

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
						<p>were sent letters providing information about the proposed HST system and alternatives and requesting information about any traditional cultural properties that could potentially be affected. Subsequently the Native American Heritage Commission, through an interagency agreement with the Authority, facilitated a series of informational meetings with tribal representatives and notified tribal representatives about the meetings and the Draft Program EIR/EIS environmental process. Use of the Native American Heritage Commission for meeting notification and facilitation was determined to be the best way to reach out to tribal representatives during the program-level process. Prior to the release of the Draft Program EIR/EIS, the Authority met with tribal representatives on September 9, 2003, at Frazier Park in the Tehachapi Mountains; on September 10, 2003, at the San Luis Recreation Area in Gustine; and on October 9, 2003, at the Temecula Community Center. Subsequent to the release of the Draft Program EIR/EIS, the Authority and FRA met with tribal representatives on March 24, 2004, at the San Luis Recreation Area in</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
						Gustine; and April 14, 2004, at UC-Riverside.
				<p>Native American inclusion should be initiated from the start as there is a potential to affect ceremonial and burial sites. This strategy should include special meetings with Native American groups from specific counties of the project area, i.e., Los Angeles, Kern, etc. The follow considerations should be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Native American consultants should be hired to monitor any above and belowground observations and excavations. These consultants should be selected from groups that are culturally aware and sensitive to specific tribal geographical locations. ▪ All cultural artifacts discovered and located during as excavation and construction phases should be considered as property of those tribes located within the tribal geographical boundaries of that discovery. Artifacts should be placed into TEMPORARY repository at a local university until such time that an Native American museum is established. ▪ Under no circumstances should any funerary or burial remains be 	W063-2	<p>Please see standard response 3.12.1. See standard response 10.1.4.</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>subjected to any type of scientific analysis such as radio carbon dating etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Under all circumstances all federal and state regulations regarding cultural artifacts should be adhered to, i.e., CEQA and U.S. Preservation Act 106, etc. ▪ An "In Situ" position should be adhered to as much as possible in terms of any burials remains that are located within the project area. All appropriate notifications should be made in accordance with laws and regulations. In the event of any burial relocation all appropriate Native American ceremonial processes should be adhered. Additionally, Native American ceremonial elders should conduct all ceremonies. ▪ Favorable consideration should be made for the funding of designated site areas for the establishment of Native American memorials throughout the project area in order to preservation cultural identity and awareness. Furthermore, funding should be established to erect a Native American museum or museums within the project areas. 		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Special funds should be set aside for the establishment of cultural/historical educational programs administered and presented by Native Americans to the various communities within the project areas. All appropriate regulations and consultations should be made to identify, protect and preserve the flora and fauna indigenous to Native American use, i.e., deer grass, salt grass, redbud roots, etc. Additionally, agreements should be made between appropriate agencies and the Native American community for the use of identified flora and fauna. 		
W064	between February and May 17, 2004*	Kirk Klausmeyer, Graduate Student	UC Berkeley 2172 Blake St. #3, Berkeley CA 94704	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft EIR/EIS for the high-speed rail proposal. I am a graduate student at UC Berkeley and I am completing a masters in environmental planning. I am particularly interested in how public and private entities incorporate endangered species into their planning process. While the draft EIR/EIS does a good job mentioning impacts to endangered species, the analysis could be strengthened. I have assembled a GIS file with all of the available federally designated critical habitat	W064-1	Please see standard response 3.15.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>designations for the state of California from the US Fish and Wildlife Service. I also asked for and received the GIS file for the high-speed rail alignment alternatives from your agency. I added a buffer to the alignment based on the 0.5-mile buffer on each side of the alignment used in the EIR/EIS for sensitive areas. I found that the proposed buffered alignments affect 10 separate critical habitat designations for 21 separate threatened or endangered species. The common and scientific names of these species are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bay checkerspot butterfly (Euphydryas editha bayensis) ▪ Butte County meadowfoam (Limnanthes floccosa ssp. Californica) California condor (Gymnogyps californianus) ▪ Coastal California gnatcatcher (Polioptila californica californica) Conservancy fairy shrimp (Branchinecta conservation) ▪ Contra Costa goldfields (Lasthenia conjugens) ▪ Delta smelt (Hypomesus transpacificus) ▪ Fleshy owl's-clover (Castilleja campestris ssp. Succulenta) 		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Greene’s tuctoria (<i>Tuctoria greenei</i>) ▪ Hairy Orcutt grass (<i>Orcuttia pilosa</i>) ▪ Hoover’s spurge (<i>Chamaesyce hooveri</i>) ▪ Least Bell’s vireo (<i>Vireo bellii pusillus</i>) ▪ Longhorn fairy shrimp (<i>Branchinecta longiantenna</i>) ▪ Quino checkerspot butterfly (<i>Euphydryas editha quino</i> (=E. e. wrighti)) ▪ Sacramento Orcutt grass (<i>Orcuttia viscida</i>) ▪ San Bernardino Merriam’s kangaroo rat (<i>Dipodomys merriami parvus</i>) ▪ San Diego fairy shrimp (<i>Branchinecta sandiegonensis</i>) ▪ San Joaquin Orcutt grass (<i>Orcuttia inaequalis</i>) ▪ Slender Orcutt grass (<i>Orcuttia tenuis</i>) ▪ Solano grass (<i>Tuctoria mucronata</i>) ▪ Tidewater goby (<i>Eucyclogobius newberryi</i>) ▪ Vernal pool fairy shrimp (<i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>) ▪ Vernal pool tadpole shrimp (<i>Lepidurus packardi</i>) 		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Colusa grass (<i>Neostapfia colusana</i>) <p>The draft EIR/EIS does not include maps of any of these Federally designated critical habitats. The final should be amended to show the location of these critical habitats and the locations where the proposed high-speed rail alignments intersect or pass nearby the habitat. I urge you to recreate my analysis for the final programmatic EIR/EIS. I noticed that some of the technical reports contained more information on critical habitat, so your consultants may have the critical habitat files. If not, you can contact the following people from the Fish and Wildlife Service in California. They were quite helpful to me.</p> <p>Kirk_waln@r1.fws.gov (Ventura) Greg_goldsmith@r1.fws.gov (Arcata) Joni_Mitchell@r1.fws.gov (Sacramento) Tony_mckinney@r1.fws.gov (Carlsbad)</p> <p>While I understand that this stage of the EIR/EIS is merely programmatic, I believe that this is the best time to incorporate information about conflicts with Federally designated critical habitat. Working to avoid critical habitat to the greatest extent possible at this early stage will help to avoid costly delays and consultations with the Fish and Wildlife Service later in the process. I generally support the high-</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				speed rail proposal, but I do not support the analysis as it currently stands. Thank you for your time and consideration.		
