

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>regarding land use issues.</p> <p>"Potential inconsistencies with land use plans, and identification of general mitigation strategies." (Pg. 3.7-1)</p> <p>"Property: Assessment of potential property impacts is based on the types of land uses adjacent to the particular proposed alignment, the amount of right-of-way potentially needed due to the construction type, and the land use sensitivity to potential impacts." (Pg3.7-3)</p> <p>Analysis of only lands adjacent to project is too narrow</p> <p>"Study Area defined for land use compatibility . . . is .25 miles on either side of the centerline of the rail and highway corridors. For the property impacts analysis the study area is narrower – 100 ft on either side of the alignment centerlines." (Pg. 3.7-5)</p> <p>Analysis area is too narrow.</p> <p>Concerns are loosely addressed over the Diablo Range HST alignment options, particularly the two that go through Henry Coe State Park. Concerns have been expressed regarding potential impacts for Henry Coe State Park and potential impacts from bisecting areas north of the park. Also, mention concern over impacts along Orestimba Creek and Don</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. (S-6)</p> <p>Is Henry Coe State Park located near agricultural resources?</p> <p>Does Orestimba Creek run through farmland?</p> <p>If so, mitigation strategy discussion is required.</p> <p>Deferring discussion of mitigation strategies until a later time fails to meet CEQA requirement.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The Draft PEIR/S should fully discuss the impacts of the proposed project on agricultural resources.</p> <p>The Authority should include in the Draft PEIR/S additional mitigation measures to reduce impacts to agricultural resources as part of the proposed project.</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>If analysis is put off until later it will be too late . . . Impacts train will have already left the station!</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Diana Westmoreland Pedrozo Executive Director Merced County Farm Bureau PO Box 1232 Merced. CA 95340</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W203	8/31/2004	Margaret Okuzumi	BayRail Alliance 3921 East Bayshore Rd Palo Alto, CA 94303	<p>Gen: August 31, 2004 Attn: California High-Speed Train Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments 925 L Street, Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814</p> <p>Re:Comments on the DEIR/DEIS for California HSR</p> <p>Dear High Speed Rail EIR/EIS Staff: BayRail Alliance wishes to submit the following comments on the draft EIR/EIS for California High Speed Rail. These are in addition to comments that we have made orally at public hearings on the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>We would very much like to see HSR built. Two years ago we organized a community forum on California HSR with the help of the HSRA, the Mineta Transportation Institute and a number of industry partners. We believe that HSR is necessary for California's transportation future, and that it would provide great environmental and economic benefits for our state.</p> <p>Now, two years have passed, and we are greatly disappointed to see what was presented in the DEIS/EIR. We believe that the draft needs substantial work and revision to provide information that is needed for the</p>	W203-1	<p>See responses to Comment Letter 0050.</p> <p>This (W203) is a repeated Comment Letter.</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>project to proceed. As it stands, the document is problematic and will not withstand any legal challenge. It lacks the support of a number of groups who support the concept of HSR, such as the Sierra Club, the Planning and Conservation League, the Train Riders Association of California, the Committee for Green Foothills and many other environmental groups.</p> <p>While there are a great many words in this document, perhaps the most appropriate adjective for it is "vague". In particular, we were disappointed at the light treatment that the Altamont Pass alternative received in the draft document. The explanations given for its alleged inferiority as compared to say, the Pacheco routing, are unconvincing even for those who are not strongly in favor of the Altamont routing, and almost no data is given to back up its assertions.</p> <p>Furthermore, the operating characteristics of the Altamont alternative are mischaracterized in this draft document, and then attacked as inferior. We'd like to see the operating characteristics properly described and analyzed. For example, the Altamont proposal, as long advocated for by its proponents, doesn't call for a "three-way split", but for trains to go in a two-</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>way split to San Francisco and San Jose. Travelers to Oakland would transfer to BART to reach Oakland under this scenario. So the modeling data given in Table 2.6-4 is misleading and meaningless. Additionally, we believe that most travelers would be traveling to San Francisco, not to San Francisco and San Jose equally. But no origin-destination projections are given for any city pairs in this draft document. This information needs to be provided. By artificially imposing the same number of trains to go to San Francisco and San Jose instead of basing the split on projected demand, the modeling results are seemingly rigged to produce a less favorable outcome for the Altamont routing.