Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				mph) peak speed running. This is not a good time to try some far-out technology. High speed rail is a proven technology with a legitimate track record in Europe and Japan. Build on what they've done, and leave room for expansion, but do not try and be more cutting-edge -- we can't afford to have a system that won't work because you tried experimental technolgy that doesn't work.		has been done. This technology has been continually improving and would also be prudent to plan for the next generation of HST.
				This is the area of my biggest concern. You buckled under to political pressure from San Jose, which suffers from an inferiority complex. The most sensible routing for HSR isn't even in the EIR: Altamont Pass, with a triple split at Fremont, with trains serving San Jose, Oakland, and San Francisco. The routings through Pacheco Pass and under wilderness areas make no sense at all except to a few politicians in Santa Clara County who want to force every train to stop in San Jose whether it makes sense or not. This project is about more than just transporting people from LA to the Bay Area. It will provide increased intercity transportation for intermediate points such as the Central Valley and the Bay Area, Sacramento, and Southern California. I strongly urge the Authority to put Altamont Pass back on the table	W180-3	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
				and adopt it as the preferred alternative, as it is the lowest cost and most operationally effective approach to the Bay Area.		
W181	8/31/2004	Allen Payton	1006 G Street Antioch, CA 94509	Other, less costly alternative technologies, such as electric rail Group Rapid Transit (GRT) should be considered. Not only are the construction costs significantly less, the operation costs are lower, as well with an automated system, no operators and smaller stations. Plus, on-demand service eliminates empty cars and no taxpayer subsidy. In addition, the system can be built with less or without using taxpayer money. Finally, new GRT technology allows the cars to travel at speeds of 150 MPH.	W181-1	Please see standard response 2.9.2. While the technology has existed for many years to run high-speed trains without operators (fully automated systems) it has been assumed that the HST trains would have operators since this is a common safety practice typically used in current HST services operating in other countries (e.g., France, Spain, Japan, etc.).
W182	8/31/2004	John Morgan, City Planner	City of Laguna Niguel 27781 La Paz Rd Laguna Niguel, CA 92677	Via US Mail and Online Submittal Attn: California High-Speed Train Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments 925 L Street, Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814SUBJECT:City of Laguna Niguel Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments for the proposed California High-Speed Train System To whom it may concern: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Program EIR/EIS for the proposed California High-Speed Train System. The City of Laguna Niguel has the following general	W182-1	Please see standard response 6.41.2.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				comments on the Los Angeles to San Diego via Orange County alignment: ▪ Subsequent project-specific environmental analysis should identify how the proposed project would affect the new Metrolink commuter rail station along Forbes Road in the City of Laguna Niguel. The analysis should include review of the number of future projected daily ridership and rail-line trips at the Laguna Niguel/Mission Viejo Metrolink Station based on existing conditions, compared with projected changes resulting from the various LOSSAN alignments/improvements through the City of San Juan Capistrano and the City of San Clemente. Analysis and mitigation (if applicable) of additional traffic, air-quality and noise impacts should be included. ▪ Subsequent project-specific environmental analysis should identify if the project will include improvements within the City of Laguna Niguel which extend beyond the existing rail-line right-of-way and if any improvements will require property acquisition. Development and operational impacts to surrounding uses should be analyzed.		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				▪ The City of Laguna Niguel appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Program EIR/EIS for the proposed California High-Speed Train System and requests copies of all public meeting and hearing notices and draft environmental documentation. When available, please mail to: City of Laguna Niguel Community Development Department 27781 La Paz Road Laguna Niguel, CA 92677 Attention: John Morgan, Associate Planner Should you have any questions regarding the above comments, please contact me Sincerely, Community Development Department Robert P. Lenard, Director _____ John Morgan Associate Planner cc. Robert Lenard, Community Development Director Stephen Higa, AICP, Senior Planner		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W183	8/31/2004	Jonathan Bair	655 12th St., #315 Oakland, CA 94607	Considering that vastly more people live in the East Bay and South Bay than in the SF area, and that the East Bay has existing rail links that would benefit more from an upgrade than using Caltrain, and that an East Bay terminus without an SF terminus would serve more riders and cost less money, why is SF the terminus? Why should a SF station be constructed at all, let alone before an Oakland station? SF already has an upgraded train to San Jose, and Oakland does not, so the high-speed train in the East Bay would have a much larger secondary commuter benefit than an SF Peninsula train. And since the train is intended for residents, not tourists, Oakland would produce more riders since the metro-area population is much larger. Why wasn't an Oakland-only option considered?	W183-1	See standard response 6.1.4. In regards to phasing of the HST system, please see standard response 10.1.7. The HST service would result in travel times between Downtown Los Angeles and Downtown San Francisco of about 2 hours 35 minutes, without a transfer. The HST trip between San Francisco (Transbay Terminal) and San Jose (Diridon Station) would be as little as 30 minutes, whereas the current Caltrain service takes 58 to 96 minutes between San Francisco (4th and King) and San Jose (Diridon Station). Of the 43 daily Caltrain trains (in each direction) only some are express ("baby bullet") trains providing the quickest travel times (58 minutes), whereas many of the trains are local service with travel times about 96 minutes. HST service to the downtowns of major cities such as San Francisco, greatly increase the connectivity and accessibility of the HST system, and enable the system to directly serve major regional transit hubs such as the Transbay Terminal and San Francisco International Airport (SFO). The Authority's ridership and revenue forecasts concluded that

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
						HST service to San Francisco would have higher ridership and revenue potential than a HST routing along the East Bay to Oakland (Corridor Evaluation, December 1999). As part of its Business Plan, the Authority concluded that service to San Francisco and/or Oakland is essential to the feasibility of the HST system. In identifying a preferred HST alignment, the Authority did consider, but rejected an Oakland only option for serving the Bay Area. However, please see standard response 6.2.1.