W065	between February and May 17, 2004*	Paul Hunt	4929 Webster St. Oakland, CA 94609	A route through Henry Coe would break-up a tremendous California wilderness. Pacheco makes more sense for our future. Henry Coe is very rugged (and pristine). It must be MUCH more expensive than going through Pacheco.	W065-1	Please see standard response 6.3.1.
W066	between February and May 17, 2004*	Jon Innis, Educator	27247 Ave. 196, Strathmore, CA 93267	<p>Please consider my input on route locations of a California high-speed rail system. I've long been an advocate of investing in advanced homeland technologies rather than advanced bombing technologies. It makes me blister with anger to think of all the high-speed train systems or photovoltaic electric systems we could have built with the billions wasted in Iraq.</p> <p>I live in the very smoggy San Joaquin Valley which is getting smoggier as more houses are being built on the prime farmland and more Californians drive from north to south. I look at the foothills of the Sierras as the place that future housing should be built, if it must be built, rather than on prime farmland. Foundations may cost a bit more on poor soil, but top quality</p>	W066-1	The purpose and need of the proposed HST system is to link California's major metropolitan areas. If constructed, the HST system could ultimately be extended to other locations—if it were financially and environmentally feasible to do so. However, the investigation of other potential HST extensions beyond the proposed HST system is beyond the scope of this program environmental process. The alignment you have identified (through the Sierra foothills from Redding to Chico to Yuba City to Roseville to Ione to Merced Falls to Clovis to Porterville to Woody to Tehachapi to Rosamond to Phelan to Rialto to Murrieta and on to San Diego) does not serve California's major metropolitan areas. Such an alignment would not be able to attract the ridership and revenue

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>farmland should be saved for food production.</p> <p>I'm grateful that the currently proposed high speed rail route goes through the San Joaquin Valley but I don't like the idea that it will cover and promote the covering of much more farmland. I think the main north to south route should go through the Sierras' foothills from Redding to Chico to Yuba City to Roseville to Ione to Merced Falls to Clovis to Porterville to Woody to Tehachapi to Rosamond to Phelan to Rialto to Murrieta and on to San Diego. This route would be cheaper to purchase, is much less developed, would save farmland from more development, is more scenic, largely avoids the San Andreas Fault, and is mostly flat or moderate hills. It passes many recreation areas (Tahoe, Yosemite, Sequoia, Kings Canyon, Wrightwood, San Diego), universities, and airports. It doesn't duplicate as much of the current transportation systems such as Amtrak routes and Highway 99. It would provide sensible links to coastal areas, more airports, Las Vegas, and Palm Desert with connecting routes. Connecting routes could be Rialto to Indio, Rialto to Long Beach, Rosamond to Oxnard, Phelan to Las Vegas, Porterville to San Luis</p>		<p>necessary to support a viable HST service. Please also see standard response 2.25.1 regarding the consideration and rejection of routes east and west of SR-99, and standard response 2.1.12 regarding high density development around stations.</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>Obispo, Merced Falls to Gilroy to Watsonville, Ione to San Leandro, and Roseville to Novato. Many California communities have existing public transportations that would link to many of the communities I listed. My feeling is that educated people who have money to spend and who enjoy the outdoors will be willing riders of such a train system. With proper bus, light rail, and rental car access, traveling by high-speed rail would be great.</p>		
				<p>Questions... Why wasn't a public forum scheduled for Tulare County? I know we are the biggest welfare county in the state and we're mostly hispanic, but is that a good reason to ignore us? I've been interested in this a long time and have written numerous letters to law makers on the subject in the past but yesterday on the radio was the first I've heard of your organization.</p>	W066-2	<p>Seven public hearings were held on the Program EIR/EIS during the public comment period (Sacramento–March 23, 2004; Los Angeles–April 13; San Francisco–April 15; San Diego–April 20; Fresno–April 28, 2004; San Jose–May 26, 2004; and Los Angeles–June 23, 2004). The Authority and FRA believe that this was an appropriate number of hearings for a program-level environmental process, and that the locations selected would allow for participation throughout the state. It would not be feasible to have held public hearings in each county or city that may be impacted by or interested in the proposed HST system. Fresno was determined to be the best location in the Central Valley for a public hearing because</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
						of its large population and its central location. During the public comment process, the Authority staff made several presentations in Tulare County (including: Tulare Association of Governments Transportation Committee on 2/23/04, Valley wide Workshop in Fresno on 4/26/04, Visalia City Council on 5/03/04, and the Visalia Chamber of Commerce/EDC on 8/10/04). Please also see standard response 8.1.1 regarding notification of Draft Program EIR/EIS document and public hearings.
