Comment Letter I070

I070

June 1, 2004

RECEIVED JUN 7 2004

Joseph Petrillo, Chair
High Speed Rail Authority
925 L Street, Suite 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Petrillo,

I am writing to state my opposition to the intrusion of the High Speed Rail Line into the Wilderness area of Henry W. Coe State Park.

Violating Coe's wilderness, called the Orestimba Wilderness, is wrong for several reasons:

> This area has been elevated to the status of a State Wilderness in order that it be preserved and protected forever.
>
> A wilderness area provides for the sustenance of a viable gene pool for California plants and animals, many of which could soon be on the verge of becoming endangered because of the pressure from the increasing intrusion of our human population into their habitat.
>
> The presence of a wilderness is essential for human beings. The wilderness experience revives the spirit, allows one to come into harmony with unmanaged, non-human centered systems. This experience will be even more treasured by future generations as the population in the Bay area increases. I070-1
>
> The construction and operation of a rail line whether it be on the surface or through a series of tunnels would be an intrusion that would have a strong negative effect on all of those factors that are important to a wilderness, whether human or ecological.

I urge you to take all the steps necessary to preserve and protect our important Wilderness, and keep the High Speed Rail out of Henry W. Coe State Park.

Yours Sincerely,

Carol A. Frazer

Carol Frazer
17345 Oak Leaf Drive
Morgan Hill, CA 95037

Response to Comments of Carol Frazer, June 1, 2004 (Letter I070)

I070-1

Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Comment Letter I071

I071

June 1, 2004

Joseph Petrillo, Chair
High Speed Rail Authority
925 L Street, Suite 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

RECEIVED
JUN 7 2004

Dear Mr. Petrillo,

I am writing to state my opposition to the intrusion of the High Speed Rail Line into the Wilderness area of Henry W. Coe State Park.

Violating Coe's wilderness, called the Orestimba Wilderness, is wrong for several reasons:

> This area has been elevated to the status of a State Wilderness in order that it be preserved and protected forever.
>
> A wilderness area provides for the sustenance of a viable gene pool for California plants and animals, many of which could soon be on the verge of becoming endangered because of the pressure from the increasing intrusion of our human population into their habitat.
>
> The presence of a wilderness is essential for human beings. The wilderness experience revives the spirit, allows one to come into harmony with unmanaged, non-human centered systems. This experience will be even more treasured by future generations as the population in the Bay area increases. I071-1
>
> The construction and operation of a rail line whether it be on the surface or through a series of tunnels would be an intrusion that would have a strong negative effect on all of those factors that are important to a wilderness, whether human or ecological.

I urge you to take all the steps necessary to preserve and protect our important Wilderness, and keep the High Speed Rail out of Henry W. Coe State Park.

Yours Sincerely,

William Frazer

William Frazer
17345 Oak Leaf Drive
Morgan Hill, CA 95037

Response to Comments of William Frazer, June 1, 2004 (Letter I071)

I071-1

Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Comment Letter I072

I072

June 5, 2004

RECEIVED JUN 7

RECEIVED JUN 7 2004

California High-Speed Rail Authority
925 L Street, Suite 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

To Whom It May Concern:

Please DO NOT continue plans for routing either of two proposed high-speed train routes through the Orestimba Wilderness of Henry W. Coe State Park. I am a frequent visitor to Henry Coe and cherish it for its serene and quiet atmosphere and its integrity as a wilderness area. I often camp there and treasure it as a place to hear coyotes yipping, see boars roaming through the brush and wake to the gobblings of wild turkeys.

I am concerned that parts of the Orestimba Wilderness will be declassified in order to make a train route permissable through that area. The Orestimba wilderness represents 25% of the preserved state wilderness in Northern California. If the Orestimba Wilderness Area is bisected by the high-speed train, that wilderness will cease to exist. I072-1

I am a supporter in general of mass transit and rail travel. However, the cost to the natural world and those humans who turn to it for inspiration is far too high for these routes!! Please consider other routes which will not damage or require declassification of California's remaining Wilderness Areas.

Thank you for considering my thoughts,

Deanna D. Ross

Deanna Ross
598 Van Buren Street #1
Monterey, CA 93940

Response to Comments of Deanne Ross, June 5, 2004 (Letter I072)

I072-1

Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Comment Letter I073

I073

Brenda Andringa
571 Creekside Ln
Morgan Hill, CA 95037

June 9, 2004

JUN 14 2004

California High Speed Rail Authority
925 L Street #1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: High Speed Rail Proposal

Dear Gentlepeople,

I urge you to recommend that no route for this railway include any portion of the Henry Coe State Park. This is a true state treasure. We should not continue to impeed on the only open space left for the first inhabitants of California, the wildlife. In addition, I use the park at least once a month and find that I am never closer to God than I am when I am on the top of a ridge with the wind in my hair and the sun on my face. Please don't take that away from me. Come on down and I'll take you for a horseback ride and show you things that you'll never forget in a lifetime. I073-1

Please recommend that no route include any portion of the Coe State Park.

Thank you.

Brenda Andringa

Response to Comments of Brenda Andringa, June 9, 2004 (Letter I073)

I073-1

Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Comment Letter I074

I074

J. EDWARD HOLLENDER
1323 PHEASANT DRIVE
GILROY, CALIFORNIA 95020
PHONE: 408 842 0538
FAX:408 846 9671
E-MAIL: jader@worldnet.att.net

CE
JUN 14

June 4, 2004

California High-Speed Rail Authority
925 L Street, Suite 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Authority Officers and Members,

I recently learned that you are considering two possible routes through the Diablo range that would pass through Henry Coe State Park. That such routing would be considered through any state park (not legal by the charter for a park, as I understand it) is very disturbing, that the routes through Henry Coe would pass through the Orestimba Wilderness section of the park is almost unbelievable. Surely there are more viable alternatives than disrupting one of the most pristine and beautiful areas of our state. For example, transverse the mountains further south so as to include Salinas in the system or cross the range through the Altamont Pass or the Pacheco Pass (Pacheco being, by far, the least attractive of these three examples from an environmental impact perspective). I074-1

I am a strong advocate of high speed rail. California, as well as other sections of the country would greatly benefit from the implementation of these networks. I do not, however, believe we must destroy on of the few significant pristine and undisturbed areas of our state to secure right-of-way for the high speed rail line. I urge you to drop consideration of the Henry Coe routing and develop more environmentally benign alternatives.