W184	8/31/2004	Thomas Walker, Legal Analyst	AARP240 5901 Broadway #71 Oakland, CA 94618	Build the dam thing already and quit talking about it! The quicker you build it the better! Get **** moving. Thank you for your time and consideration.	W184-1	Acknowledged.
W185	8/31/2004	Renata Breisacher Mulry, Director, Research	Bexen Press PO Box 130215 Carlsbad, CA 92013-0215	Comments from BEXEN PRESS on DEIR Statement for the California High-Speed Train System The preparation of the above document is entirely premature. This project is designed to primarily serve the San Joaquin Valley; it really is not a statewide project. The fact that the proposed system begins in San Diego and finally terminates in Sacramento, with complicated connections to the San Francisco Bay area, does not alter the route's real destination, which is Sacramento.	W185-1	Acknowledged. The Authority disagrees with the comments on potential HST alignment options. The purpose and need of the HST system includes serving California's major metropolitan areas. The Authority's ridership and revenue forecasts have concluded that the largest market potential for HST in California is the segment between the San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles Metropolitan Area. The identified preferred alignment

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				From the beginning, routing has always been a glorious turf war. The fact that the two main economic and population centers in California, Los Angeles - Orange County and the San Francisco Bay area, would not be linked directly has been completely ignored. We know of no one who travels from here to San Francisco via the Antelope Valley or Fresno, unless the trip is perhaps leisure and that's a different scenario. California High-speed rail is a transportation project. It is not a jump-start for local economies or land development or density. The focus has become blurred, in scope and emphasis.		options would directly link the San Francisco Bay Area, Los Angeles, and Orange County as well as Sacramento, the Central Valley, the Inland Empire and San Diego. The proposed HST system would provide travel times that would be competitive with other modes of transportation. Please see standard response 6.23.1 in regards to the identification of the Antelope Valley alignment as the preferred alignment between Bakersfield and Los Angeles. Please see Chapter 2, Section 2.6.8C of the Program EIR/EIS for the rationale as to the elimination of the I-5 as a corridor option between the Bay Area and Bakersfield. The proposed HST system has been designed operate at high-speeds throughout most of the system (please see Figures 4.3-1 and 4.3-2 of the Program EIR/EIS). As explained in the Draft Program EIR/EIS, the HST system would utilize the LOSSAN corridor no further south than Irvine (see Chapter 2). The only segments of the system that are not proposed to use "dedicated" tracks are between San Francisco and San Jose, and Los Angeles and Irvine (on the LOSSAN

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
						Corridor) which are heavily urbanized areas where reduced speeds will be required as a result of speed restricting curves. The Authority acknowledges but disagrees with your comments relating to ridership forecasts. This work builds upon many years of investigation by the Authority. Please see the reports done by Charles River Associates regarding ridership and revenue projections.
				At this time transportation in this state is planned by a literal hodgepodge of jurisdictions, from local and regional transit authorities, to Amtrak, Caltrans, assorted rail freight carriers, airport authorities, and your proposal introduces a new jurisdiction. If you want to really integrate high-speed rail with existing routes, then the project absolutely needs to be under the umbrella jurisdiction of Caltrans. This agency already partially underwrites some existing rail lines and it is entirely logical that rail should be added to its jurisdiction.	W185-2	Acknowledged.
				Currently, according to the DEIR, air travel and automobiles carry 98% of the traffic in California. Previously, one reason for selecting a valley route was that airlines had abandoned the region	W185-3	The Authority acknowledges but disagrees with your comments relating to capital costs, and ridership projections. Please see Chapter 4 of the Program EIR/EIS,

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				to a large extent. This could change tomorrow. The existing train service from Bakersfield essentially does the same thing now, although the Sacramento portion is very awkward. Of course, from Los Angeles the service doesn't work at all, since it requires a bus transfer to Bakersfield from Los Angeles. According to what we see, the high-speed portions of the proposed route are few and far between. In the whole LOSSAN corridor, speeds never reach 100 mph; shared tracks, too many stops, too much traffic on the tracks, especially freight, and safety concerns make this speed impossible. You plan to share tracks. If you do this, you will never achieve anywhere near the desired speed. This is why we find the point to point travel time projections to be wildly optimistic and unattainable. Only dedicated tracks will make projected travel times realistic. The passenger projections also are unrealistic. After all, airlines go where the passengers are. If they don't find them in the Valley now, why do you assume the passengers will suddenly appear for rail? A lot of glossy brochures have been distributed to the public -- a great deal of public money has been spent to get		supporting appendices, and technical reports for the capital cost assumptions as well as the Authority's Corridor Evaluation Report from 1999. Unlike most rail systems in the United States, the proposed HST system would be fully grade-separated. Extensive HST revenue service in Europe and Asia has proven the HST to be the safest, most reliable form of intercity transportation.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				to this DEIR. In the U.S., reliability of rail travel of rail travel is poor. Tracks are notoriously subject to damage from objects, vehicles, collisions at grade crossings, etc.		
				Cost projections really are so low they need to be reworked. Any project built in many phases, which you plan, result in enormous cost increases. This is true for any project. Are you building High-speed Rail on the cheap, in order to bring a lower bond figure to the voters? Do not succumb to this temptation. Only a very high quality, beyond the state of the art project will be a success. You get exactly what you pay for.	W185-4	Please see response to Comment W185-3.