				What is the cost and feasibility of building chunnel like tunnels through the San Gabriel or Sierra Nevada Mountains. A route from Lancaster straight to Long Beach would be cool. Better yet, how would a straight line connecting Fresno to Mammoth to Salt Lake?	W066-3	To address the complex issues associated with the tunneling required for the statewide HST system, the Authority held a technical tunneling conference in December 2001. The conference was attended by tunneling contractors, specialized tunnel engineers, geologists/geotechnical engineers, and representatives of the program management and regional study consultant teams. "The attendees acknowledged the Authority's objective of minimizing the amount of tunneling required, particularly the use of long tunnels (more than 6 mi [10 km] long), due to cost, time of construction, and

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
						<p>potential for delay. Tunnels more than 12 mi (19 km) long were considered to be infeasible for this project. The attendees also acknowledged the Authority's objective of crossing major fault zones at grade. The technical information produced by the tunneling conference is documented in the <i>Tunneling Issues Report</i> (California High Speed Rail Authority, January 2004)." (Draft Program EIR/EIS, pages 2-10). The <i>Tunneling Issues Report</i> states, "due to tunnel boring construction practices and equipment maintenance, the attendees suggested a practical limit of 6-8 mi for a single tunnel heading. By using multiple headings (boring in both directions toward the midpoint of the tunnel segment), tunnel lengths of 12 mi could be achieved. However, based on the additional tunnel infrastructure (third tube) required, continuous tunnel lengths beyond 6 mi are also significantly more costly. In addition, the attendees raised issues regarding the size and limitations of current contracting practices that further support limiting the continuous length of tunnels. Tunnels of over 12 mi in total length were considered impractical." (Page</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
						31) The suggested tunnel locations/routes involving the Sierra Nevada Mountains, and Fresno to Salt Lake City are outside the scope of this Program EIR/EIS, but would undoubtedly require tunnels far exceeding the length considered to be practicable.
				Thanks for your efforts! I'll take any high-speed train we can get!	W066-4	Acknowledged.
W067	between February and May 17, 2004*	Bruce Race, Architect/Urban Planner	RACESTUDIO 1128 The Alameda Berekeley CA 94707	<p>The EIR assumes the service competes with airlines rather than enhanced rail corridor services from traditional providers. The \$25B budget could instead:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide 140mph, double tracked service in the San Joaquin corridor; ▪ Lightrail for every major central Valley community creating a managed armature for growth rather than having communities compete for sprawl inducing access; and ▪ Connect the systems to SF and LA rail networks. <p>There would be \$7B left over for rolling stock. Instead of having a diversified and redundant transit system, we will have a monolithic and expensive train that would travel only 60 mph faster than traditional rail that will compete</p>	W067-1	Please see standard response 2.9.2 and 2.9.1

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				with cars, not airlines. The modal alternatives have to consider an enhanced traditional rail and light rail system. These systems can approach higher efficiencies and speeds, with greater local access, if given just 65% of the same budget. The EIR is not valid without a comparison with a more robust and modern traditional regional and local rail and transit system.		
W068	between February and May 17, 2004* – second submittal	Bruce Race, Architect/ Urban Planner	RACESTUDIO 1128 The Alameda Berkeley CA 94707	The HSRA has had to market the system like it was a 200 mph Costco where the lucky cities that successfully competed for stations get the economic benefits and the adjoining areas get the environmental impacts. This system will induce sprawl by opening up the Central valley’s cheap land. Rather than investing in better local light rail transit and enhanced regional traditional rail that creates an armature for growth, this system will put more pressure on the parts of the state that already lack water and have critical air quality problems. It will increase local traffic because it will use transportation funding (in spite what the marketing program says) that can support alternative modes. And, it cannot be incrementally implemented. We will live with traffic projections until (opening service in) 2017 and beyond. With light rail and enhancing heavy rail, we can	W068-1	The HST system is proposed to serve intercity trips, rather than local commuter trips and it will be integrated with public transit services. The HST system is forecast to carry 42-68 million passengers annually by 2020, generate an operational surplus, and have benefits which considerably exceed the costs of the system. Please refer to the Authority’s June 2000 Business Plan for further details and also see standard response 2.1.1. Light rail and heavy rail systems are designed to carry local, regional and commuter trips, but do not provide competitive travel times for intercity trips between California’s major transportation markets. Intrastate air travel, as part of the Modal alternative, is considered because HST is a viable alternative to reliance on continued expansion of air and

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				experience the benefits within a year or two. By comparing the high-speed rail to air travel, rather than alternative rail transit, the HSRA has avoided being compared to investments that will mitigate, rather than exacerbate, growth in the Central Valley.		highway intercity travel. The proposed HST system has potential to result in air quality benefits. Cities and counties, which have responsibility for land use planning, can and should address future potential growth to minimize sprawl, as well as meeting other needs (e.g., assuring that new developments have an adequate water supply). Please see Chapter 5 "Economic Growth and Related Impacts" of the Program EIR/EIS in relation to the potential impacts of the HST system as it relates to growth and the economy.
W069	between February and May 17, 2004*	Nadine Scott	550 Hoover St., Oceanside, CA 92054	I am 100% in favor of this project. I frequently go to Northern California and the drive time is horrendous. Also, when I have packages to carry, it is impossible to fly. This will be a fantastic addition to my travel choices.	W069-1	Acknowledged.
