoroughly studied the impacts of the high speed rail. I believe the California High Speed Rail is a necessary project for this state, and is worthy of state support. It would definitely be a great asset to this state.	W178-1	Acknowledged.
W179	8/31/2004	Lisa Clark	8543 Culp Drive Gilroy, CA 95020	This train MUST NOT go through Henry Coe Park. It is protected land which should remain protected. I actually use areas of this park frequently and it would a terrible shame to see any of it disturbed to build a train which in itself is a waste of taxpayer dollars. I do not support the train and I especially do not support a route through a pristine, protected wilderness.	W179-1	Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W180	8/31/2004	Kevin Standlee, Logistics Solutions Engineer	PO Box 64128 Sunnyvale, CA 94088-4128	<p>The CAHSR project is vital to the transportation future of this state. Proceeding with it would be a visionary step comparable to the building of the state highway system and the state higher education system that has made California a world leader. Although I'm not completely satisfied with all of the options being studied - in particular the Central Valley-Bay Area connection - the project as a whole is worthwhile, and I support it and would support reasonable increases in sales tax, income tax, or gas tax to fund it.</p> <p>We can no longer simply build more roads or assume that airlines will solve all of our intercity transportation problems. Airplanes have a larger environmental impact than most people think. Expanding airports to handle the steadily-increasing intrastate traffic is at least as expensive as the HSR project, and the apparent "profitability" of short-haul air carriers such as Southwest is misleading, as they don't have to pay for much of their external costs. Rail is a much better mode choice for travel in distances envisioned by this project.</p>	W180-1	Acknowledged.
				I encourage the Authority to not expect to be able to deliver anything better than existing HSR performance such as the existing TGV/Eurostar 300 kph (186	W180-2	Please see standard response 2.12.2. The Authority concurs that HST is a proven technology and that California should build upon what