</p> <p>We ask that you work with long-time HSR proponents like Michael Kiesling of Architecture 21 and TRAC to describe the Altamont Alternative more accurately. We understand that the Altamont routing was actually the preferred alternative in an earlier HSR study, so the strenuous objection to studying it in the DEIR seems odd, especially when you acknowledge in your draft report that it may be significantly cheaper and faster than other alternatives.</p> <p>We are further disturbed at the unequal</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>treatment and level of scrutiny the routes received in the "Reason for Elimination" Table 2.6-3. For example, the Altamont route is given a poor rating for environment, yet the Pacheco pass route would impact many more acres of wetlands and important birding areas.</p> <p>We understand that the Audubon Society is open to the notion of rebuilding the Dumbarton Rail bridge and for HSR to provide mitigations for that along the Bay, and would prefer that to significant impacts to the wetlands along the Pacheco route. Also, we have heard that very few tall ships would need to pass the Dumbarton rail bridge, only on the order of once or twice a year and always with plenty of notice. Perhaps a lower rail bridge that is designed to open for ships twice a year would be a cost-effective alternative. In any case, the magnitude of the environmental impacts of the Altamont routing on San Francisco Bay wetlands are not discussed in much detail in your draft document to justify the elimination of this route in favor of the Pacheco route.</p> <p>The poor ratings given to Altamont for Revenue/Ridership and Connectivity/Accessibility seem equally implausible. because the Altamont</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>corridor is much more heavily populated and congested at present as compared to the Pacheco corridor.</p> <p>We think it is likely that the Altamont routing would provide greater revenues to HSR initially. Again, we ask that projected origin-destination data be presented in the draft DEIR/DEIS. No information is presented in the draft DEIR/DEIS to indicate what ridership from San Francisco and San Jose would be lost if the Pacheco route, rather than the Altamont route, is selected. We ask that the Altamont alternative be analyzed fairly with full data given for expected ridership and travel times between city pairs.</p> <p>Our organization has a significant presence in the south bay. We do feel that San Jose riders would have a better, more appealing travel experience with San Jose becoming a terminus as compared to being a "pass-through" city for HSR. Instead of having to leap onto trains that are perhaps already 2/3 full with travelers from San Francisco, San Jose riders could enjoy having empty trains waiting for them at the station, to be filled mostly with riders from San Jose.</p> <p>We note that a number of cities along the Peninsula have concerns about the impacts of HSR on their cities which</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>can be reduced through an Altamont, rather than a Pacheco routing. Finally, there are issues with train capacity at San Jose and San Francisco stations that are not considered. San Francisco will not have the physical capacity to be the terminus for all HSR trains, nor do we believe that it is necessary for it be so.</p> <p>Please revise and recirculate the DEIR so that it fully considers the Altamont Pass Alternative. By fighting a fair assessment of the Altamont routing, the Authority has lost many friends of the project and decreased the chances of HSR ever winning a bond measure or being built. We hope that the HSRA EIR team will listen to these community voices and rectify this situation so that the project will have a chance to succeed.</p> <p>Sincerely, Margaret Okuzumi Executive Director BayRail Alliance</p>		
W204	8/31/2004	Joan Spencer, Respiratory Therapist	7195 Yorktown Dr. Gilroy, CA 95020	I feel that the Bullet train project is a travesty. It should not be allowed through our protected park area. Our air quality is bad enough. We will be stepping in the wrong direction if we put into service a system of transportation. which utilizes fossil	W204-1	Acknowledged. The Authority has adopted objectives to minimize the impacts on natural resources such as parklands (see objectives listed in the Program EIR/EIS, page 2-9). The Program EIR/EIS describes how the HST Alternative would reduce

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				fuels.		consumption of fossil fuels compared to the alternatives and would contribute to improved air quality (please see sections 3.5 and 3.3).