				Since part of the route might call for elevated structures, how do you plan to deal with this type of visual pollution? The concept of environmental justice / equity is established now in the public perception; therefore, just because affluent subdivisions generally do not face railroad tracks, older, less desirable areas should not have to carry the burden of pollution, as they have in the past. Bexen Press has always supported any innovative transportation project that can deliver what it promises. It is good that a delay is considered before this	W185-5	Please see Section 3.9 of the Program EIR/EIS. Acknowledged.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				project comes before the voters. Don't let imagination supercede good planning and realistic expectations. Thank you for your consideration.		
W186	8/31/2004	Scott Peters, San Diego City Councilman	City of San Diego 202 C St MS 10A San Diego, CA 92101	Gen: August 30, 2004 VIA FACSIMILE AND US MAIL Attn: California High-Speed Train Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments 925 L Street, Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814 Re: Draft Environmental Impact Report for Proposed High-Speed Train System Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR") for the proposed High-Speed Train System. I would like to specifically comment on the Los Angeles to San Diego section of the proposed project, known as the "LOSSAN Corridor." This section of the project is not a part of the high-speed train section, but is instead a CALTRANS project that will focus on non-electric diesel powered trains along the coastline. LOSSAN Corridor For Additional Diesel Trains Not Electric High Speed Trains The stated purpose of the project is to relieve capacity constraints of the existing transportation system in a manner sensitive to and protective of		These are repeated comments. Please see response to Comment Letter AL074.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				California's unique and natural resources. The report should make clear that, in the LOSSAN corridor, there is no plan for a High-Speed Train ("HST") system, but only non-electric diesel powered trains. This is not clearly explained in the DEIR, which raises confusion as to what kinds of trains are being proposed along the LOSSAN corridor along the coast. The project would fail in its stated objective to relieve the existing transportation systems in a manner sensitive to and protective of California's natural resources. The LOSSAN corridor proposed double tracking would increasing the amount of diesel train traffic along the Southern California coastline. The proposed alternatives that the DEIR prefers (Chapter 6 in DEIR) call for double tracking through two of San Diego's precious natural lagoons. The Camino Del Mar Tunnel Options require extensive tunneling under the City of Del Mar and placing additional rail lines through both the Los Peñasquitos Lagoon and the San Dieguito Lagoon. Insufficient Environmental Analysis of Increased Train Traffic's Environmental Affects On The Lagoon These options would lead to a large tunnel opening into the Los		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				Peñasquitos Lagoon and increased train traffic through coastal estuaries. This increase in train traffic would conflict with the City of San Diego's goals and initiatives in protecting the Lagoon. The past couple of years have seen an active effort by the City of San Diego and its residents to scale back traffic and congestion in the Los Peñasquitos Lagoon. The City has closed Sorrento Valley Road from all vehicle traffic along the edge of the Los Peñasquitos Lagoon. The City, working in conjunction with citizen groups, has re-designed Carmel Valley Road to enhance the community character and protect the Lagoon from excessive run-off, while removing invasive plant species. The DEIR's Biological Resources and Wetlands Chapter's cursory review of potential impacts to the sensitive biological resources is inadequate. Prior to a choice of any one routing alternative, the DEIR needs to have a more detailed and scientific analysis of how increased diesel train traffic through coastal lagoons could affect the sensitive biological diversity of the lagoons. Currently the extent of the DEIR's biological resources and wetlands impact analysis focuses only the structures the trains will run on and		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				not on what impacts additional quantities of train traffic may have. "The Camino del Mar tunnel would not result in new impacts and the new bridge would follow the existing bridge over the Los Peñasquitos Lagoon and San Dieguito lagoons. Overall, the Camino del Mar tunnel would likely have fewer potential impacts on biological resources associated with the lagoons, because it would not introduce new structures to the southern edge of the San Dieguito Lagoon." Page 3.15-30 The environmental analysis above is insufficient in its analysis of routing diesel trains through coastal estuaries with sensitive biological resources. These alternatives will also increase noise and air pollution, as well as increase vibrations throughout the region. The DEIR on page 3.4-23 is completely devoid of any discussion of how the increased noise and vibrations could affect the lagoons and their inhabitants. These lagoons are ecologically sensitive and the additional train traffic from two rail lines through them is neither sensitive nor protective to the environment. Insufficient Routing Alternatives		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				The DEIR is lacking in analyzing alternative alignments and routing options for the Oceanside to San Diego portion of the LOSSAN corridor. The DEIR alleges to use existing right of ways, yet there is no routing option using the I-5 corridor. This multi-lane existing concrete structure should be examined as an alternative routing for the diesel trains, either on top of or underneath the I-5. I understand the concern about investments already made in tracks and stations north of San Diego along the proposed routing. But choosing a routing alternative based on these factors alone is negligent and poor planning. The current routing options fail to recognize and account for the uniqueness and preciousness of the few remaining Southern California Coastal Estuaries that these tracks are slated to travel through. Loss of any acreage of any of our remaining coastal lagoons or increased traffic through them should be avoided at all costs. CALTRANS should be taking proactive steps to avoid any future degradation to these coastal lagoons and also use this opportunity to remove current track encroachments.		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				Incomplete Analysis of Future Modal Transportation Alternatives In The LOSSAN Corridor The DEIR is also limited in its discussion of the Modal Alternatives outlined on page S-3. The DEIR modal alternatives are designed around the premise that increasing highway capacity for cars is the only future freeway use to transport passengers. There is a failure in the DEIR to recognize alternative means for transporting passengers throughout the LOSSAN corridor, which would not require intensifying the use of passenger trains within the corridor. An example of future means of transportation is Bus Rapid Transit ("BRT"), approved locally by SANDAG and nationally by the Federal Department of Transportation. (See http://knowledge.fhwa.dot.gov/fta/brt.nsf/home.) There is nothing speculative or infeasible about analyzing BRT, which will be a regional alternative means of transportation that could serve as a feeder to the HST system outside of the LOSSAN corridor. In order to sufficiently examine future routing needs, a complete examination of additional modal possibilities in the LOSSAN corridor should be completed.		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				The project engineers must recognize that HST and additional rail lines are many years off. When discussing possible modal alternatives to transport passengers some 15 plus years into the future, advancements in modal technologies must be addressed, or the environmental analysis will be unreliable at the time of implementation. The DEIR's analysis of modal alternative potential effects on the biological resources of the lagoon (page 3.15-29) is insufficient in that it is based on current modal technologies. This section fails to account for new modal options and relies unjustifiably on increased private automobile traffic as the only future modal alternative. Sincerely, Scott H. Peters SHP:rg - I have also faxed a copy of this letter.		