Sincerely,

J. Edward Hollender

Response to Comments of J. Edward Hollender, June 4, 2004 (Letter I074)

I074-1

Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Comment Letter I075

I075

JUN 1 - 2004

4801 Yamato Drive
San Jose, CA 95111
May 26, 2004

California High-Speed Rail Authority
925 L Street, Suit 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

Gentlemen:

On May 24 an op-ed appeared in the San Jose Mercury written by Rod Diridon extolling the notion of a high-speed rail link between Sacramento and San Diego. Mr. Diridon's major concern seemed to be whether San Jose would be on the main route, a rather parochial consideration.

Somehow Mr. Diridon seems determined to reinvent the past. He was deeply involved in the building of a trolley line in San Jose, something that was supposed to fill a transportation need. What the Diridon trolley line has resulted in is trolleys running up and down the tracks with a half dozen people in them. The cost of the system is borne by the taxpayers of the valley.

California grew up with the automobile. It's no accident that cities are sprawling. People like that. It's no accident that there are shopping centers with massive parking areas. People like that. European cities are very different from those of the west. They are compact, and high rise. Big cities in the east are also compact and well suited to rapid transit on rail lines. A bullet train would be ideal on a route between Boston and Washington, DC. But it hasn't been built yet. I075-1

So to Mr. Diridon's op-ed. First he says that the authority has "invested" so far nearly thirty million dollars. I would choose another word, maybe like spent or squandered. Then he projects that the population of the state will double by 2040. That's half a lifetime and I sincerely question whether anyone can project that far out. And if it is does happen we can build a line then. Finally Mr. Diridon concludes with the statement that "every industrialized country in the world has or is building a high-speed train system" I'm concerned with what he has been smoking. I know of only three high-speed trains. And Mr. Diridon might take a trip to England and find that country wouldn't build a high speed connection between the Chunnel and London.

Sincerely,

Charles Prevost

Response to Comments of Charles Prevost, May 26, 2004 (Letter I075)

I075-1

Please see standard response 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 in regards to the HST ridership and revenue forecasts and the viability of HST service in California. The Acela service on the Northeast Corridor achieves speeds of up to 150 mph between Boston and Washington D.C. and is considered to be a "high-speed" rail service. Population projections used for the Program EIR/EIS and supporting technical studies are Department of Finance projections, the co-lead agencies believe that these projections are very credible. In regards to HST systems, please see standard response 2.12.2. It should further be noted that England recently opened the first segment of its new HST link between the "Chunnel" and London, the remaining segment is under construction.

Comment Letter I076

I076

Oakland, CA
June 14, 2004

JUN 16 2004

Dear Representative of the California High Speed Rail Authority,

I am probably one of the few people writing to you who has actually been in the Orestimba Wilderness. I've hiked through different parts of this wilderness perhaps 15 to 20 times – most recently on June 3 (2004) after I had backpacked the previous day into nearby Mississippi Lake from Henry Coe State Park headquarters. My day hike on June 3 took me through the Robinson Creek area, which aligns with part of one proposed high-speed rail route, then up the Pinto Creek Trail and into the higher ground of the Mt. Stakes region. My 26.5 mile round trip hike, true to past year's hikes, proved to be a mix of adventure and misadventure. I can always count on one or the other, or both, in the Orestimba Wilderness. Fabulous wildlife, solitude, heat, difficult terrain, poison oak, flies, sometimes a swim, thirst, cramps, and too many miles are always, in some combination, part of the bargain in there.

The idea of a high-speed route from Los Angeles into the Bay Area is one I support, but I urge you to put this route through the Pacheco Pass area (or over the Altamont Pass), where the land is already somewhat developed and where you would avoid impacting such as wonderful place as the Orestimba Wilderness. A rail line through the wilderness (and the roads needed to service this rail line) would make it a non-wilderness; the train noise, the above ground portions of track, and the greater vehicular access to the area would have substantial transforming effects. Even a route just to the north of Henry Coe State Park, though a better choice than through the park, would not be the best option because chances are good that some of this land will be added to the park in the coming years. I076-1

Relatively few people use the Orestimba Wilderness (though an awful lot of wildlife does), so the obvious benefits to humans seem small. Still, I think the proximity of large tracts of wild land appeals greatly to Bay Area residents, and their votes on a variety of parkland bonds and initiatives over the past several years seem to support this idea. The argument really comes down to a question of whether or not this wilderness is worth preserving intact for itself. I believe it is, and I think many Bay Area residents would agree with me.

Thanks very much for taking the time to read this letter.

Sincerely,

Thomas Ford

Thomas Ford

Response to Comments of Thomas Ford, June 14, 2004 (Letter I076)

I076-1

Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Comment Letter I077

I077

the blues

JUN 17 2004

June 12, 2004

Dear High-Speed Rail Authority:

Recently my wife and I camped for several nights in Henry W. Coe State Park. What a wonderful wilderness. It is very fortunate and we are very thankful that people with foresight have set aside land to remain as wilderness. We live in the San Francisco Bay Area and we benefit from many groups, including State government that continues to work towards the preservation of natural lands.