W070	between February and May 17, 2004*	Cheryle DeWitt,	12854 Cam. de las Olas Del Mar, CA 92014	This rail system should be taken out of the wetlands immediately and put by I-5. Rail systems don't belong in wetlands. They damage the environment, kill animals and pollute. Move it ASAP.	W070-1	Please see standard response 6.42.1. Please also see standard response 2.30.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W071	between February and May 17, 2004*	Elizabeth Mahan	Central Valley Rails to Trails Foundation, 9050 Dillard Road Wilton CA 95693	I appreciate the work you are doing and hope that the bond measure will not be delayed until 2008. I would like to see this train in the Sacramento area in my lifetime.	W071-1	Acknowledged. The Governor and Legislature have placed a bond measure (SB1169) on the November 2006 ballot that would provide \$9 billion towards the construction of HST in California and nearly \$1 billion for improvements to other existing conventional rail services which compliment and provide feeder service to the HST system.
				As a resident of Wilton, I strongly oppose use of the Central California Traction Rail Corridor for the Sacramento to Stockton route. The community has other plans for this unused corridor and the conversion to high-speed rail would be highly disruptive to our traffic patterns and intended creation of a recreational trail. The downtown route makes more sense and utilizes an active corridor with much less disruption to the environment and adjacent communities. I am also concerned that a selection may be delayed for several years. Our community is going forward with conceptual planning for the trail and will have great difficulty obtaining planning grants if the corridor selection is still in limbo. If you do not intend to use the CCTC for the Sac-Stockton route, please announce that decision as soon as possible. If you know that the	W071-2	Acknowledged. Please see standard response 6.12.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				CCTC route is preferred, then give us the courtesy of knowing that information so that the hundreds of volunteers and financial supporters for the rail-trail do not waste their valuable resources. I would appreciate being kept informed on the status of the corridor decision.		
W072	between February and May 17, 2004*	Patrick Carroll, Manager	60 Ora Way #104 San Francisco, CA 94131	I am a long time supporter of high-speed rail, but I have been less than pleased with the political taint of the California High Speed Rail Authority and its selection of a route through environmentally sensitive areas in the Diablo Range between San Jose and Los Banos, over the proven Altamont Pass Route. Selection of the Pacheco route smacks of political patronage of the worst sort. It would require much more grading, filling and drilling than the Altamont alternative. It would open up farmland for development while bypassing the already developed I-580 corridor. It calls for a station in the middle of a dairy farm in Los Banos. Curious, until one discovers that the dairy farm is owned by the family of former Assemblyman Rusty Areias, who just happens to be employed by as a subcontractor on the environmental study working for Parsons, Brinckerhoff, Quade and Douglas (PBQ&D). Coincidence? I	W072-1	Please see standard response 2.18.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				think not. California doesn't need and cannot afford another multibillion dollar debacle that will enrich a handful of insiders while leaving the rest of us out in the cold. I urge the Authority to stop the insider abuse and get back on track. This state needs and deserves a real high-speed rail system that will serve all Californians.		
W073	between February and May 17, 2004*	Edson Tennyson, Engineer	3200 LaRotonda Drive Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275	Cost must be reduced. Use more existing trackage where speed permits. Maximize patronage. not speed. NO MAG-LEV. It can't share any existing track or right-of-way. It costs too much to build and to operate. China found the power costs eats them up. Their first commercial Mag-Lev line cost far too much and attracts far too few. China has stopped further MagLev plans to study use of conventional high-speed rail.	W073-1	Please see Responses 2.10.3.
W074	between February and May 17, 2004*	Afam Agbodike	2520 College Ave #206, Berkeley, CA 94704	I believe it is a serious mistake to leave out the Altamont alignment for the California high-speed rail system. It will leave a major and fast growing population center unserved by the HSR system. It is my personal position that I will vote against the bond if the Altamont corridor is not considered.	W074-1	Please see standard response 2.18.1.
				I also feel that maglev technology should be considered, especially with the intention of Southern California to	W074-2	Please see standard response 2.10.3

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				implement a maglev network. It has now been proven in the real world by the line in China, and allows for shorter overall trip time because of higher speed, and shorter stopping time.		
W075	5/23/2004	Robert Footlik	76 Clifton Place Stevenson Ranch, CA 91381-1105	The EIR Report recommendation of station stop in the Santa Clarita Valley is unacceptable. The Santa Clarita Valley is one of the fastest growing communities in the United States, let alone California, and the High-Speed Rail Authority has a responsibility to serve that community NO MATTER WHAT IT TAKES! A station stop in San Fernando will in NO WAY serve the citizens of the Santa Clarita Valley. The City of Santa Clarita has responded to the EIR in similar fashion, and irrespective of the final alignment selected, you need to find a way to accommodate Santa Clarita.	W075-1	<p>Five different potential station locations were investigated for the Santa Clarita Valley (SR-126/I-5, Magic Mountain Parkway/I-5, Via Princessa/SR-14, Old Road/I-5, and San Fernando Road/SR-14) and all five were rejected as part of the screening evaluation because they were impracticable, and/or did not meet the project objectives. The rationale behind eliminating the Santa Clarita Valley station options is presented in Section 2.6.9 <i>Alternative Alignment and Station Options Considered in Screening Evaluation</i> (Draft Program EIR/EIS, page 2-71).</p> <p>The Authority has identified the Sylmar Metrolink site as the preferred HST station site to serve the San Fernando Valley, Simi Valley, and Newhall/Santa Clarita areas. The Sylmar Metrolink site would provide a direct connection to the Metrolink regional commuter rail service and would have convenient</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
						access to the Los Angeles freeway network.