W187	8/31/2004	Tricia Altree	Airport Coalition 3635 Elliott St. San Diego, CA 92106	We fully support the implementation of HSR line(s) for all of California. It is our hope that with better focus on non-aviation transportation alternatives, we can better serve Californians as well as protect our environment from needless noise and ground and airborne toxins.	W187-1	Acknowledged.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W188	8/31/2004	Brent Mishler, Biology Professor, U. of Cal, Berkeley	38775 Stonington Terrace Fremont, CA 94536	I am generally in support of the concept of a high-speed train. I have ridden them in Japan and Germany and appreciate their benefits. However, I am strongly against the proposed alternative routings through the mountains east of San Jose. I am especially against the routing through Henry Coe State Park, but also feel that the Pacheco Pass Route is a worse choice environmentally then Altamont Pass.	W188-1	Please see standard response 2.18.1.
				The Henry W. Coe State Park is the finest one in the state system of parks, and the Wilderness area in the north of the park (where the route would go), is the greatest gem of all. It is has recently been revealed that the consultants never even visited this area, or any part of the park. There is no justice in summarily taking one of the last wilderness areas left in the Bay Area. Based on personal experience (I am the director of the Univerisyy and Jespon Herbaria and professor of integrative biology at UC Berkeley, and have doen extensive field work in these mountains), I know that the biodiversity of the affected area in Henry Coe Park is much higher than the Pacheco Pass, which is in turn much higher than Altamont Pass. The	W188-2	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
				latter is the perfect route from the biodiversity standpoint -- it has already been largely destroyed of native vegetation by grazing, the freeway, and wind turbines.		
				I realize the route would be slightly longer, but the Altamont Pass route is superior in many ways environmentally, and was summarily (and it appears from the newspapers, unethically) remover frm consideration. Some adverse impacts are always necessary, but given the already fragile nature of the East Bay montains, that have been impacted in many ways already over the last 150 years, we must choose the least damaging alternative routing here. Thank you for rethinking this hasty decision.	W188-3	Please see standard response 2.18.1.
W189	8/31/2004	Michael Kiesling	Architecture 21 1000 Union Street #207 San Francisco, CA 94133	Comments included below are also mailed to the Authority. 30 August, 2004 Re: Comments on DEIR/EIS for the proposed California High Speed Rail Project To whom it may concern: I have been following the State of California's progress on High Speed Rail since 1980, when I was in the eighth grade, and received the RFP for the initial project. Page 9-2 of the 1996	W189-1	See responses to Comment Letter I138. This (W189) is a repeated comment letter.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				High Speed Rail Summary Report and Action Plan assumed the financial plan for the project would be on the 1998 or 2000 ballot. Something has gone very wrong with this project..... California needed this project 20 years ago, soon after the French proved the effectiveness of a new high speed rail system. Sadly, the information and analysis in the current DEIR/EIS is nowhere close to the level needed to move this vital project forward. My questions and comments on some of the most troubling assumptions in the DEIR/EIS are included in the following text. I would be very happy to meet with staff and consultants to further clarify my questions and comments. -Michael Kiesling Notes on CHSRA DEIR/EIS The document overreaches the scope of a Program-Level EIR/EIS. The document seeks to predict the intrastate transportation infrastructure for the year 2020, and then find the best way to meet the (assumed) projected demand. At this macro-level, it defines a high speed rail system to meet the projected demand. It then develops improvements and expansions to the existing highway and air travel		

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				infrastructure to meet the same projected demand. These constitute the project alternatives, listed in Section 2.1 of the DEIR/EIS, page 2-1. The alternatives to be studied are: ▪ 2.1.1 No Project Alternative - assumes planned improvements to the existing transportation infrastructure ▪ 2.1.1 Modal Alternative - "potentially feasible" highway and aviation system improvements ▪ 2.1.2 High Speed Train Alternative - "reasonable and feasible" alignment and station options. Why does this project level DEIR/EIS go beyond the stated alternatives in Section 2 and enter in to the question of defining a single HSR alignment and route? Demand was predicted prior to the initiation of the EIR/EIS. Why not satisfy the program level EIR/EIS by determining the environmental superiority (or not) of a HSR alternative prior to establishing a set alignment? Isn't there the strong possibility that unforeseen impacts will be unmitigable? What is the legal threshold between a "program level" and project level" EIR/EIS? Has this threshold been		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				crossed by the CHSRA? Will that threshold be crossed by the CHSRA by using the EIR/EIS to define a single route for implementation? 2.5.2 Modal Alternative Carried Forward Highway Component Why is I-680 not considered for improvement? Isn't I-680 a primary route for Bay Area-Sacramento area auto traffic, especially from the Santa Clara and San Ramon Valleys? What was the criteria for determining the highway component of the Modal Alternative? Was this criteria, if it exists, applied evenly throughout the state? Why are there no highway improvements assumed between the San Francsico Peninsula (I-80, SR-92, SR-84) and the East Bay when there are three stations assumed for the HSR system on the peninsula? How are the 15,630 daily trips (2000 CRA Table E-9) generated by the three peninsula stations to be accommodated by the modal alternative? Is it assumed all these trips will travel via US-101 and SR-152 to reach the Central Valley and Los Angeles? What travel data backs this assumption? Aren't the majority of trips between the San Francisco peninsula and the Central Valley / Los		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				Angeles made via I-580 (Altamont Pass)? Aren't the majority of trips between the greater Bay Area and the Central Valley / Los Angeles made via I-580 (Altamont Pass)? Exisitng I-5 between SR-99 and SR-14 is a 8-10 lane facility. Why is it listed in Table 2.5-1 on page 2.19 as a 6 lane facility? Aviation Component: How can it be assumed "future local/regional trips would shift from San