We understand that two of the four proposed rail alignments now under consideration for connecting Los Angeles to San Jose and San Francisco transect the Wilderness Area in Henry W. Coe State Park, despite the fact that State Law currently prohibits mechanized travel within State Wilderness Areas. I077-1

We feel firmly that we can not, must not, allow the High-Speed Rail system to transect the wilderness area of Henry W. Coe Park. Such a system should be aligned within existing transportation corridors.

Please ensure that this encroachment on exiting wilderness areas does not take place.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Brian & Ann Blue

the blues • 1583 St. Helena Drive • Danville, CA 94526
bebluc@pacbell.net

Response to Comments of Brian and Ann Blue, June 12, 2004 (Letter I077)

I077-1

Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Comment Letter I078

I078

JUN 17 2004

Dear Sirs,

The DEIR for the proposed state High Speed Rail ~~are~~ is insufficient. I am especially concerned about the threats to Henry Coe State Park and the undeveloped lands throughout Mount Hamilton area I078-1

More environmental representatives should be consulted. There should be a watchdog committee. Thank you Linda Nicolls

Response to Comments of Linda Nicoleto, June 17, 2004 (Letter I078)

I078-1

Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Comment Letter I079

I079

June 20, 2004

RECEIVED JUN 22 2004

Joseph Petrill, Chair
High Speed Rail Authority
925 L Street, Suite 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Chairman Petrill,

High Speed Rail, as a mode of transportation between Sacramento, the Bay Area, Los Angeles and San Diago is worthy of serious study. But I strongly suggest that no High Speed Rail corridor be selected going through State Park or Wilderness lands. Impacts upon these lands cannot be mitigated and a High Speed Rail program cannot afford the value placed upon their integrity. If a pan-park or pan-wilderness corridor is selected as a preferred option, I will shift my support away from High Speed Rail and support its opposition.

Having reviewed the High Speed Rail study's Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), I find myself in agreement with its finding that the High Speed Rail option is the "preferred system alternative". However, the DEIR as written is not adequate for selection of a preferred route passage corridor and station selection. I therefor call for a revision of the DEIR and its re-circulation for public comment. We have time to do this right; but if we proceed with a flawed basis for the expenditure of 30+ Billion dollars, we run the very real risk of having the entire idea of High Speed Rail terminated. I offer the following pointed and hopefully constructive criticism of the DEIR for use in DEIR revision. I079-1

1) Altmount Pass Corridor Should be a Considered Option

The DEIR considered a down-selected list of 5 corridor options for connecting the Bay Area to the Central Valley. However, it is flawed in its omission of the Altmount Pass corridor as an option and this omission should be rectified in a DEIR revision. I read the DEIR's justification for this act but do not accept its validity. According to the DEIR, section S.3, "The system should maximize the use of existing transportation corridors...". It is obvious that the Altmount Pass corridor meets this objective better than the three "Diablo Range Direct" options being considered by the DEIR which punch virgin corridors through the Diablo Range. This issue was not acknowledged in the DEIR. However, the DEIR did acknowledge that the Altmount Pass corridor would cost the least. Indeed, more was said about the Altmount Pass corridor than any of the 5 Bay Area to Central Valley options actually under consideration. I079-2

Yes, the Altmount pass corridor has its short-comings; so do all 5 Bay Area to Central Valley options officially under consideration. The DEIR identified no technical obstacle to the Altmount Pass corridor; rather it sited a prediction of reduced ridership as justification for its disqualification for further study. Why is it OK to consider a corridor that punches through a State Wilderness but it's not OK to consider alternative that is probably cheaper, will not harm Wilderness but may result in reduced ridership? The DEIR's disqualification of the Altmount Pass corridor appears to be a value judgement not worthy of a serious study and contrary to the public review process.

2) Station Specific Urban Growth Potential and Associated Impacts

Regarding the impact of urban growth, a revised DEIR should quantify the acreage that would be developed at individual station stops as a result of high speed rail. The impacts of this acreage should then be quantified in terms of loss to biological, water, clean air and visual resources.

As currently written, the DEIR fails to list station specific growth impacts. Instead it makes a general claim that there is a low potential for impact upon acres of urbanized land required. It quantified an example in the Bay Area by stating "the stations at Los Banos and Gilroy are forecast to attract a small amount of urbanized acreage (0.5%) away from traditional urban centers in Santa Clara, Sacramento and Sanisslaus Counties". I079-3

This assessment is fundamentally flawed; because the issue should be the number of acres developed in a far flung station like Los Banos or Gilroy. The DEIR's focus upon land not developed in current urban centers misses the point. For starters, an acre of land not developed in a current urban center would translate into a greater number of acres developed in the far flung location where land costs are less. For another, an acre developed in a far flung location incurs far greater costs to the environment and government budgets for infrastructure development.

Even if we accept the estimate that 0.5% of the current urban center land mass that would be displaced to far flung locations, that is still a very large number of acres. A revised DEIR should list total acreage affected, not percentages of current urban center acreage as a gauge of impact. As currently written, the DEIR appears to be evading the issue by using improper measures.

3) Corridor and Station Specific Impacts not Evaluated and Cannot Support a Preferred Option Selection.

For all corridor options, the DEIR fails to discuss, qualify or quantify environmental impacts. It is not adequate to simply name an environmental impact. For example, the DEIR stated that the two Diablo Range routes would have a visual impact caused by their passage through the State's Orestimba Wilderness. That is the extent of the DEIR's review of visual impact to a Wilderness? Again, the DEIR as written does not represent a serious study worthy of such an important decision.

For all Station stops, the DEIR fails to evaluate their individual cost and benefits; and yet we are somehow expected to down-select stations from this study? A down select based upon so little information would not serve the public as it would have to be based upon uninformed and personal bias. . I079-4

4) The DEIR should evaluate each option's visual impact by quantifying the miles of exposed corridor and place a higher impact factor to those miles within open space and an even higher impact factor to miles within wilderness areas.