W205	8/31/2004	Rudyard Clark, G I S Technician	13309 Traub Ave Los Angeles, CA 90059	The centerline of State Freeway 99 should be used as much as possible for the proposed north / south alignment of the project; for the sake of minimizing various impacts such as costs, and improving public safety and allowing maximum speeds.	W205-1	The UPRR alignment through the Central Valley is predominately adjacent to State Route 99 (SR 99) and was one of the options carried forward throughout the Draft Program EIR/EIS. The centerline of SR 99 is not a feasible option for HST service, since there is often not enough room in the median, the curves of SR 99 would not permit continuous high-speed operations, and the many highway overcrossings of SR 99 would force costly, high aerial structure configurations. The Authority has identified the UPRR alignment (along SR 99) as the preferred alignment between Sacramento and Stockton and through the City of Fresno, but has identified the BNSF alignment option between Stockton and Bakersfield. Please see standard responses 6.12.1, 6.13.1, 6.14.1, & 6.15.4.
W206	8/31/2004	Michael Katz	2835 Buena Vista Way Berkeley, CA 94708	This comment also applies to Sections 3.1 (Traffic & Circulation), 3.2 (Travel Conditions), 3.3 (Air Quality), and 3.5 (Energy):	W206-1	The Authority considered but rejected Modal Alternatives which focused on conventional rail improvements or as part of the

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>I believe that the "Modal Alternative" analyzed in this EIR/EIS is not pertinent to the proposed HST Alternative, and is therefore deficient. I urge the HSRA to repeat the analysis using a more realistic definition of the Modal Alternative. This definition would omit or minimize the highway and aviation capacity expansions analyzed in the draft EIR/EIS, while focusing on feasible and incremental improvements to the state's "conventional" rail system: Provide more direct trips and direct connections; eliminate the current need for bus transfers; and make incremental reductions in travel times through trackbed, routing, and operational improvements, on a regional and/or national (Amtrak) basis. I believe that such a realistic Modal Alternative would score better than the No Project Alternative, and would score competitively with the HST Alternative, in Sections 3.1 (Traffic & Circulation), 3.2 (Travel Conditions), 3.3 (Air Quality), and 3.5 (Energy).</p>		<p>development of the Modal Alternative because these alternatives would not provide or assist in providing a competitive option to satisfy much of the representative demand that the Modal Alternative is designed to meet and would not meet the purpose and need of the proposed system. Please see section 2.5.1 of the Program EIR/EIS.</p>
				<p>I urge decisionmakers to adopt the No Project Alternative, which (based on the EIR/EIS analysis) shows lower Noise & Vibration impacts than the HST Alternative. I also believe that a more realistically defined Modal Alternative (omitting or minimizing highway and</p>	<p>W206-2</p>	<p>Acknowledged. Please see the Summary of the Draft Program EIR/EIS for the rationale for selecting the HST Alternative as the preferred alternative.</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				aviation capacity expansions, and focusing on incremental and feasible improvements to "conventional" rail) would score better than the HST Alternative on this criterion.		
				I believe that this section [3.7] fails to adequately capture two equity impacts of the proposed HST Alternative: (A) Geographic equity: The HST Alternative would likely cause a significant shift of jobs (whether existing or new) from the state's established coastal urban centers to lower-cost locations in the Central Valley. However, the HST Alternative would be subsidized by contributions from the state's whole population, which is currently concentrated in those coastal cities. This means that much of the state's population would effectively (and unfairly) be taxed to export their jobs, or future job opportunities, to the Central Valley.	W206-3	Please see Chapter 5 "Economic Growth and Related Impacts" of the Draft Program EIR/EIS. The Authority's analysis concludes that there would not be "a significant shift of jobs". The proposed HST system would serve California's major metropolitan areas – including the major coastal populations of San Francisco Bay Area, Los Angeles Metropolitan Area, Orange County and San Diego.