W076	5/27/2004	Don Meehan	1714 Merrill Dr. San Jose, CA 95124	Please do not build a rail, road, tunnel, or dam in Henry Coe Park. Its the second largest state park in the state-it shouldn't even be legal to propose it!!!!!!	W076-1	Please see standard response 6.3.1.
W077	5/28/2004	Todd Clobes, Biotech	314 San Jose Ave. San Francisco, CA 94110	While I completely agree with the construction of CA HSR, I am at a loss to explain why you want to route the connection to the central valley south of San Jose. As a former resident of Livermore, I saw the dire need for fast reliable transportation in the Tracy to Fremont corridor. This area is where people live and work - not in Henry Coe State Park. It would be foolish to design and build a world-class rail system and not take into account the realities of travel patterns. Please study the Altamont corridor and provide a means for people to travel locally as well as throughout the state. The success of HSR will rely on the daily commuters as much as the infrequent long haul riders.	W077-1	Please see standard response 2.18.1.
W078	6/5/2004	Beth Brummitt	12992 Caminito del Canto Del Mar,CA 92014	I STRONGLY OPPOSE DOUBLE TRACKING THROUGH THE PENASQUITOS LAGOON. I live nearby in Del Mar. The trains would have a large negative impact on more noise and vibration in the area, and it	W078	Please see standard response 6.42.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				appears to me that there would be direct destructive habitat impacts in the sensitive lagoon during construction. A new station would also bring more unwanted noise, traffic, and neighborhood, and not even be near the main population centers it expects to serve. Traffic definitely needs to be planned and managed, but we strongly feel that all of our communities would be best served if transit remains along our already established transit corridors, and the rail line is moved to the freeway. I particularly favor the expansion of Bus Rapid Transit on HOV lanes. I STRONGLY OPPOSE DOUBLE TRACKING THROUGH THE PENASQUITOS LAGOON.		
W079	6/12/2004	Anne Winter, Writer	2553 Via Merano Del Mar, CA 92014	This is the best plan that anyone can come up with? Tearing up Del Mar; adding more tracks, trains, pollution, noise to the wetland areas on each end of town. Why bother having protected areas if they are so easily breached? Why bother trumpeting California's coastline if it's really just there to be paved over, all the little towns and special spots wrecked. Go back to the drawing board. You can do better than this.	W079-1	Please see standard response 6.42.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W080	6/26/2004	Taylor Van Scoy	3457 Josie Ave. Long Beach, CA 90808	Hello, I attended the public hearing at the MTA building in Los Angeles on June 23, 2004 about the High Speed Rail system. I heard a few people comment about the noise. I was just wondering if the people of the board, or other faculty have tested any new trains, or prototypes of the ones that will be used in the operation of the High Speed Rail. I would think that if it is electric, it wouldn't pollute at all, but as far as the noise factor, if these trains are aerodynamically inclined, and they run very fast and smooth, much like a steel rollercoaster, I can't imagine any significant trouble with the noise or vibration to nearby industries.	W080-1	The Program EIR/EIS generally describes potential noise impacts along certain representative segments of the proposed system depending on train speeds, frequencies, and adjacent land uses. Specific impacts and mitigation will be identified in the subsequent project-level environmental review. See also standard response 3.4.1.
				By the way, I am very much in favor of this High Speed Rail system. It will definitely help me to be able to see my close relatives who live up near the Sacramento area, because of the convenient travel duration, and the cheap ticket price.	W080-2	Acknowledged.
W081	7/7/2004	Rachel Poole	581 Frederick St. San Francisco, CA 94117	I am in strong support of the draft program EIR/EIS in all respects. I believe high-speed train construction of this kind in California will vastly improve the impact of transportation on the environment, commerce, the political landscape, and on the well-being of the population. Automobile and air travel have outgrown their	W081-1	Acknowledged.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				intended frameworks on all levels. I believe the report shows a responsible and level-headed approach to solving this problem and providing Californians with a world-class alternative to the dangers and inefficiencies of the current system.		
W082	7/12/2004	Joanne Fuss	2073 Redwood Drive Santa Cruz, CA 95060	I find it irresponsible of our public stewards to consider sending the this rail system through the northern portion of Henry Coe, no matter how much Merced may be pushing for this route. Our wild areas are already so few, and in the future this resource will be even more valuable to an ever increasing population. If you adopt this northern route, many will look back in dismay at the lack of foresight our leaders had to degrade such a precious resource. And how can you say it will not be used for commute purposes? You know darn well the development industry of Merced County (where I am from, and have relatives who are in the field) is pushing for this. Please be considerate of the needs of your grandchildren and greatgrandchildren as you plan this rail system.	W082-1	Please see standard response 6.3.1.