5) Tunneling would result in a mountain of rock tailing. What is the fate of this material and would it have a visual impact? The DEIR should account for the rock tailing and quantify the impact of their fate upon visual, biological and water resources.

Comment Letter I079 Continued

6) Tunneling has a history of increasing the rate of water drainage from mountains. In the arid regions of both the Diablo Range and Southern California, a number of threatened species depend upon Mountains for their slow release of water through-out the dry season. Tunneling may impact these species and their habitat. The DEIR must identify these species, their range of habitat. Only then can the revised DEIR quantify the potential impact of specific corridor options.

7) Tunneling would not only expose rock tailing to the elements, it would also expose virgin rock on the inside of mountains and concentrated drainage patterns. Both of these factors serve as vectors for the transport of potentially toxic minerals, salts and acids. The DEIR must identify the compounds released by tunneling, quantify their volume and project their concentration in local streams. The DEIR should then assess the biological impact of tunneling related to such pollutants.

8) Habitat fragmentation is a crucial issue given scant attention in the DEIR. A revised DEIR should identify the habitat and range for species of concern and evaluate corridor option relative to this back-drop.

9) A revised DEIR should evaluate cumulative impact to habitat fragmentation. For example, evaluation of the Pacheco Pass corridor option should assess the cumulative impact to habitat fragmentation caused by the combination of Highway 152 and the High Speed Rail.

I079-4 cont

Sincerely,

Matthew Nahan, Ph.D.
695 Coral Ct.
Los Altos, CA 94024
(408) 742-3927 (Work)

Response to Comments of Matthew Nahan, June 20, 2004 (Letter I079)

I079-1

Please see the preferred HST alignment and station locations as described in the Final Program EIR/EIS (Chapter 6A). The Authority believes that the preferred HST alignment and station locations minimize impacts to State Parks and Wilderness lands.

I079-2

Please see standard response 2.18.1.

I079-3

Quantification of the acreage that would be developed at individual station stops as a result of HST is beyond the scope of a program level document. Should the HST proposal move forward, more detailed project-specific studies will be required. Please also refer to standard response 6.3.1.

I079-4

Environmental analysis was done at a program-level detail, however, the Authority believes that there was sufficient information provided in the Draft Program EIR/EIS to select a preferred alignment and station locations (see comment I079-1 above). Details such as “rock tailing” and “increasing the rate of water drainage from mountains” and “identify the compounds released by tunneling, quantify their volume and project their concentration in streams” is beyond the scope of a program level environmental document. Should the HST proposal move forward, more detailed project-specific studies will be required. Please see standard responses 3.15.3 and 3.15.5 in regards to potential impacts from tunneling on habitat, groundwater and drainage. Please see standard responses 3.15.2, 3.15.3, 3.15.9 and 3.15.13 in regards to habitat fragmentation and the level of detail of the program EIR/EIS process. Please see standard response 3.17.1 in regards to the cumulative impacts analysis.

Comment Letter I080

I080

June 21, '04

attention: California High-Speed Train
Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments
925 L Street, Suite 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Governor Schwarzenegger:

From your past comments we realize that you both value State Parks and support the High-Speed Rail initiative. We suspect you are unaware that some people consider your support for High-Speed rail as a license to run tracks through State Parks and State Wilderness Areas in spite of existing State laws prohibiting such activities in these special lands.

Believe it or not, two of the four proposed rail alignments now under consideration for connecting Los Angeles to San José and San Francisco transect the Wilderness Area in Henry W. Coe State Park, despite the fact that State Law currently prohibits mechanized travel within State Wilderness Areas. I080-1

If you agree that preservation means *"forever"* instead of *"until someone finds another use for it"*, we urge you to do the following:

- Direct Ruth Coleman, Director of Parks and Recreation, to resist non-mission uses within State Parks and State Wilderness Areas.
- Tell the HSRA Board of Directors that you want the High-Speed Rail system implemented without destruction of State Parks and State Wilderness.

Sincerely,

Dennis W. Pinion

Director, Advocates for Coe Park
(May 19, 2004)

Regards,
Fischler

JUN 2 2 2004

Response to Comments of Dennis W. Pinion, June 22, 2004 (Letter I080)

I080-1

Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Comment Letter I081

I081

RECEIVED
JUN 24 2004

149 Forest Hill Drive,
Los Gatos,
CA 95032

Tel. (408) 356-5457
E-mail: mpegler@prtm.com

Joseph E. Petrillo,
Chairman,
California High-Speed Rail Authority,
925 L Street,
Suite 1425,
Sacramento,
CA 95814

May 26th 2004

Re. Transcript of Mike Pegler's comments at the *HSRA Public Hearing* in San Jose

Mr. Petrillo,

Thank you for the opportunity to speak at the *California High Speed Rail Authority* hearing in San Jose on May 26th. As you requested, please find attached the full text of my comments.

Overall, I was encouraged by the number of people speaking in favor of this important project for California. I was disappointed however at the "micro" view that so many speakers took. I believe that this project is desperately needed as we plan for the future but am fearful that it will be stalled as people squabble over the details. Without the high-speed rail network, the "bigger picture" environment will suffer and the quality of life that we enjoy so much will decline significantly. In addition there will be the associated lost opportunities to create jobs, boost the economy, conserve energy, and enhance the free flow of people and goods. I081-1

Fundamentally, I believe that the high-speed rail network needs to minimize the journey times between major cities. If the service is not highly competitive with road and air, on a city-center to city-center basis, then it will not be well used by business travelers and others, and therefore not fully realize the potential benefits of such a system. To achieve this, the design needs to:

- Minimize journey time between locations by taking the most direct routes, but:
  - Avoid crossing designated State parks or wildlife preserves
  - Minimize the use of tunnels due to the speed reductions that they impose
- Minimize the number of intermediate stations, while balancing the needs for large catchment areas
  - Use well-planned and coordinated light rail and other commuter services to provide feeders into and out of the high-speed network

Having seen how effective high-speed networks can be in other countries, I am a huge proponent of the proposed network in California.