				(B) The only feasible funding mechanism that I have heard presented for the HST Alternative is an increase of at least one cent in the statewide sales tax. All sales taxes are regressive, so the state's most economically vulnerable residents would be unduly (and unfairly) taxed to export their jobs or job opportunities	W206-4	Financing plans are not included in this program EIR/EIS process. As part of its June 2000 Business Plan, the Authority considered but <u>rejected</u> recommending a HST funding plan that was based on a ¼ of a cent statewide sales tax for the consideration of the Governor and Legislature. The Governor and

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				from established coastal cities to the Central Valley. Furthermore, California's sales tax is already punitively high -- the highest in the nation. Californians pay near-European sales-tax rates, but compared to Western Europeans, receive inferior and declining public services. In particular, Californians certainly do not receive the universally guaranteed health insurance that European Value Added Taxes help support. Further increases in California's already high sales-tax rate could harm the state's economy in ways not adequately analyzed in the draft EIR/EIS -- by reducing aggregate in-state economic demand; by crowding out municipalities' and counties' sales-tax needs; and/or by driving more demand and more economic activity out of state (for example, via Web-based purchases) or into the underground economy.		Legislature have placed a bond measure (SB1169) on the November 2006 ballot that would provide \$9 billion towards the construction of HST in California and \$1 billion for improvements to other existing conventional rail services which compliment and provide feeder service to the HST system.
				I urge decisionmakers to adopt the No Project Alternative, which (based on the EIR/EIS analysis) shows lower Agricultural Resources impacts than the HST Alternative. I also believe that a more realistically defined Modal Alternative (omitting or minimizing highway and aviation capacity expansions, and focusing on incremental and feasible improvements	W206-5	Acknowledged. Please see the Summary of the Final Program EIR/EIS for the rationale for selecting the HST Alternative as the preferred alternative. Please also see previous responses W206-1, and W206-3. The Authority acknowledges but disagrees with your comments relating to capital costs. Please see Chapter 4 of the

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>to “conventional” rail) would score better than the HST Alternative on this criterion.</p> <p>In particular, I would emphasize that the HST Alternative seems likely to fuel a development boom in the Central Valley: In response to new faster rail connections, jobs and residents (whether new or existing) would shift from the state’s established urban centers near the coast to lower-cost Central Valley communities. This is likely to cause large-scale conversion of prime farmland to urban uses. That conversion would be a highly undesirable misuse of resources: the Central Valley’s prime farmland is some of the most productive in the world, and prime farmland is permanently lost once its fertile topsoil is cleared.</p> <p>I urge decisionmakers to adopt the No Project Alternative, which (based on the EIR/EIS analysis) shows lower Aesthetics & Visual Resources impacts than the HST Alternative. I also believe that a more realistically defined Modal Alternative (omitting or minimizing highway and aviation capacity expansions, and focusing on incremental and feasible improvements to “conventional” rail) would score better than the HST Alternative on this criterion.</p>		<p>Program EIR/EIS, supporting appendices, and technical reports for the capital cost assumptions as well as the Authority’s Corridor Evaluation Report from 1999. The capital cost estimates draw upon years of HST investigation in California, construction experience within California, and the experience of HST systems worldwide. The Program EIR/EIS concluded that the No Project Alternative would result in slightly more urban area growth than the HST Alternative (please see Chapter 5 of the Program EIR/EIS). 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