W083	7/16/2004	Cathy Burt	10054 Colony Rd Wilton, CA 95693	I am in favor of the proposed High Speed Train system. My objection is to the proposed use of the abandoned Central Calif. Traction Railroad line that goes from Sacramento to Stockton.	W083-1	Acknowledged. Please see standard response 6.12.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>The majority of this line runs through undeveloped, rural farmland. To convert this abandoned line to a high speed train system would have a negative affect on the natural resources and farmlands, an adverse social and economic impact and there are soils constraints in this area that caused this railway to be abandoned in the first place.</p> <p>The majority of this abandoned railway runs through rural farmland. To install a high speed train through this area would expose the residents (human, animal and birds) to noise pollution and vibration. There are large sections that are not close to any roads or highways. The HST would have a severe impact on these areas.</p> <p>This area is composed of small (2 to 20) acre ranches with some large agricultural areas interspersed. Rapid development to the west of the area is threatening to overtake the rural way of life here. The addition of the HST to this area would accelerate this urbanization that is threatening the way of life here.</p> <p>The HST would have a negative affect on the agricultural resouces in Eastern Sacramento county. Our farmland is rapidly disappearing due to the high prices available for land to be</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>developed. The introduction of the HST to this area would help to further erode the farmlands used for agriculture.</p> <p>One of the benefits of living in a rural area is the views of the hills, green pasture lands, trees and the lack of noise and sights of highways or freeways full of cars, trucks and pollution. Installing the HST in this area would have a negative affect on these benefits.</p> <p>One of the major reasons the Central Calif. Traction Railroad was abandoned was due to the moist, wet soils in this area. The tracks continually sank and the trains would derail. The cost of continually shoring up the tracks became prohibitive and the railway was abandoned.</p> <p>This area has many vernal pools. The soi is clay like and becomes very hard in the summer but mushy in the winter from winter rains. Our yard is very much like a sponge in the winter. With every step the water seeps up around a person's foot. As I stated above, the original railway was abandoned because the tracks continually sank into the ground and would cause the train to derail.</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>The areas that the Central Calif. Traction Railroad travels through is a biological resource and wetland. There are many vernal pools in this area and wild life and bird life abounds. The introduction of a HST into this area would have an adverse affect on the wild life and wetlands that are here.</p> <p>As I stated above, the Southwestern area of Sacramento county is experiencing rapid, unstructured growth. There is a push by developers to quickly gobble up and develop any available land for further rapid, unstructured growth. The introduction of a HST into this area would only assist in the rapid development of this rural area.</p> <p>The unavoidable adverse environmental impact of the introduction of a HST along the now abandoned Central Calif. Traction Railway would be the noise, vibration, development and elimination of current wetlands and wildlife habitats.</p>		
W084	7/20/2004	Michael Graff	4512 Richmond Ave. Fremont, CA 94536	You must properly study Altamont alignments. In particular, you should study Michael Kiesling’s proposal at www.arch21.org .	W084-1	Please see standard response 2.18.1.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W085	8/1/2004	Lawrence Rodriguez, Geologist	17215 Oak Leaf Dr. Morgan Hill, CA 95037	The construction of a high speed rail that will connect Los Angeles to S.F. will serve the citizens of California well. Although we the citizens have voted for bond measures to procure wilderness land, knowing the legislator has enacted laws to protect it. We voted to keep this "bit" of land as wilderness no matter what the future may offer. Please, lets not set a precedent by changing the state law for a high speed rail through this non renewable resource. The high speed rail will be a valuable asset and the routs could be altered. Orestimba State Wilderness is also a valuable resource and if altered will never be the same. Lawrence J. Rodriguez, Proud Californian	W085-1	Please see standard response 6.3.1.
W086	8/4/2004	David Wells	P. O. 1523 Fresno, CA 93716	California High-Speed Rail Authority 925 L Street Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814 ** Ph. (916) 324-1541 Attn: California High-Speed Train - Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments 925 L Street, Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814 Fax: (916) 322- 0827 Chairperson: Joseph E. Petrillo Vice-Chairperson: Fran Florez Board Members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Marc Adelman, 	W086-1	Please see standard response 2.9.2 and standard response 2.10.3. All steel-wheel-on-steel-rail HST system trains capable of maximum speeds of at least 200 mph (322 kph) rely upon overhead electric lines for power.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Donna Andrews, ▪ Rod Diridon, ▪ Bob Giroux, ▪ Lynn Schenk, ▪ Tom Stapleton Executive Director: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mehdi Morshed ▪ Dan Leavitt (Deputy Director) ▪ Carrie Pourvahidi (Deputy Director) The California Citizens for Economic Leadership Committee commends the concept of a High Speed Rail Service in California. However, it does not agree with, nor condone, any rail usage that involves overhead cables for conducting electrical power to the trains. As illustrated in the case decision of Florida’s High Speed Rail Authority, we encourage and recommend, that provisions for future electrification be incorporated into the actual construction of the high speed rail lines as a precautionary and secondary “fall back” measure, but that technologies like the Bombardier “JetTrain” and/or “mag-lev” and/or high-speed mono-rail technologies be provided the primary opportunity to be bid, because electric overhead cables are extremely unsightly and contribute immensely to aesthetic degradation of communities		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>and the attractiveness of the State of California as a whole.</p> <p>Such overhead cables and their suspension apparatus that are used for conveying electric power to power the high speed trains are intensely unsightly, especially in the urban areas where all the track switching takes place and the multiple tracks are placed. If California expects to offset its budget problems by attracting "brain" oriented businesses to locate here, then it has to appeal to those kinds of people's mentality and sense of desired aesthetics and surroundings.</p> <p>Presently, even without those types of environmental aesthetic hindrances in the cities and urban areas, there still is an intense desire to migrate out of the cities and live in the more rural areas if one's allowed to do that, via their present employment and job descriptions. Given the choice, the general population will pick the low populated and/or rural areas almost any time, over living in the more crowded cities; and especially, those cities that have little or no eye appeal such as the older rust belt cities that have electric trolley and train overhead lines and wires. Chicago or Philadelphia, versus say Denver or Dallas or Ft. Worth. the latter cities will</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>win almost every time, if one were to judge on aesthetics.