Please let me know if you would like me to expand upon any of my comments, or if I can be of further assistance or support to this critical effort for California's continued success. I081-2

Yours sincerely,

Mike Pegler

Attch. Transcript of my comments at May 26 public hearing (assuming no 3-minute limit)

Cc: Rod Diridon, Board Member
Dan Leavitt, Staff Member

Comment Letter I081 Continued

Address at Public Hearing – by Mike Pegler
California High Speed Train Program – Draft EIR/EIS
May 25, 2004

Ladies and Gentlemen,

My name is Mike Pegler – I am a resident and homeowner in the San Jose area. I come before you today as a concerned citizen – representing myself and my family.

I would like to thank the Authority for the opportunity to speak today, and commend everyone involved in the planning and analysis that has been performed to-date.

I would like to provide a brief background on why I feel I am qualified to make comments today, provide a summary of my support, provide details of why I support the proposed Program, and close with some specific comments as you deliberate on the several major design and policy issues now under consideration.

Firstly, my background. I travel extensively, using all three modes of transport addressed in this proposal – air, road, and rail:

- I have flown nearly 150,000 miles over the past 12 months, including over 50 flights between San Jose and San Diego
- I have the privilege of owning an automobile and have driven thousands of miles in California and Europe
- I have traveled by train extensively – including the in the US, the UK, France, and Switzerland

I give you this as background to my comments and my assertion that I can provide an objective view of the proposal being discussed today. Although I am not representing a group here today, I believe that I can offer some unique perspectives, based on my extensive travels – as a business and leisure traveler – but also as someone who believes in preserving the natural wonders of this great State. I081-3

I cut short a business trip to San Diego to be here today. As we boarded our giant flying vacuum cleaner in San Diego (a "regional jet" to use airline parlance), one of my fellow passengers remarked, as he was squeezing into his cramped seat "what species was this designed for?"!

In summary, based on reading the *Summary Draft Program EIR/EIS for the proposed California High-Speed Train System* I am delighted at the proposal and am in favor of proceeding. As one of my client's put it "it's about time – we desperately need it!". I would now like to explain why.

In California today, we enjoy a quality-of-life second-to-none. Without drastic action, this will not be the case for very long:

- Our road infrastructure is under increasing stress, with many inter-city routes at or above design capacity leading to many problems, including:

  - Increased commute times
  - Reduced mobility and reliability
  - Reduced fuel efficiency
  - Increased pollution
- Our airports are at or near capacity – delays, unreliability, and long security lines are becoming a fact-of-life

If no measures are taken to address this problem, we will see a further deterioration in quality-of-life and reduced mobility – something that we all value highly.

High-speed rail can form a key component in the safe and rapid transfer of people and time-sensitive goods to enable the economy to grow and flourish and to improve our quality-of-life.

We are the 5th largest economy behind the US, Japan, Germany, UK, and France. It's interesting to note that, with the exception of the US, all the countries larger than us in economic size, have successful high speed train networks:

- Japan with the *Shinkansen* bullet-trains. Capable of transporting up to 100,000 passengers each day, Shinkansen, offers travelers a fast, frequent, safe and reliable service. There have been no passenger fatalities since Shinkansen services were introduced in 1964 and, on average, trains arrive within 24 seconds of schedule
- Germany with the ICE 174 mph high-speed trains (record 225 mph)
- The UK with 140 mph Intercity 225 express trains and more recently the 186 mph *Eurostar* Channel Tunnel trains
- France with their TGVs – Introduced in 1981, running at normal operating speeds of 186 mph, one set a speed record for 320 mph in 1990. TGVs are so well used that they have had to migrate to double-deck versions to increase capacity of a much-used network. They can even run at up to 138 mph on shared, regular track. The safety record of TGVs has been almost flawless, with no deaths or serious injuries on high speed lines, only a few minor derailments - the same cannot be said for California's road network! I081-3 cont

Overall, I am convinced that the high-speed train system proposed will:

- **Reduce traffic congestion** and the need to expand the current road network
- **Benefit the environment**
  - Although there will be a visual and noise impact on a micro scale, the macro picture is far more favorable – consider two alternatives to move 300 Californians …. 1 train, using electricity generated centrally and distributed to high-efficiency electric motors – the other using 299 cars with their 25% efficient gas engines burning natural resources and polluting as they go
- **Save energy and reduce our dependence on oil** – more important now than ever before
  - I find it staggering (and quite believable) that the energy required per passenger mile for this service is one fifth that of a commuter automobile trip! (and one-half that for an intercity automobile trip)
- **Increase mobility – for us all** – whether using the train or not!
  - If you use the train, you get there quickly

Comment Letter I081 Continued

- If you use your car, you get their quicker too, since the roads are less congested than with if there was no robust rail alternative!
- **Create a significant number of job opportunities** for an extended period
  - Long-term and significant numbers of interim jobs to design and build the network
  - Long-term job opportunities to operate the system

  (Many of which can't be outsourced – a key point in the current economic climate!)
- **Provide a safe, fast, and reliable alternative to air travel**
  - On a per-passenger mile basis, it is twice as safe to travel by rail as road – and far less stressful – enabling would-be drivers, to eat, drink, sleep, or work as the miles fly by I081-3 cont
- **Provide a sound option for business travelers** – providing longer working times, in greater comfort
  - As other countries' experience has shown, high-speed rail can be the business traveler's transport of choice, as long as the journey times are short enough and the end points are close enough to the intended destination
- **Provide a significant project to rally the State around** during tough economic times (akin to the Interstate construction or dam building effort of prior decades)
  - Job creation and economic stimulus alone is compelling, as long of course, as the funds approved by voters really are used for this project, as they intend!

