# Chapter 8. Web Comments

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W001 | between February and May 17, 2004* | John Ritchey | 103 Mustang Dr. #301 San Luis Obispo, CA 93405 | You've done a wonderful job preparing the EIR. I only hope the project passes voters in November. | W001-1 | Acknowledged. |
| W002 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Faye Ostergaard | 1938 Felspar St., #3 San Diego, CA 92109 | A high-speed rail is exactly what the state of California needs. This will allow for people of all ages to travel from San Diego to Sacramento without the headache of cars, vans, or buses. Allowing a direct route to the State Capital will unite California.<br>There are too many cars traveling from San Diego to San Francisco/Sacramento with only one or two passenger(s). This causes a high volume of air pollution and that is not good for the ozone and/or our future generations. | W002-1 | Acknowledged. |
| | | | | I like the route option that runs along the I-5 verses going through Palmdale. | W002-2 | Please see standard response 6.23.1. |
| | | | | For the second optional route locations at Merced or going through Los Banos; I feel that an economical study should take place. Will it be cost effective to build through Los Banos to Gilroy? Or should there solely be a direct route connecting the new railway to the already existing railway (B.A.R.T.)? Again I would like to see a cost estimate breakdown before commenting on that section of the | W002-3 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | railway system. | | |
| | | | | The number of accidents along Interstate 5 that connects northern and southern California is appalling and I think they are due to drivers being exhausted. This railway will give an alternative to the long drive and will decrease the number of cars on that Interstate. The amount of pollution that one passenger cars produce is staggeringly higher than a Railway system, with a number of passengers. | W002-4 | Acknowledged. |
| | | | | I would like a detailed cost analysis worksheet proved on each "Route Option" | W002-5 | Cost data worksheets for each HST alignment option are available and were included in the Costs and Operations technical report, January 2004. |
| W003 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Lisa Tsering, journalist | 2625 Ivy Dr., #7 Oakland, CA 94606 | I think we really need this rail system, as a citizen and a voter you have my full support. | W003-1 | Acknowledged. |
| | | | | Hello, this web site is very bureaucratic. I had to wade through countless pages to get to this response page. Please !!! From the first page of the web site, make a CLEAR link to rider feedback. The "contact us" link just has a street address. In the year 2004, that is a tad archaic. If this is really a system for the people, make it easy for the people to get involved. Thank you | W003-2 | Acknowledged. The Draft Program EIR/EIS, and the supporting technical documents, were placed on the Authority's website with the intent to make it easier for the public to "get involved" and review and comment on the documents. We believe the "Comment on the EIR/EIS" page is located in the most logical and prominent portion of the |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | website (under the "Draft EIR/EIS"). The following is the text for the "Comments on the EIR/EIS" page:<br>**To Comment on EIR/EIS**<br>The Authority is now soliciting public comments on the Draft Program EIR/EIS. The formal comment period began on February 13, 2004, and will end on **August 31, 2004** (the board voted to extend the public comment period at the March 23, 2004 Authority meeting in Sacramento). Please take advantage of this time to review and comment on the Draft Program EIR/EIS and potential impacts of a statewide high-speed train system.<br>Comments can be submitted in the following manner:<br>**Online**<br>Comments on the Draft Program EIR/EIS can be submitted through this website.<br>**Mail or Fax Written Comments**<br>An alternate to submitting comments online is to mail or fax comments.<br>**Mail:**<br>Attn: California High-Speed Train Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments<br>925 L Street, Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814 |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | **Fax:**<br>(916) 322-0827<br>Attn: California High-Speed Train Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments<br>**Attend a Public Meeting**<br>The Authority and FRA will host a series of public hearings to present the Draft Program EIR/EIS and to receive public comment. |
| W004 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Janice Feldman | 2604 Lewis Lane \| Carlsbad, CA 92008 | Cost considerations should be compared to highway and streets' costs if we do not do more public transportation.<br>Maybe you should charge less and have more people use the rails instead of trying to pay for it by raising costs | W004-1 | Please see standard response 4.4.1. |
| W005 | between February and May 17, 2004* – first submittal | Saadi Howell, communication designer, private citizen/rail advocate | 806 N. Wilson Ave., Apt. B<br>Pasadena, CA 91104 | My comment is in regards to the proposed LAX to LA Union Station high speed train link. I think that high speed trains would be a great asset in moving people the large distances in Los Angeles metropolian area, i.e. maybe a pair of lines one going north/south from the Valley to Westwood to the South Bay and finally Long Beach and an east/west line going from East LA/Montebello to Downtown LA Union Station to Central Region(some area like central wilshire) to West LA (destination like LAX or westwood), maybe a big 8 stop ring encircling the area could be another option. I've got a | W005-1 | The co-lead agencies have determined that a direct HST service to LAX not be part of the initial statewide HST network. The HST system would be connected to LAX and Western Los Angeles County by local transportation (shuttle, regional transit, or the automobile). A direct HST link to LAX requires a costly spur line with very limited maximum speeds that would have lower ridership potential than HST links to the San Diego (via the Inland Empire) and to Orange County. Please also see standard response 2.36.8. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | link showing such an option if you are interested http://home.earthlink.net/~idaas/index.html<br>Anyway in regards to the LAX/Union Station connector, I think its a great idea although I think one central station on the route might be a great asset for the population that lives in the region the train is passing through. Considering that Union Station is on the eastern portion of the city it would be advantagous to have a second transit hub like Union Station linked to the highspeed line near the central core of the city in order to make the route a feasible option for a larger portion of the Los Angeles citizenry. | | |