</p> <p>It is our strong contention that overhead electric lines are not good for business, nor good for California's long term economics. As easily demonstrated by the fact that underground electric wiring, has long ago been implemented in the major urban and city areas because the general population "hated" the looks and visual aesthetics of electric poles and lines everywhere. (The same held true of telephone service, as well.) Overhead lines have been outlawed in most communities new construction building codes - that should be proof enough of the general publics' view of overhead electrical wires and cables. (Gasp!) Therefore, we intensely urge the California High-Speed Rail Authority not to force us to take this issue to the public for a general vote, and thus seek other remedies that involve more time, money and efforts to combat what the general population has already told planners via their present building codes and laws.</p> <p>We urge the California High-Speed Rail Authority to cease and desist any plans for overhead electric lines to power any high speed rail trains, for the economic good of all parties concerned.</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>The California Citizens for Economic Leadership Committee commends the concept of a High Speed Rail Service in California. However, it does not agree with, nor condone, any rail usage that involves conveying upwards to two hundred trains per day at 200 miles per hour through the downtown of Fresno, California. We advocate the bypass and a rail maintenance yard be place to the west of the city with feeder lines or "siding" tracks coming into the City of Fresno, for the economic well being of employment to the city that has one of the most high unemployment rates in the country, rather than locating maintenance yards in Sacramento or elsewhere. Additionally, with so many trains going through downtown Fresno as such high speeds and such noise impacts, it would adversely affect the re-development of the downtown area, especially the Chinatown area that is presently being actively pursued in redevelopment efforts that have taken 9 to ten years to culminate and get under way with some definitive plans and actions.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Yours truly,</p> <p>David Wells, Executive Director</p>	W086-2	Please see standard response 6.20.5.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
W087	8/8/2004	Kim Forrest	784 Bluff Drive, Los Banos, CA 93635	In section S.3, the EIR/EIS states that "The system should maximize the use of existing transportation corridors and rights-of-way..." However, there are currently no tunnels through the Diablo Range. The reasoning for the elimination of the "Northern Mountain Crossing" route over Altamont Pass appears to be faulty and not fully developed. There is no explanation as to why it is projected that the Pacheco Pass alignment would have 1.1 million more intercity riders per year than the Altamont Pass alignment. Considering the large and rapidly growing population centers at Stockton and Tracey, this does not make sense. In addition, given that 1.1 million is only 2% of the estimated total ridership of 68 million and could easily be within the margin of error for this projection, this statistic should not be used to determine a critically important environmental and social-impacting decision. The Pacheco Pass alignment would result in an estimated 10 minute reduction in travel time between Los Angeles and San Jose and eight minutes faster between Los Angeles and San Francisco. This surely cannot be valid justification for the great environmental damage done to this area of the Diablo Range. And, the reason for rejection – the three-way	W087-1	Please see standard response 2.18.1. Please also refer to the CRA ridership and revenue technical reports referenced in the Program EIR/EIS. Travel time differences and frequency differences were described in Section 2.6.8.F of the Draft Program EIR/EIS.

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>split at Newark/Fremont – may very well better serve and provide more options for intra-Bay Area transportation needs (an area well-known for its traffic jams). In the reasoning for the elimination of the Altamont Pass alignment, the EIR/EIS lists “Bay crossing, wetlands, biology, hydrology”. However, wetland impacts would require mitigation under the Clean Water Act. The EIR/EIS states that “the Altamont Pass alignment would not avoid or substantially reduce potential environmental impacts, since it would require the construction of a new wetlands/water crossing over San Francisco Bay...”</p> <p>That assumption is incorrect, because any impacts must be mitigated. It thus appears that the main reason for eliminating this alignment was due to expense of tunneling or other construction and mitigation costs.</p>		
				<p>In the “Southern Mountain Crossing”, the EIR/EIS states that, “the Antelope Valley SR-58/Soledad Canyon could provide superior connectivity and accessibility to the Antelope Valley and would have a higher potential for serving long-distance commuters to Los Angeles” [emphasis added]. Is long-distance commuting – and the negative social and environmental impacts it</p>	<p>W087-2</p>	<p>Please see standard response 6.23.1. Please also see Chapter 5 “Economic Growth and Related Impacts”.</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>causes, not the least of which is urban sprawl – something that this project should encourage?</p>		
				<p>The EIR/EIS states that high-speed train travel time between San Francisco and Los Angeles will be comparable to air travel. However, it must be considered that air travel is tremendously less impacting to the landscape, environment, and social structure throughout the train corridor. Unfortunately, this EIR/EIS only considers the exact footprint of the rail right-of-way, and totally disregards the impacts to surrounding areas that are obviously impacted for quite some distance – including growth-inducing impacts.</p> <p>There is a great need for analysis on social impacts and quality of life issues regarding the growth-inducing impacts to small communities. This is not just a “land consumption”, “economic impacts”, “increased employment opportunities”, and “personal income growth” issue. The EIR/EIS states that “the level of difference between alternatives for urbanized area size is small compared to the overall level of growth”. This may be statistically valid for the entire population of California, but the impacts on small communities could be massive. The EIR/EIS section</p>	<p>W087-3</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 5 of the Program EIR/EIS, “Economic Growth and Related Impacts”. The environmental analysis for this program EIR/EIS did not only consider the “footprint of the rail right-of-way”. Please see Chapter 3, “Effected Environment and Environmental Consequences”, and Chapter 6, “HST Alignment Option Comparisons” of the Program EIR/EIS for the envelopes considered for potential HST impacts for each resource topic.</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				addressing communities states that induced growth does not create new barriers within neighborhoods and does not result in impacts on community cohesion. However, larger communities clearly have a different "community cohesion". Additional social science work is needed on this EIR/EIS.		