				<p>I urge decisionmakers to adopt the No Project Alternative, which (based on the EIR/EIS analysis) shows lower Cultural/Paleontological Resources impacts than the HST Alternative. I also believe that a more realistically defined Modal Alternative (omitting or minimizing highway and aviation capacity expansions, and focusing on incremental and feasible improvements to "conventional" rail) would score better than the HST Alternative on this criterion.</p> <p>I urge decisionmakers to adopt the No Project Alternative, which (based on the EIR/EIS analysis) shows lower Hydrology & Water Resources impacts than the HST Alternative. I also believe that a more realistically defined Modal Alternative (omitting or minimizing highway and aviation capacity expansions, and focusing on incremental and feasible improvements to "conventional" rail) would score better than the HST Alternative on this criterion.</p> <p>I urge decisionmakers to adopt the No Project Alternative, which (based on the EIR/EIS analysis) shows lower Biological Resources & Wetlands impacts than the HST Alternative. I also believe that a more realistically defined Modal Alternative (omitting or</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>minimizing highway and aviation capacity expansions, and focusing on incremental and feasible improvements to "conventional" rail) would score better than the HST Alternative on this criterion.</p> <p>I urge decisionmakers to adopt the No Project Alternative, which (based on the EIR/EIS analysis) shows lower Parks and Recreation impacts than the HST Alternative. I also believe that a more realistically defined Modal Alternative (omitting or minimizing highway and aviation capacity expansions, and focusing on incremental and feasible improvements to "conventional" rail) would score better than the HST Alternative on this criterion.</p> <p>I urge decisionmakers to adopt the No Project Alternative, which (based on the EIR/EIS analysis) shows lower Visual Aesthetics and Farmland impacts than the HST Alternative. I also believe that a more realistically defined Modal Alternative (omitting or minimizing highway and aviation capacity expansions, and focusing on incremental and feasible improvements to "conventional" rail) would score better than the HST Alternative in cumulative impacts, and would likely score better than the No Project</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>alternative (and than the analyzed Modal Alternative) in Air Quality, Land Use, and Hydrology impacts.</p> <p>I believe that the HST Alternative's costs are not realistically estimated. Given the typical cost overruns observed in other large engineering projects in California (such as the Bay Bridge seismic reinforcement project), these estimates should be multiplied by a factor of at least five or six, to realistically project the likely cost to taxpayers.</p> <p>I urge decisionmakers to adopt the No Project Alternative, which (based on the EIR/EIS analysis) shows less expansion of urban areas -- that is, less sprawl -- than the HST or Modal Alternative.</p>		
				<p>For the Oakland to San Jose alignment, I strongly urge:</p> <p>(1) A direct connection from Southern California, not a "spur" with a required transfer. Any transfer requirements would sharply reduce the time and convenience benefits of the proposed HST system.</p> <p>(2) Select the "Hayward Line to I-880" alternative. This alternative offers shorter travel times, increased ridership, and less impacts on ecologically fragile areas than the</p>	W206-6	<p>The Authority has recommended a direct connection to Oakland as part of the preferred HST alignment. The Authority has identified the Hayward Line to I-880 alignment option as preferred between Oakland and San Jose.</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				"Hayward/Niles/Mulford Line" alternative.		
W207	8/31/2004	Georgia & Joseph Stern	6870 Holsclaw Rd Gilroy, CA 95020	The maps we were given for the proposed routes in the Gilroy area are at least 30 years old. We know this because buildings that have not existed for 30 years are shown on the maps and our house as well as many other homes and buildings in our area that have been built more recently (our home is 20+ years old) are not shown. We assume that the estimated cost of this project is based on the maps we received. Obviously, since the maps are not current and our Gilroy area has seen tremendous growth in the last 30 years, how accurate are the cost estimates for this project?	W207-1	The capital cost estimates are based on the definition of the alternatives and on quantities derived from current geographic databases through the use of geographic information systems. Costs were not based on the same maps used to illustrate the referenced alignment options for various graphical purposes in the Program EIR/EIS. Right of way (property costs) were specifically based on recent (typically year 2000 or newer) existing land use data contained in available databases from local land use agencies.
				It is obvious that the proponents of this high speed rail are trying to make the system more appealing to the constituency by including many "stops" that are not really in the best interest of the "high speed" idea.	W207-2	Please see standard response 2.31.4.
				Considering that the majority of growth outside the immediate bay area is directly west of Oakland, why isn't the route through the Altamont Pass being considered? This route is the most direct and would service the most people. Having traveled in Europe and used their bullet trains. the proposed	W207-3	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
				system for a high-speed rail alternative falls far short of the ideal and should be revised.		