Francisco International Airport to Oakland International Airport and the airport in San Jose" (p 2.21)? How will the privately owned and operated airlines shift their service plans to accommodate this assumption? How realistic is this assumption of a reduction of local/regional flights (assumes reduction to accommodate growth in long distance/international flights) when many of the shorter flights serve to fill the longer flights? How does this assumption of a shift in the flights to the two other Bay Area airports affect traffic congestion on the regional highway system? How does this affect the investments in fixed transportation infrastructure to SFO? How do limitations on operating hours (San Jose) and environmental issues (bay fill Oakland) affect this		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				assumption? Where has this planned shift of services between airports happened in the United States? What is the governmental authority to do so? 2.6 High-Speed Train Alternative Why was the Altamont alternative dropped when the Final Report - Corridor Evaluation, December 30, 1999, states the following about the retained Pacheco Alternative: "this alternative leads to a Sacramento to San Francisco travel time of 1 hour and 48 minutes, which is not as competitive with other modes of travel compared to the Altamont Corridor alternative." In other words, Pacheco does not attract as many trips between the Bay Area and Sacramento as does Altamont..... "the time to San Francisco is only 3 minutes longer". In other words, trips using the Pacheco alignment are 3 minutes longer to the majority of Bay Area stations.....or, trips using the Pacheco alignment are 3 minutes longer to the second-busiest station in the system, San Francisco, from every location. or, trips using the Pacheco alignment are 3 minutes longer for almost 70% of the passengers with origins/destinations in the greater Bay Area... "the Pacheco Pass option would have more negative environmental impacts as compared to Altamont Pass		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				option." "There would be substantially more water crossings associated with this alignment including over 20 small streams between the San Joaquin River and Los Banos." Why are travel times and environmental impacts ignored when the decision was made to completely drop the Altamont Alignment from consideration? Travel Times / Operations How do longer travel times to the second (San Francisco) and third (Sacramento) busiest destinations on the system meet the goals of fastest travel time? How does a greater than ten-fold increase in wetlands impacts by acre (Altamont 27.4, Pacheco 290.0 - Appendix 2-H CHSRA EIS / EIR - January 2004) reduce environmental impacts? Why is it stated "the greatest benefit of the Pacheco Pass is found in system operations since all trains would pass through San Jose " (p 2.36), when San Jose is not even one of the top five busiest stations? Why was the statement revised from the 9/3/01 report that said, "the greatest benefit of the Pacheco Pass is that all trains would pass through San Jose"?		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				How do operations improve by creating a system with a greater overall length, especially when operation and maintenance costs are based on train and track miles? How well is equipment utilized if trains must serve both the San Francisco peninsula and San Jose on a single line? San Jose - San Francisco travel time is about 20% of the total trip time for a San Francisco - Los Angeles run, yet trains will run at only 2/3 capacity if they need to serve all Bay Area stations on a single line. Isn't it more efficient to run full trains to their destinations? Wouldn't Altamont be a more efficient way to operate, with a schedule that considers the demand for all stations, providing service balanced to demand? Given that the system must be constructed in phases, please provide estimated ridership (broken down by station origin and destination) and estimated operating revenue and estimated operating cost for both the initial system, any subsequent phases, and full system build-out. Which choice of initial operating system has the highest return on investment as measured by operating surplus minus borrowing costs? Would an initial operating system via the Altamont Pass provide a higher return on investment		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				by this metric? If a longer and slower Palmdale alignment is chosen in Southern California for geotechnical or other reasons, how will this affect decrease ridership to and from the Bay Area? How much less would ridership decrease if the system entered the Bay Area via the Altamont Pass, which previous studies showed resulted in a lower trip time for the majority of passengers? South Bay Wetlands The environmental impact of a new bay crossing is given as a reason to eliminate Altamont. Why was the Mulford Line alternative for the San Jose - Oakland line retained in the DEIR/EIS when Altamont wasn't? What was the criteria employed to determine impacts on the South Bay wetlands? The Mulford alternative affects over seven times the acreage of wetlands of the Altamont alternative (Altamont 6.7, Mulford 49.9 - Appendix 2-H CHSRA EIS / EIR - January 2004). Both pass through the Don Edwards refuge. Mulford passes through an area planned for restoration, Altamont doesn't. The Dumbarton line (Altamont) is publicly-owned and planned for reactivation as a publically-operated commute rail service. The Mulford line		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				is owned by the UPRR and operates as a freight railway, along with Amtrak and ACE passenger service. The Mulford line will require a separate facility for HSR. Coordination of service would allow Dumbarton (Altamont) to run on the same facility as the HSR. Is the implementation of a new facility on the Mulford line present fewer impacts than a consolidated facility on the Dumbarton alignment? Dumbarton HSR Crossing Estimate Cite a single high speed rail bridge with a cost approaching anywhere close to the $1.2b quoted for the new Dumbarton crossing. The longest brige on the new Dutch HSR, over the Hollandsch Diep, is about the same length and has about the same main span as a high-level Dumbarton crossing would, but it cost less to build than even the Authority's previous estimate for Dumbarton, $300m. From: http://enr.construction.com/features/transportation/archives/030630.asp Hollandsch Diep Designed to carry fast, heavy trains on a 2% slope, the bridge has 12, mainly 105-m spans with a continuous single trough deck topped with a 14-m-wide composite concrete slab. The roughly 3-m-deep steel troughs rest on V-shaped pier-top supports of similar dimensions.		