In terms of my specific recommendations, I urge the California HSRA and Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) to consider the following general policy points:

- Learn from other countries, as the planning and implementation continues, where appropriate – leverage proven technologies such as those used in Japan or France I081-4
- Continue with a steel-wheel on steel-rail approach – avoid radical designs such as *maglev* – while they may be superior in the future, this project is too costly and too critical to our State to proceed with high-risk. A 200 mph network is "light years" ahead of where California is today and will offer respectable journey times. French experience has proven that 300 mph+ can be obtained with steel-wheel-on-steel-rail technology
- Rollout the construction and operation in Phases – get something running as soon as possible on routes with projected high demand and high benefit (e.g., San Francisco to Sacramento or San Francisco to Los Angeles)
  - Integrate with existing routes e.g., LOSSAN between LA and San Diego for Phase 1 I081-5
  - Upgrade more of the network to use dedicated, separated tracks as Phase 2
  - Use this initial revenue to continue to fund continued network build-out but get it right first time, and focus on a successful launch – bad press at the outset could be a financial disaster for the project
- Focus on routes that lower journey times – particularly for the longer journeys, but:
  - Do not cross any State Parks or wildlife refuges
  - Minimize tunneling or other major works, where reasonably possible
    - Tunneling increases likelihood of cost over-runs and project cancellation
    - Tunneling also requires a reduction of speed – as the Germans found with their ICE system which has to slow to go through tunnels; the TGVs of France on the other hand do not pass through tunnels on any high-speed sections I081-6
  - Use existing Rights Of Way, where possible, if the above is met, to minimize construction costs and environmental impact

Mike Pegler's Comments before California HSRA Public Hearing *May 25, 2004*

Page 3 of 5

  - When planning for the second generation of TGVs, the projection – which I believe was realized – was that for every minute shaved off the journey time from Paris to Lyon, 100,000 business travelers a year would switch to rail from alternative transportation (primarily air travel). I would imagine that a similar model exists for service between say San Francisco and Los Angeles
- Build the system to be scalable – consider particularly signaling for higher speeds than those initially proposed, so that if higher speeds become technically possible in the future, this network is able to benefit from them (this was one of the challenges that has forced the UK rail network to be slower than the motive power was capable of)
- Ensure that the stations selected are, where possible, in downtown locations
  - One of the key challenges we face in this State are those stations that are "in the middle of no-where" and need a car to get into town I081-6
- Ensure that other forms of transportation interface well at stations, including:
  - Buses
  - Taxis
  - Light rail
  - Rental cars
  - Car parking facilities – with low daily costs for passengers

  (Note: for public transit options, ensure connecting services to maximize the utility of the overall service)
- Ensure that the rolling stock and stations cater for business travelers – for example, ensuring that laptop power is available at all seats

To address the specific major design and policy issues under consideration, here are my thoughts

(*Note: fundamentally I support this project, regardless of the specific details – I believe that the my view of the details is worth sacrificing for the bigger picture; my biggest fear is that many, including environmentalists get so caught up in the local minute impacts, that they loose the big picture, the project stalls, and everyone looses*):

- *Northern Mountain Crossing*
  - Reduce the time between the South Bay and Sacramento and use the "Northern Tunnel" option, but avoid encroaching on any part of the Henry Coe State Park
    - Given one of the key goals of reduced journey time for long-distances, the journey time south to LA and beyond remains relatively unaffected by any of the proposed routes. However, the Pacheco Pass options increase the journey north to Sacramento by some 20 minutes or so. I therefore suggest using Cal Train or similar connected networks to feed riders in from Morgan Hill or Gilroy I081-7
- *Southern Mountain Crossing*
  - Follow the I-5 corridor to make the journey as direct as possible
  - While I applaud the foresight of the Antelope Valley community to be included on the network, the increased journey time may reduce ridership I081-8
  - Consider a connecting service to Antelope Valley
- *Bay Area*
  - Take the more direct I-880 route from San Jose to Oakland and do not cross the Don Edward's SF Bay National Wildlife Refuge I081-9
- *Southern California*

Mike Pegler's Comments before California HSRA Public Hearing *May 25, 2004*

Page 4 of 5

Comment Letter I081 Continued

- Use a dedicated line (i.e., the Union Pacific Railroad Santa Ana Branch) – preferably the same high-speed interconnected electric service as the rest of the network i.e., minimize hassle for the traveler I081-10

- *Shared Use Options*
  - Consider shared use for Phase 1 only
  - Move ultimately to a dedicated network to maximize the benefit (example in the UK of CTRL1 – increasing from limited speed to 186 mph by moving from shared to dedicated) I081-11
- *Link to LAX*
  - If the rail link cannot swing past LAX directly (preferred to maximize convenience e.g., TGVs directly to CDG), then use another transit network (e.g., along the lines of the highly successful *Heathrow Express* from LHR to London city center) – (their slogan - "15 mins every 15 mins") I081-12
- *Station Locations*
  - Ensure that at a minimum, the following stations are included: I081-13
    - Sacramento
    - San Francisco (downtown, including the
    - Trans Bay Terminal)
    - SFO
    - San Jose (Diridion – consider San Jose Airport too and how passengers will get to and from the airport easily)
    - Los Angeles Union Station
    - San Diego
  - Consider dropping Redwood City as a station due to its proximity to Palo Alto; or consider stations at Redwood City and Mountain View I081-14
  - Consider dropping Santa Clara Station due to its proximity to San Jose I081-15
  - Balance remaining stations to assure good stopping schedule and maximizing ridership reach at each station, while maintaining short total trip times
    - Our first trip on the *Amtrak Capital Corridor* was a shock – low speed train coupled with one that seems to stop everywhere, resulting in a 3-hr or so journey time for one which should only take 1.5 hrs by car I081-16

In closing, I would urge that this project proceed with due haste, and that the related initiative remain on the ballot for this November. This is a long-term project with a huge beneficial impact for California. The sooner we can get people to start digging to get this going, the better! I for one, look forward to seeing this great state of California fly by at 200 mph while relaxing or working in a stress-free environment, leaving those who choose to enjoy their cars to fly along at a mere 70 mph on un-congested roads. I081-17

Thank you for your attention.