				1. In order for a high-speed train system to be effective, there must be an infrastructure in place to support the commuters that will be arriving and departing via the high-speed train. Such an infrastructure exists, at least marginally, in the immediate bay area (BART, Valley transit etc.) No such support system exists in the south county and would need to be constructed in conjunction with the high speed rail in order for it be a feasible alternative to our existing highways and rail service. This aspect has not been addressed in the public forum nor has it been planned for. The costs of building infrastructure to support this rail system would be significant. How are you addressing these issues?	W207-4	The Authority and the FRA respectfully disagree with your assessment. The detailed forecasts for HST ridership and revenue were done that did not assume the implementation of infrastructure to "support the commuters that will be arriving and departing via the high-speed train". Please also see standard response 2.1.2 in regards to the HST ridership and revenue forecasts. Please see standard response 2.1.12 in regards to the selection of multi-modal HST stations.
				2. Since the infrastructure needed for the commuters using this high-speed alternative exists to a larger degree in the immediate bay area, why are you not considering the Altamont Pass route? The south county is the only area in our larger bay area, which still has an existing agricultural base. Using the	W207-5	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>proposed routes through the south county would encourage more urban sprawl and jeopardize the already struggling agricultural base. The Altamont Pass route would eliminate this problem. Why are you not considering the Altamont Pass route?</p> <p>Using the proposed routes through the south county would encourage more urban sprawl and jeopardize existing open space necessary for many species currently listed on the endangered list. The Altamont Pass route would eliminate this problem. Why are you not considering the Altamont Pass route?</p>		
W208	8/31/2004	Wilma Wheeler	P.O. Box 3208 Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546	I support high speed rail in California. High Speed rail is already available and used consistently in Europe. It is time we developed a system here. It would save commute time and be cleaner for our air. It should be developed as soon as possible.	W208-1	Acknowledged.
W209	8/31/2004	Marcel Cary, Software Developer	409C Cork Harbour Circle Redwood City, CA 94065	<p>August 31, 2004</p> <p>Mr. Dan Leavitt Deputy Directory California High Speed Rail Authority 925 L St., Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814</p>	W209-1	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. Leavitt:</p> <p>As citizens of California and frequenters of our local State Parks, we are deeply concerned that the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS focuses heavily on possible train routes through Henry Coe State Park and does not include more alternatives that locate the route within existing transportation corridors.</p> <p>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. This omission is especially serious and prominent given that 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 		

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, Marcel M. Cary Heather O'Hara 409C Cork Harbour Circle Redwood City, CA 94065</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W210	8/31/2004	Heather O'Hara, Land Assistant	409C Cork Harbour Circle Redwood City, CA 94065	<p>August 31, 2004</p> <p>Mr. Dan Leavitt Deputy Directory California High Speed Rail Authority 925 L St., Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814</p> <p>Dear Mr. Leavitt:</p> <p>As citizens of California and frequenters of our local State Parks, we are deeply concerned that the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS focuses heavily on possible train routes through Henry Coe State Park and does not include more alternatives that locate the route within existing transportation corridors.</p>	W210-1	Please see standard response 6.3.1.
				<p>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. This omission is especially serious and prominent given that 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.</p>	W210-2	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
				Heather O'Hara Marcel M. Cary 409C Cork Harbour Circle Redwood City, CA 94065		
W211	8/31/2004	Darrell Clarke	339 10th Street Santa Monica, CA 90402	<p>High Speed Rail is very important for California's future mobility. For it to succeed -- to gain the necessary public support -- there must be confidence by key stakeholders and the broader public that it is the right project, and that all appropriate alternatives were properly evaluated.</p> <p>This is also what the California Environmental Quality Act requires. The Center for Transportation Excellence sponsored a conference on passing transportation ballot measures, in Tempe, Arizona, December 7-9, 2003 (see www.cfte.org). Their vivid message was that broad participation by public stakeholders is critical to building the necessary voter support.</p> <p>The effort to pass bonds for High Speed Rail logically begins with its natural supporters, especially environmentalists and rail transit supporters.</p> <p>Thus, the Altamont route alternative must be comprehensively studied, to meet both CEQA's requirements and public stakeholders' expectations, if California is to get High Speed Rail.</p>	W211-1	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
				Darrell Clarke Co-Chair, Friends 4 Expo Transit City of Santa Monica Planning Commission and former Chair (titles for identification)		
W212	8/31/2004	Susan Voss	6860 Holsclaw Road Gilroy, CA 95020	<p>The social justice section needs to be amended to comment on the loss of sustainable agricultural lands that will result from further subdivision of properties, particularly in the Gilroy Bypass section. The social justice section also needs to comment on the injustice to property owners in the Gilroy Bypass section who will be left with non-viable agricultural land that is restricted to agricultural uses.</p> <p>The maps currently available for public viewing in the Gilroy Bypass section are at least 30 years old since they incorporate buildings that have been gone for at least that long. Any cost analyses that are based on these project maps will be fatally flawed since they do not show later developments.</p>	W212-1	Please see the response to W212-3 below.