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				The mainly Dutch, six-firm consortium HSL-Drechtse Steden signed the $427 million design-build contract in mid-2000, aiming to complete the bridge next May. Two 2.5-km sunken tube tunnels under the Oude Maas and Dordtsche Kil rivers, plus some 9 km of simple track also form part of the contract. Except for concrete piers, all major elements, including nearly 9,000 tonnes of steel, are prefabricated nearby and delivered by river. Precast concrete caissons, each sunk onto large steel piles, support cast-in-place piers. The 25-m- long x 10-m-wide caissons travelled on pontoons before being sunk into place. Deck steelwork troughs were barged to site in 60-m lengths, with concrete slabs already attached, all weighing some 1,200 tonne. At each pier top "hammerheads" form the deck support and end sections of each span. Hammerheads are 45-m-long box fabrications made integrally with V-shaped supports of similar proportions bearing on the piers. Too tall to clear overhead obstructions on the boat ride from the fabricator's yard, hammerheads travelled to the site on their sides, leaving tops slabs to be cast later on the bridge.		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				The above description of the Dutch bridge seems to be much closer to the requirements and cost for a new Dumbarton crossing than What was the methodology for the $300m estimate for a Dumbarton Crossing in the initial HSR studies? Why does the DEIR/EIS quote a mitigation cost of up to $1b, based on the SFO runway expansion project, when no such number was ever citied in the SFO project? How does the estimate for a mid-bay crossing compare to the physical situation at Dumbarton? How does the mid-bay location of the example bridge, a 11.2 mile bridge with the main span about 5 miles from the shore, compare to the location of the Dumbarton crossing? How does the scale of the example bridge, a 850' span and 135' clearance, compare to the required span and clearance of the Dumbarton Bridge, maximum requirement assumed to be 340' x 85'? (based on existing SR 84 bridge). How does the cost inflate so greatly from the $70m cost (1984 dollars - about $200m in 2004) for constructing the Dumbarton highway bridge? What is the "high speed factor" (15-20% increase in construction costs) in Appendix 2-J? Is this "high speed factor" applied anywhere else in the project?		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				Why is it assumed that the proposed commute rail service in the Dumbarton corridor would still run on the old bridge, thus requiring an entirely new corridor for the HSR bridge? Does this assume there would be no commute service on the HSR? If the CRA 1996 draft ridership study assumes stronger demand for a commuter service in the Altamont Corridor than the Pacheco Corridor (for new riders), why is the commute potential of the Dumbarton corridor ignored in the DEIR/EIS? Operations Why was ridership modeled for the Altamont alternative based on the assumption that service to the Northern California terminals would be based on an equal split of service? Why wasn't the demand taken into consideration when deciding how to model the ridership differences in the Pacheco vs Altamont alternatives? How does the potential for ridership in Gilroy and Los Banos compare to the potential for ridership in Fremont, Pleasanton-Livermore, and Tracy? If headways play a significant role in the modeling of ridership, why did demand play no role in the assumptions used to model Altamont ridership? What would the results be if the Altamont ridership was modeled with 2/3 of the trains running to San Francisco and 1/3 to San Jose?		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				What is total ridership for the San Francisco peninsula stations (San Francisco, San Francisco International Airport, Redwood City)? What is the total rideship for San Jose? How do these two numbers compare? Why wasn't service modeled relative to the numbers generated by summing the ridership on the two Bay Area lines? What does the assumption of both an Oakland and San Francisco terminal do to the overall ridership? How many new riders are gained with the addition of an Oakland terminal, assuming the existence of a San Francisco terminal? What is the cost-benefit analysis of an Oakland extension, assuming a San Francisco terminal? Is a BART extension to San Jose assumed for the project? How is ridership affected if it is assumed that San Jose riders access the system in Fremont via BART? What is the cost of constructing an extension of BART from Fremont Station to San Jose Diridon Station? What is the cost of constructing HSR from Fremont to San Jose Diridon? Los Banos Light Maintenance/Storage Facility How was Los Banos determined to be the best location to service Bay Area trains, when it's over 200km from the terminal in San		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				Francisco? How does the Los Banos location meet the requirement that the light maintenance facility be within a 5-minute trip of the terminal? What criteria was used to determine this location? Are there no other locations closer to San Francisco than Los Banos that could serve as a light maintenance facility? What are the impacts of the Los Banos facility on the surrounding environment, including wetlands? How does the goal of keeping the right of way alongside Henry Miller Avenue "The route is proposed to be alongside the roadway to minimize disruption to agricultural fields." (Bay Area to Merced High Speed Train Screening Evaluation 9-3-02, p. 62) create the fewest impacts? By keeping the railway right of way immediately adjacent to Henry Miller Avenue, doesn't this require the acquisition and demolition of all homes and most farm structures along the ROW? How is this a benefit? Has an assessment of the number and value of structures along Henry Miller Avenue required for the Pacheco HSR alignment been made? What are the impacts to agriculture if these acquisitions take place? What are the environmental justice issues surrounding condemnation and relocation of the residents of these		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				homes? System Ridership The DEIR/EIS assumes full build-out, but this assumes the initial segment will be successful, as funding is assumed to come from the "profits" of the initial segment. Has the ridership of the initial operating segment, assumed to be San Francisco to Los Angeles, been modeled as a stand-alone system? Do the number of cities served on this initial segment affect ridership? What are the projections for revenue on this initial segment? How many more passengers would an initial Los Angeles - San Francisco system attract if it utilized the Altamont Alternative? How much less expensive would the extension to Sacramento be? What is the ridership on a initial system if it uses the Pacheco alignment? How great is the catchment for stations? How