



September 24, 2007

California High-Speed Rail Authority, EIR/EIS Comments
 925 L Street, Suite 1425
 Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: California High Speed Rail Alignment Alternatives Bay Area to Central Valley

Dear California High-Speed Rail Authority:

Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on the alignment alternatives for the Bay Area to Central Valley section of the proposed California High Speed Rail System.

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) proposes a high-speed train (HST) system for intercity travel in California between the major metropolitan centers of Sacramento and the San Francisco Bay Area in the north, through the Central Valley, to Los Angeles and San Diego in the south. The HST system is projected to carry as many as 117 million passengers annually by the year 2030.

The Authority and Federal Railroad Administration completed a statewide program environmental impact report/environmental impact statement (EIR/EIS) in November 2005, as the first phase of a tiered environmental review process for the proposed HST system. Following the certification of the statewide program EIR/EIS, the Authority initiated this Bay Area to Central Valley environmental review process which further examines this region as the next phase of the tiered environmental review process.

The City of Pleasanton has reviewed the EIR/EIS for the Bay Area to Central Valley HST Program and attended the public hearing in Livermore on August 27, 2007 to gain a better understanding of the project.

The EIR/EIS assessment of the overall Visual/Aesthetic Impacts is identified in the executive summary as "low to medium." Each of the proposed Altamont alignments brings 30-foot elevated structures through the City of Pleasanton. These elevated structures should be identified as having a *high* visual and aesthetic impact to Pleasanton. Appendix 3.9-A identifies the impacts only as *medium*. Any alternative that produces elevated structures through downtown and/or residential areas of the City should be considered a *high* visual/aesthetic impact, and these *high* impact alternatives are not supported by The City of Pleasanton. This proposed use and associated visual impacts are inconsistent with the City's General Plan, Downtown Specific Plan, and the Master Plan for the Downtown Parks and Trails System.

PUBLIC WORKS

P.O. BOX 520, Pleasanton, CA 94566-0802

Administration	Engineering	Traffic	Inspection	Operations Service Center
200 Old Bernal Ave. (925) 931-5648 Fax: 931-5479	200 Old Bernal Ave. (925) 931-5650 Fax: 931-5479	200 Old Bernal Ave. (925) 931-5650 Fax: 931-5479	157 Main Street (925) 931-5680 Fax: 931-5484	3333 Busch Road (925) 931-5500 Fax: 931-5595

PHS2-1

PHS2-2

The noise and vibration impact rating is identified as "medium" in the executive summary, and is documented in Appendix 3.4-A as *medium* (noise) and *medium* (vibration) for the I-580/I-680 alignment for the segment in Pleasanton and as *medium* (noise) and *high* (vibration) for the Union Pacific Railroad alignment. Medium to High noise and vibration impact in residential and downtown areas are not acceptable impacts to the City of Pleasanton, and any alternatives with this rating are not an acceptable alternative for the City of Pleasanton. The noise impacts will likely exceed our General Plan noise standards.

PHS2-3

The EIR/EIS does not identify specific impacts to the adjacent land uses, including information regarding the need and amount of additional right-of-way. The EIR/EIS also does not identify the impact to the three adjacent school land uses in Pleasanton which would be impacted with the Union Pacific alignment. Furthermore, the Bernal Property Specific Planning Area is adjacent to the proposed alignment. The plan for the Bernal property was ratified by the voters of Pleasanton and precludes any expanded use of the railroad system.

PHS2-4

The City of Pleasanton would like the EIR/EIS to provide greater detail on the design and impacts for the I-580/I-680 alignment. This would include a discussion on the impact to the adjacent land along both the I-580 and I-680 corridors.

After reviewing the alignment options and resulting visual, aesthetic, noise and vibration impacts, the City of Pleasanton does not support the Altamont Pass alignments along the Union Pacific alignment as it is currently envisioned and described in the EIR/EIS, for the reasons noted in this letter.

PHS2-5

The City of Pleasanton remains open to an alternative that uses the Altamont Pass and terminates in the City of Livermore.

Sincerely,



Jennifer Hosterman, Mayor
City of Pleasanton

C: City Council
Nelson Fialho, City Manager
Rob Wilson, Director of Public Works
Mike Tassano, Deputy Director of Public Works, Transportation