				In the Executive Summary it notes that the Altamont Pass alternative has been scraped largely because of the cost and routing issues. Why wasn't the Altamont Pass route considered with a terminus at Oakland? BART provides a viable link to San Francisco, bus and	W212-2	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>ferry lines could bring passengers into San Francisco and major markets could still be served. Local politicians might scream about being excluded, but this is a cost alternative that should be considered. A major impairment to the entire project that is never discussed is the lack of convenient supporting infrastructure, particularly in some areas. In the Santa Clara Valley mass transit is not a viable alternative to the automobile because schedules and routes between buses, trains, and trolleys are not synchronized to promote efficient travel. Infrastructure needs to be measured by the extent and efficiency that it serves the populace not by its mere presence and road miles. Without an efficient supporting infrastructure, the bullet train project will be under utilized and California’s citizens will be paying for a frighteningly costly project without a hope of any real cost benefit.</p>		
				<p>The basic premise that underlies the entire impact report on the agricultural section is false, and it invalidates the conclusions and statements reached in that section. The author states on page 3 of Chapter 3 that “ ... potential impact was limited to the geographic extent of the area needed for improvements only with no extra area</p>	<p>W212-3</p>	<p>Further quantification of the loss of agricultural land that will result from subdivision of properties and the loss of viable, sustainable agricultural acreage is beyond the scope of this program EIR/EIS process. The Agricultural Lands section of the Draft Program EIR/EIS states “For purposes of this discussion, farmland</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>surrounding them.” In other words only the land within the right of way needed for construction was considered. This area is defined as potentially varying from 50 to 100 feet. This premise totally ignores the impact of the subdivision of agricultural properties and areas, and its impact on the loss of economically viable and sustainable agricultural lands.</p> <p>The Gilroy Bypass route is a prime example of a failure to account for the impact of subdivision of agricultural lands. Land in the Gilroy Bypass alternative is owned in parcels of usually less than 40 acres. In the Gilroy Bypass area east of the 101 Highway and not within the potential industrial development area of Gilroy, local farmers rent many small contiguous land parcels which they manage as an integral unit. The ability to farm contiguous parcels is key to sustainable agricultural in the Gilroy Bypass area since it allows for economies of scale and the ability to compete at lower competitive cost levels much like the Central Valley farmers. High speed railroad tracks and its right of way will: subdivide properties, carve up the large sustainable agricultural areas into smaller, non contiguous areas, increase</p>		<p>severance is defined as the division of one farmland parcel into two or more areas of operation by the placement of a barrier (in this case a rail line) through the parcel. Potential severance locations are discussed qualitatively, not quantitatively, in this program-level document. Parcel-specific information is not considered in this program-level analysis.” (Section 3.8.1B of the Final Program EIR/EIS) Potential farmland conversion and severance impacts would be addressed further in subsequent project-level documents. Please refer to Chapter 5 “Economic Growth and Related Impacts”, Section 5.4.7 “Farmland and Agriculture for the conclusions for estimates of the potential farmland conversion and loss of agricultural land that will result from growth inducement from the HST and Modal alternatives. Please also see standard response 6.3.1 regarding the HST alignment between San Jose and the Central Valley.</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>farmers' operating costs and discourage, if not end, any opportunity for sustainable agriculture within the Gilroy Bypass area. Farmers and land owners in the area will be left with large weed patches that are restricted to agricultural use without a hope of being able to use the land for viable agricultural.</p> <p>The report needs to address the loss of agricultural land that will result from the subdivision of properties and the loss of viable, sustainable agricultural acreage. This measurement cannot wait for a later comparative analysis of the alternate routes, since failure to perform this analysis now will result in significantly understating the total loss of agricultural lands, particularly in any geographic areas which are characterized by smaller land parcels.</p>		
W213	8/31/2004	Laurie Schwaller	43857 S. Fork Dr. Three Rivers, CA 9327	Please use existing rights of way, avoid Henry Coe State Park, etc.	W213-1	Please see standard response 6.3.1.