				<p>Clearly, an inadequate range of alternatives was considered. These three alternatives were extremely simplistic, with no consideration given to a logical mix of rail, air, and automobile transportation improvements. The EIR/EIS shows a 30 minute drive-time savings between San Francisco and Los Angeles resulting from \$82 billion needed to implement the Modal Alternative. That is nonsensical. Obviously, a vastly improved air travel option between those two metropolitan areas is needed. Expending \$82 billion to slightly shorten a seven-hour drive would not appear to be cost-effective.</p> <p>When discussing "Aviation Improvements Only", the EIR/EIS states that "air travel would not be competitive for trips less than 150 miles". Thus, conversely, air travel would be competitive for trips greater than 150 miles, and rail travel for trips</p>	W087-4	Improved air travel for long distances and HST service only within metropolitan areas (San Francisco-San Jose-East Bay, Los Angeles-San Diego, Sacramento-East Bay) would not be a reasonable alternative since it would not serve many intercity trips between major metropolitan areas of California, particularly the intercity travel markets of the Central Valley and would not meet the purpose and need of the HST system. The EIR/EIS analyzes an appropriate range of potentially feasible alternatives which could meet the purpose and need of the proposed HST system. The modal alternative considered a mix of potentially feasible improvements to the highway system and airports in order to meet the same level of intercity travel demand that the proposed HST system would serve, and this

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>less than 150 miles. When one looks at the travel needs and deficits of the State in a logical and economical manner, it appears that a blend of options would work best. The Authority needs to consider such options as improved air travel for the long distances between major metropolitan areas and high-speed rail within the metropolitan areas (San Francisco – San Jose – East Bay, Los Angeles – San Diego, and Sacramento – East Bay). Not only would this better focus transportation efforts where they are clearly needed, it would eliminate costly and unnecessary expenses such as hundreds of miles of rail where it is not needed; move people off of the highway system, decreasing wear and tear on the highway -- and thus operations and maintenance expenses, as well as improving safety; and vastly reduce negative environmental and social impacts across the entire landscape of California.</p>		<p>permits an appropriate comparative analysis of the impacts of these system alternatives. Please also see Response to Comment 0024-31.</p>
				<p>My comments regarding the Draft Program EIR/EIS are quite generic, as is the EIR/EIS. My comments focus on the Grasslands Ecological Area of the northern San Joaquin Valley. This 160,000-acre area – roughly located in a triangle with the towns of Dos Palos, Los Banos, and Gustine along the base</p>	<p>W087-5</p>	<p>Please see standard response 6.3.1. Please also see responses to Comment Letter AL072.</p>

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>of the triangle and Merced at the apex of the triangle – is located in Merced County. It consists of diverse habitats, and is recognized for its importance to a variety of wetland species. The Grasslands includes seasonally flooded wetlands, semi-permanent marsh, woody riparian habitat, wet meadows, vernal pools, native uplands, grasslands, and native brush land. Hundreds of thousands of shorebirds migrate through the area; it was officially recognized in 1991 by the Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network as one of only 15 internationally significant shorebird habitats. In addition, it was recognized in 1999 by the American Bird Conservancy as a Globally Important Bird Area. It is currently being nominated as a Wetland of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention due to its importance to a variety of wildlife, including several rare and endangered species, its critical role as wintering habitat for Pacific Flyway waterfowl, and its status as the largest remaining block of wetlands in what was once a vast Central Valley ecosystem.</p> <p>The Grasslands is a critical area for Pacific Flyway waterfowl populations, providing wintering habitat for 20</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>percent of the total population. Waterfowl populations average a half-million, with peak waterfowl numbers at one million. Several federally listed or proposed threatened and endangered species are known to occur either seasonally or year-round. As one of the largest remaining vernal pool complexes, Grasslands is home to many rare species associated with this disappearing habitat. San Joaquin kit fox, Aleutian Canada geese, Swainson’s hawks, and tri-colored blackbirds are also very dependent upon the area. Less than five percent of the original four million acres of Central Valley wetlands remain.</p> <p>In recognition of the rich and critically important natural resources of the Grasslands, the conservation agencies have focused more attention and funding on this area than most areas of the State. There are two U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service national wildlife areas encompassing approximately 35,000 acres, a U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service conservation easement program that encompasses 70,000 acres on 170 separate private properties, six units of the California Department of Fish and Game wildlife areas encompassing approximately 25,000 acres, a California Department of Parks and</p>		

Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS

Comment Number	Date Received	Name	Address	Comments	Number	Response
				<p>Recreation state park, and an extremely active Natural Resources Conservation Service program. This area has garnered numerous habitat restoration and enhancement grants totaling millions of dollars, and is one of the most active areas for conservation group involvement.</p> <p>However, under "Impacts on Public Parks, Wildlife Areas, and Recreation Resources", there is absolutely no mention of the natural resources of the Grasslands, the public and private ownership and protection of these resources, nor the internationally recognized designations of importance -- except one passing mention of San Luis NWR. There is no mention of the critically important habitat that the Grasslands provide waterfowl/waterbirds. Some of the suggested alignments ignore other well-recognized important natural areas, particularly the "Northern Mountain Crossing". Whether via Pacheco Pass or Diablo Range, this entire section of the Coast Range has been recognized for its important natural resources. The Nature Conservancy owns fee title and easement on 61,000 acres in this area, as part of its Mount Hamilton Project. The U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service has</p>		