does the various station locations in Northern California serve the Bay Area? How many miles are passengers expected to travel to reach a HSR station? What is the rush-hour travel time from San Ramon to a HSR station? What is the travel time from San Ramon to the Oakland Airport? Which cities are outside the HSR catchement? What percentage of passengers are expected to access		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				stations via private auto? What demand for parking will exist at Redwood City station? San Jose? SFO? Has a schedule been developed that shows the combined operations of HSR and Caltrain service between San Jose and San Francisco? Has a schedule been developed which shows the combined operations of HSR and high speed commuter service between the Central Valley and the Bay Area? How was the site for the Los Banos station chosen? Why is there no corresponding station on the Coe/Diablo alignments? What market is served by a station on the west side of the Central Valley in Merced County? How does this affect the potential for sprawl? Central Valley A west of 99 route was shown to require 180 acres of farmland, 57% of which is considered prime farmland (December 1999 Corridor Evaluation, p. III-25). Yet a UPRR alignment (along SR-99) would require 250 acres of farmland, 71% prime. The UPRR alignment was estimated in 1999 to cost over $3b more than the west of 99 alternative. How is farmland preservation aided by dropping the West of 99 corridor? What benefit of the UPRR alignment is worth the added $3b? What criteria was used		

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				in the decision to drop the West of 99 alternative? What criteria was used in the decision to retain the UPRR alternative? The UPRR alignment runs through the city centers, allowing (obviously) city center station, but the trade off is higher cost (at least $3b) and greater travel times (15 minutes more than west of 99), assuming reduced speed operations in the city centers, and a longer route (6 miles). To remedy this, the DEIR/EIS assumes high speed bypasses of the larger city centers along the UPRR, and full speed operation through the smaller ones. These bypasses will add to the length of the line (straight line through town vs. curved bypass around town), leaving the "express" line the longer line. This scheme for bypasses around city centers also adds to the $3b difference in alternatives, because bypasses were not assumed in the original analysis. How much cost do the addition of the bypasses add to the project? Assuming a bypass and station line for each major city in the Central Valley, wouldn't the West of 99 alignment result in lower costs, a significantly shorter route, and actually fewer acres of farmland needed for construction?		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				Wouldn't the lines into the city centers cost less, as they could be engineered for lower operating speeds? Depending on service levels, couldn't these lines initially be constructed as single-track spurs, saving initial construction costs? If funding is limited, is there a possibility that ONLY the bypasses or the in-town line will be built in the UPRR corridor? If the decision is made to "phase" the bypasses first in the UPRR corridor, will "temporary" stations be built outside of city centers? With a west of 99 alternative, could the existing Amtrak service serve as an initial feeder to the HSR if some lines into city center stations were deferred? Why hasn't the mitigation of parcel splits by swapping land on either side of the ROW with adjoining farms been addressed? What is the effect of a HSR alignment along the UPRR corridor on the pressure to bring SR-99 to full interstate status if many interchanges will be built or re-built for the HSR project? How does this upgrade of highway facilities affect sprawl? Project Costs How were the estimates for the SFO-Millbrae and Redwood City Station developed? Were these costs checked against Caltrain's recent experience with new station design and construction? Why are many		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				components of the cost of a Fourth and Townsend Station in San Francisco omitted, such as real estate costs, environmental mitigation, etc? Why are no maps available to complement the detailed capital cost data? There is no way to determine the segments that the capital cost tables refer to, so it is virtually impossible to determine the cost of each alterntiave where there are a number of sub-alternatives. Please provide detailed maps clearly showing each segment of the project, keyed to the extensive spreadsheets. Other Impacts Why is there no mention of the San Joaquin Valley National Cemetery? Doesn't the Pacheco alignment cross the cemetery property? How far is the railway from the gravesites at the cemetery? What is the sound impact of the trains on the solitude of the cemetery? How was this significant receptor missed in the study? How many other omissions like this might there be in the DEIR/EIS? What is the construction impact on the Coe/Diablo alternatives? How will machinery and workers access the tunnel portals? How many miles of construction roads will be built? How long will it take to bring workers to and from construction sites for each shift?		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				How does this travel time affect the labor cost of the alternative? What amount of energy is required to move in workers and material to the remote construction sites? Where will materials be staged? What impacts does the introduction of large numbers of humans have on the animals in the area? How will the construction roads be removed (will they be removed) and how will the land be restored when construction is complete? How is emergency access provided for the line, once in operation? What effect will wildfire supression policies have on the operation of the railway in the wilderness? How realistic is it to assume a station in Santa Clara (to serve Mineta International Airport) and a station in San Jose at the existing Diridon Station? Are these stations not more than 3 miles apart? Why wasn't an analysis of either a San Jose OR a Santa Clara station conducted? Every rail operation, with the exception of VTA's Vasona line, stops or runs past the Santa Clara station, making it as strong a candidate for a Silicon Valley station as Dirdon station. Additionally, could not the adoption of the Santa Clara station site reduce the need to add two new levels to Diridon Station.		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				including over a mile of elevated railway tracks? Thank you for your review of my comments and I await answers to all my questions. I am available to meet with Authority staff or consultants to answer any questions that may arise from the preceeding comments.		