W214	9/1/2004	Suri Samson	11320 Entrada Place Los Altos Hills, CA 94024	I feel that building High Speed Rail through Henry Coe State Park and other completely undeveloped, reserved spaces is unacceptable. These places need to be preserved.	W214-1	Please see standard response 6.3.1.
				The biggest problem I have with major alignments of High Speed Rail is the connection between the Bay Area to the Central Valley. The fact that we are	W214-2	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
				not going through the Altamont Pass does not make sense financially (requiring Billions of dollars more in capital expenditures for tunnelling), travelwise (taking significantly more time to travel between the Bay Area and the Sacramento Area), and population-wise (doesn't include enough people through which the corridor passes through, not as many people ride it, doesn't make enough money to cover costs).		
				A second problem I have with the Authority's proposal is with this conventional "non-electric" route from Los Angeles to San Diego via Orange County. Why is this route not electrified? Is this because of pressure from Orange County officials and residents? If that's the real reason, then that's unacceptable for such a small number of wealthy individuals to block the greater good of over 35 million Californians.	W214-3	Please see standard response 2.21.1.
W215	9/1/2004	Michael Kincaid	1643 Edgewood Dr Palo Alto, CA 94303-2821	Please consider the Altamont alignment fully and properly. It is the best solution and balance among competing needs, providing much better service to Sacramento and the East Bay. Though it may offend the political sensibilities of San Jose, it is not operationally impractical and deserves further study.	W215-1	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
W216	9/1/2004	Kristel Wickham, Director of Quality Assurance	1102 Viscaino Ave. Sunnyvale, CA 94086	<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 	W216-1	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>travel times</p> <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, Kristel Wickham</p>		
				<p>Henry Coe State Park should be left intact and not disturbed by a high speed rail project.</p> <p>Destruction of part of Henry Coe State Park is not an acceptable adverse environmental impact in my opinion.</p>	W216-2	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
W217	9/1/2004	T.K. Wang	1465 Avon Park Ter. Los Angeles, CA 90026	<p>High Speed rail should be situated to be close to the most potential users of the system.</p> <p>Track right of way should not go into virgin areas of human development and resource preservation. The Henry Coe State Park is one of these areas. This park is not easily accessible for recreation and the rail line would not put recreation any closer but would damage the ecosystem.</p> <p>Rail alignment close to existing outlying communities will increase the value of these communities and possibly renew such areas.</p>	W217-1	Please see standard response 6.3.1.
W218	9/3/2004	Duane Sherman	891 Post St., #205 San Francisco, CA 94109	I am all for a high speed train connecting northern and southern california. This would reduce the seperation between the two important regions that our economy is based off of. it would promote more travel and hopefully give the state a little bit more income from the success of this project.	W218-1	Acknowledged.
W219	9/6/2004	Laura Cohen	27706 Sinsonte Mission Viejo, CA 92692	<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 Proaram EIR/EIS. As a director of a</p>	W219-1	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>wildlife reserve facing possible destruction due to transportation infrastructure, I want to say how important it is to plan transportation with attention to preserving our natural heritage.</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, Laura Cohen</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W220	7/20/2004	Linda Barbosa	16989 Sorrel Way Morgan Hill, CA 95037	While I agree with the need for highspeed rail transportation I believe some of the route options create too many problems. Routes should not go through parklands. They should follow established routes such as Pacheco Pass or Altamont Pass. This would provide less expense during construction and protect undisturbed parkland.	W084-1	Please see standard response 6.3.1. Please see standard response 2.18.1.

* Before May 17, 2004, the web site recorded the order in which web comments were received but not the date. After May 17, the web site recorded both the order and the date of web comments.