Mike Pegler's Comments before California HSRA Public Hearing *May 25, 2004*

Page 5 of 5

Response to Comments of Mike Pegler, May 26, 2004 (Letter I081)

I081-1

Acknowledged.

I081-2

Acknowledged.

I081-3 through I081-17

Please see responses to Comments PH-SJ019. Written comments sent are duplicates of the oral comments Mr. Pegler made to the Authority at the San Jose Public Hearing on May 26, 2004.

Comment Letter I082

I082

June 29, 2004

RECEIVED
JUL - 6 2004

California High-Speed Rail Authority
925 L Street, Suite 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

To Whom It May Concern:

Please DO NOT continue plans for routing either of two proposed high-speed train routes through the Orestimba Wilderness of Henry W. Coe State Park. I am a frequent visitor to Henry Coe and cherish it for its serene and quiet atmosphere and its integrity as a wilderness area. I often camp there and treasure it as a place to hear coyotes yipping, see boars roaming through the brush and wake to the gobblings of wild turkeys.

I am concerned that parts of the Orestimba Wilderness will be declassified in order to make a train route permissable through that area. The Orestimba wilderness represents 25% of the preserved state wilderness in Northern California. If the Orestimba Wilderness Area is bisected by the high-speed train, that wilderness will cease to exist. I082-1

I am a supporter in general of mass transit and rail travel. However, the cost to the natural world and those humans who turn to it for inspiration is far too high for these routes!! Please consider other routes which will not damage or require declassification of California's remaining Wilderness Areas.

Thank you for considering my thoughts,

Deanna Ross

Deanna Ross
598 Van Buren Street #1
Monterey, CA 93940

Response to Comments of Deanna Ross, June 6, 2004 (Letter I082)

I082-1

Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Comment Letter I083

I083

RECEIVED
JUL - 8 2004

July 4, 2004

To: California High Speed Train
Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments
925 L Street Suite 1425
Sacramento Ca. 95814

Regarding: Questions in your letter dated May 12, 2004

1. Any concerns regarding how a certain proposed route might impact cultural resources more than an alternate route.
   I think that any route you choose could impact archaeological sites along the way. I would suggest contacting such people like John Ramoni of Compass Rose, Bob Lopez Archaeology, or Roberta Greenwood and Associates for further information. On your walk survey I would recommend that you use the Native Chumash peole as well as an archaeologist to assure any new discoveries to be recorded. I feel that the route you choose should be the one that requires the least amount of equipment and manpower. I083-1

2. Suggestions for tribal involvement in archaeological contracting or monitoring for the project.
   I would recommend that each Native Monitor show some kind of document or proof of their ancestry (roll number, etc.) Each Native Monitor should have at least 6 years experience in the field and 2 years experience in a lab, and submit a resume. I would suggest that the client hire monitors according to their individual township or city with the aid or assistance of other natives. Each Native should have a 2-way radio and cell phone. I would also recommend that each sub contractor be hired on an individual basis. I083-2

3. Any concerns about how the addition of the high speed rail might affect the character of your community or region.
   I have a concern about the potential growth of communities expanding into the archaeological sites, and how this growth will effect the city's or township's policies regarding the protection of the cultural resources. I083-3

Sincerely,

Patrick Tumamait

Patrick Tumamait
Native Chumash Consultant and Monitor
992 El Camino Corto
Ojai, Ca. 93023 (805) 640-0481

Response to Comments of Patrick Tumamait, July 4, 2004 (Letter I083)

I083-1

Acknowledged. Should the HST proposal move forward to project specific study, the Authority and FRA will consider contacting these individuals and will consider using Native Chumash people, as well as archaeologists. Please also see standard responses 3.12.1 and 10.1.14.

I083-2

Acknowledged. Should the HST proposal move forward to project specific study, the Authority and FRA will take these suggestions into consideration in regards to the hiring of Native American Monitors. Please also see response to comment I083-1.

I083-3

Acknowledged.

Comment Letter I084

I084

San José State
UNIVERSITY

College of Science
Department of Chemistry
One Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95192-0101
Voice: 408-924-5000
Fax: 408-924-4945

Mr. Mehdi Morshed
California High-Speed Rail Authority
925 L Street Suite 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

JUL 14 2004

July 10, 2004

Dear Mr. Morshed,

As a native Californian, and occasional taxpayer, I am very much in favor of a the High-Speed Rail project, yet I vehemently oppose cutting the route through the Orestimba Wilderness area of Henry W. Coe State Park.

Two of the four proposed routes, amazingly enough, cut through this unique stretch of oak woodland. If the State can (and it can!) route the rail line without disturbing designated wilderness and desecrating the largest State Park in Northern California, it certainly should do so.

Of the four routes proposed, the Bell Station (southern) route would be the least damaging to native habitat. I084-1

Unfortunately, the least damaging route (Altamont Pass) is not being formally considered! I am on San Josean who would not mind San Jose being a spur line, even though I visit Southern California frequently.

But the most important thing is to recognize that the Park is more that just another piece of real estate, and leave it intact for so many of us to enjoy! I'm out there most weekends!

Sincerely,

Dr. Daniel A. Straus
Professor of Chemistry
San Jose State University

The California State University:

Response to Comments of Dr. Daniel A. Straus, July 10, 2004 (Letter I084)

I084-1

Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Comment Letter I085

I085

RECEIVED
JUL 14 2004

July 11, 2004

California High Speed Rail Authority
925 L Street # 1425
Sacramento, Calif. 95814

Dear Sir,

I am writing to express my dismay and great concerns about the proposed high speed rail line.