W190	8/31/2004	Michael Kiesling	RAFT - Regional Alliance For Transit 1000 Union Street #207 San Francisco, CA 94133	Comments below also mailed to the Authority. August 28, 2004 Re: Comments on DEIR/EIS for the proposed California High Speed Rail Project To whom it may concern: The Regional Alliance For Transit (RAFT) was organized in 1992 to save the Transbay Transit Terminal from demolition and to make sure bus service was an integral part of a new intermodal facility for Caltrain and statewide high speed rail. Over the past twelve years RAFT has advocated for the development of a properly designed high-speed rail system in California. RAFT supports the findings in the DEIR/EIS that a HSR project is the best way to meet the state's future intercity mobility needs. RAFT finds the detail of the DEIR/EIS troubling. RAFT is very concerned over	W190-1	See responses to Comment Letter O081. This (W190) is a repeated comment letter.

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				the omission of an "Altamont" alternative from the DEIR/EIS. RAFT feels that an Altamont alignment should be studied, as it seems to be the alternative best suited to providing a significant improvement to mobility in Northern California, offers the fastest travel times to all destinations in the Bay Area, with the exception of San Jose, and is by far the lowest-cost alternative. Specific questions that are unanswered in the DEIR/EIS are: ▪ How can any extra minutes of travel time between every Bay Area station (except San Jose) and the rest of the statewide system be justified? What is the justification for dropping the Altamont alternative which provided the fastest travel times to the majority of destinations? What community input lead to the development of the Coe/Diablo alternatives? What consideration was made of tying in HSR to the Bay Area's considerable existing mass transit system? Is it assumed that HSR passengers will drive to the San Francisco terminal? Where will they park? Would they not instead take Muni, BART or AC Transit to the terminal? If passengers are assumed to drive, what are the air quality impacts?		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				▪ Should not the DEIR/EIS have provided information as to how the proposed HSR will work in a comprehensive manner with existing bus and rail transit at the proposed San Francisco, San Francisco Airport, Redwood City and San Jose stations, and air quality and highway and local road congestion? ▪ If the Altamont alignment is going to be studied—how could it not be?—should not the DEIR/EIS show the tying in of existing mass transit to stations in the vicinity of Livermore and Fremont and the impacts on highway congestion and air quality? ▪ How many passengers projected to use the CHSRA for commuting are current Caltrain passengers? How does this "migration" of riders affect Caltrain, and what ridership implications does this have for the Pacheco and Diablo Direct alignments studied by the DEIR/EIS? How has the operation of the Caltrain "Baby Bullet" trains been analyzed in the DEIR/EIS? ▪ It is understood environmental leaders met with Authority staff and Board members over the issue of a bay crossing at Dumbarton.		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				Will the results of this meeting be added to the EIR/EIS to expand the discussion of environmental concerns over a Dumbarton Crossing? ▪ Why are there no maps showing specific alignment options, especially maps that could be used to correlate the segment cost data, presented in http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov/eir/pdf/rgn_stdies/state/Costs/Final_Cost_Rept_App_F.pdf ? Why weren't operations for the rejected Altamont alignment modeled based on projected demand at Bay Area terminals, rather than assuming an equal split of service between San Jose and San Francisco terminals in phase one, or between San Jose, San Francisco and Oakland in the final service scenario? ▪ Why do the cost estimates for a Dumbarton HSR bridge seem to be about 4 times higher than the costs for recent Bay Area bridge projects, including the San Mateo Bridge trestle, Benicia Bridge, and the Zampa Bridge? Wouldn't the use of recently completed projects offer a more accurate cost than a very preliminary design for a hypothetical bridge planned for the		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				widest part of the bay? ▪ Why are there no impacts mentioned concerning the San Joaquin Valley National Cemetery, even though the Pacheco alignment seems to cross the cemetery? Was the National Cemetery Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs notified of the existence of the DEIR/EIS and of the opportunity to make comments? RAFT believes that the EIR/EIS is incomplete without the reintroduction of an Altamont alternative. We would be happy to meet with Authority staff to outline our fully-developed proposal. Sincerely, for RAFT M. Kiesling		
W191	8/31/2004	Ralph Petty, Community Developme nt Director	City of Millbrae 621 Magnolia Ave Millbrae, CA 94030	A four-track rail alignment through the City of Millbrae is not an acceptable alignment and is not in conformance with the Millbrae Station Area Specific Plan and Program EIR adopted by the Millbrae City Council in November of 1998.	W191-1	The Authority has identified sharing tracks with express Caltrain commuter service as the preferred alignment option to serve downtown San Francisco and SFO. The program process concluded that there are no other feasible alignment options for bringing direct HST service to San Francisco. The train operations modeling for the Program EIR/EIS has concluded that a four-track alignment would be required to

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
						serve the projected needs of both the HST system and Caltrain. If the HST proposal moves forward, the Authority will continue to work with the City of Millbrae, Samtrans, the Caltrain JPB, MTC, and the other cities and transportation agencies along the Caltrain alignment throughout the future preparation of more detailed project specific studies. Please also see standard response 6.2.1.
W192	8/31/2004	Sheri Lubin	38775 Stonington Terrace Fremont, CA 94536	I am generally in support of the concept of a high-speed train. However, I am strongly against the proposed alternative routings through the mountains east of San Jose. I am especially against the routing through Henry Coe State Park, but also feel that the Pacheco Pass Route is a worse choice environmentally then Altamont Pass. The Henry W. Coe State Park is the finest one in the state system of parks, and the Wilderness area in the north of the park (where the route would go), is the greatest gem of all. It is has recently been revealed that the consultants never even visited this area, or any part of the park. There is	W192-1	Please see standard response 6.3.1.