In 1983 I purchased the headquarter ranch of the old Gill ranch in South West Stanislaus County. I looked far and wide for a ranch that had isolation and an abundance of game. I finally found the ranch at the base of the Roostercomb Mountain at the East side of Coe Park.

I was delighted when the area surrounding my 4850 acres was designated wilderness by the State of California. The Robinson Canyon and the Orestimba Creek is, in my opinion, the most beautiful and remote part of the entire Coe Park. Deer, elk, turkeys, and many other birds and animals call this part of heaven home. Our ranch now referred to as the Roostercomb Ranch is a very short distance to the South of the proposed route. The Orestimba Creek is at our doorstep. I085-1

A simple hike up the proposed location of the bullet train and anyone who truly cares would say, you have to be kidding. A 200 mile per hour train continuously streaking through this paradise is unbelievable.

I realize there is a need for better, faster transportation in the Golden State. I am a 5 1/2 generation native Californian and have seen the effects of increased population.

From what I have read the most logical route, the Altamont Pass is not being considered, but the Pacheco Pass route is one of two proposed sights.

Since the Pacheco Pass already has a four lane highway I strongly believe this route should be the chosen location.

I am not against progress, but am against destroying an area that can never be replaced.

Please do what is right and build the bullet rail over the Pacheco Pass and not in the heart of Gods country. We have only so much of it left. I085-1 cont

Sincerely,

Jerry A. Wilkinson

Jerry A. Wilkinson

Response to Comments of Jerry A. Wilkinson, July 11, 2004 (Letter I085)

I085-1

Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Comment Letter I086

I086

RECEIVED
JUL 19 2004

Tony Kranz
1086 Hygeia Ave
Encinitas, CA 92024
July 16, 2004

Dan Leavitt (Deputy Director)

Carrie Pourvahidi (Deputy Director)

California High-Speed Rail Authority
925 L Street Suite 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Sir or Madam:

I recently attended a public workshop where the subject was creating a grade separation at the intersection of the LOSSAN rail corridor and Leucadia Boulevard in Encinitas.

One of the leaders of the meeting indicated that a proposal to trench and double the tracks from "lagoon to lagoon" through Encinitas, which was the option preferred by the Encinitas City Council, was rejected by the California High-Speed Rail Authority. I am trying to find out the reason for this statement. Did you issue a communiqué or some other edict pronouncing this? I086-1

If you could point me to a document on the WWW or send same to the address above, I would appreciate it. My email address is tkranz@cox.net. My phone is 760-207-4534.

Thanks,

T. KRANZ
Tony Kranz

Response to Comments of Tony Kranz, July 19, 2004 (Letter I086)

I086-1

At the March 25, 2003 Authority Board meeting in San Diego, staff presented screening recommendations for some of the conventional rail design options at key locations along the Los Angeles-Orange County-San Diego (LOSSAN) corridor (Del Mar, Encinitas, San Clemente/Dana Point, and San Juan Capistrano). A revised draft report "Los Angeles to San Diego via Orange County: Conventional Screening Report" dated May 16, 2003, was approved by the Authority at their May 27, 2003 board meeting at Irvine. The rationale for the elimination of the "Long Trench" concept through Encinitas is described on page 18 of the report. Although there had been public support for that concept in the past, this concept was eliminated because of its high cost ($250 million more than the "Short Trench" concept) and constructability issues/impacts. At the Authority's March 25, 2003 board meeting, the City of Encinitas commented in favor of the Authority's recommendations. The report is available on the Authority's website. Please also see standard response 6.42.1.

Comment Letter I087

I087

JUL 20 2004

July 17, 2004

California High-Speed Rail Authority
925 L Street, Suite 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

I urge you to eliminate any thought of placing high speed rail within the boundries of Henry Coe State Park. Henry Coe State Park is one of the few places in the state where there is Wilderness. The Oristimba Wilderness. Please keep this wilderness wild and free from unnatural interventions. I087-1

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Lamson

Elizabeth Lamson
1343 Sacramento Street
Berkelely, CA 94702

Response to Comments of Elizabeth Lamson, July 17, 2004 (Letter I087)

I087-1

Please see standard response 6.3.1.

Comment Letter I088

I088

EMILY BAIRD
216 Bender Circle
Morgan Hill, CA 95037

RECEIVED
JUL 26 2004

July 19, 2004

California High-Speed Rail Authority
Attn: Dan Leavitt
925 L. Street, Ste. 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Leavitt,

I am writing to voice my opinion for public comment on the High-Speed Train being proposed from the Central Valley to the Bay Area.

I am in favor of the High-Speed Train and I am in favor of the Pacheco Pass Route.

I have lived in Morgan Hill for the last 15 years. I grew up in Chowchilla and my parents still reside there. I continue to visit them in Chowchilla almost every other weekend. The only route available is Hwy 152. The road is getting very crowded and dangerous even with all of the improvements over the years. I would absolutely ride a high-speed train that took me from Morgan Hill to Chowchilla and back instead of driving over Pacheco Pass. I088-1

As far as the proposed Pacheco Pass Route going through Henry Coe Park, I have visited the park about 10 times over the years. There are two main entrances for the park, from E. Dunne Ave in Morgan Hill or near the Hot Springs in Gilroy. Since I do not own a horse for trail riding and I can not hike for more than two or three miles nor ride my bicycle up those steep trails, I (and many others) am limited on what I can see of the park. So sitting on a train, I may get a glimpse of some scenery of the vast acreage of the park that I wouldn't have had access to in the first place.

Please continue your work to get a high-speed train running through our state.

Sincerely,

Emily Baird

EMILY BAIRD

Response to Comments of Emily Baird, July 19, 2004 (Letter I088)

I088-1

Please see standard response 6.3.1.