| W006 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Martin Culjat, Graduate Student | 110 S. Sweetzer Ave., #212<br>Los Angeles, CA 90048 | After reading endless bickering over the Altamont Pass alignment from Altamont supporters, I really don't see what the fuss is about. The argument that the CAHSRA put forward as to why they didn't study the Altamont route further makes perfect business sense. The pro-Altamont press and supporters will continue to complain until they get it their way, but I applaud the CAHSRA for doing what is best for the state - planning an efficient and profitable high speed rail system. | W006-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Pacheco Pass routing. Since there is constant opposition to the Diablo/Henry Coe routing, but with no major operational benefits, it makes sense to route the line through or near Gilroy in order to avoid mass opposition from environmentalists. | W006-2 | Acknowledged. Please see standard response 6.3.1. |
| | | | | LA-March ARB routing: The UP Riverside alignment seems like a no-brainer. It costs much less and would not require trains to turn around at LA Union Station, saving roughly 10 minutes. It would also allow for the system to use LAUS in the same configuration as it currently is. Additionally, the Colton route seems more logical than the San Bernardino routing. The extra cost and time for the San Bernardino loop is simply not worth it. Colton and UC Riverside are close enough to San Bernardino, and San Bernardino is already served by numerous Metrolink lines. | W006-3 | Acknowledged. The Authority has identified the UPRR Riverside alignment as the preferred HST alignment between Los Angeles and Pomona, and the Colton alignment between Pomona and Riverside as the preferred HST alignment. |
| | | | | Antelope Valley vs. I5: 10 minutes is a significant amount of extra time for EVERYONE travelling between N. CA and S. CA. However, Palmdale Airport may eventually become a major international airport and there is an increasing number of residents in the Palmdale area. | W006-4 | Please see standard response 6.23.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Perhaps the best solution is to route the line through I5 to decrease travel time for the whole system (and make it more competitive with driving and flying), while promising gradual improvements to the Metrolink Antelope Valley Line. With the increasing tax base and housing boom in the AV, much of this tax money should go towards improving connections between the AV and Los Angeles. A large chunk of this money should go towards improving the Metrolink AV line. When a developer builds new homes, he should be responsible to pay for some of the new roads and freeways leading to those homes; if thousands of developers and residents build new homes in the AV, they should bear much of the financial burden for improving transit options themselves. | | |
| W007 | between February and May 17, 2004* – second submittal | Saadi Howell, communication designer, private citizen/rail advocate | 806 N. Wilson Ave., Apt. B Pasadena, CA 91104 | This is a comment in regards to your proposed high speed rail LA to Irvine connector. As I've said before I think that these high speed rail lines are a great idea. Putting aside that I understand that there are costs and land usage issues, I think that a great need is not being addressed. This route in particular, makes use of an old north/south freight route. This is great for efficient land use issues however it | W007-1 | Please see standard response 2.29.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | is not putting lines where they are desperately needed. Namely north/south on a more western alignment (example along the 405 corridor). The coastal region of the entire southern California area is isolated from rail transit, this is the area that holds a large density of residential households, business and regional activity. If transportation authorities want systems like these to catch on they need to lay some new routes (namely more westerly aligned routes) not just go over old freight lines that are largely isolated from a public they could be serving.<br>Yes the Irvine station is getting close but I lived in Irvine for 10 years and that station like many others on this route was not convenient to get to, it was very far away from the cities central core in a industrial business district that as a resident I drove by once in my 10 years living in the city. | | |
| W008 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Albert Pratt, Retired Civil and Structural engineer | 40470 Brixton Cove, Temecula CA 92591 | On the positive side I fully support the project and have monitored the progress of the design almost from its inception.<br>I will be 85 years old on April 26, 2004. Completion is expected by the year 2020 and I will be 101 years old. This is not a facetious statement as my | W008-1 | Acknowledged. Please see standard response 1.1.5. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | health is excellent, and the new IRS Life Expectancy Table offers a lower curve of 10 years, but excitingly, an upper curve of 22 years. With this maximum life expectancy possibility I will be able to ride the CHSR for 6 years after completion. I contemplate the possibility that I may need help boarding the train during those 6 years.<br><br>I have been immersed in the impact of our national auto culture for over 50 years. It has been continuingly clear during that period that auto production - enhanced by multi billion dollar marketing - has outpaced the ability to provide lane miles of arterials and freeways to accommodate this American love affair with their cars. The CHSR Project has unbridled political and medial appeal as well as the practical need of high speed rail in our state to serve future transportation needs between our major California population centers. The present impact of 50 years of developing auto culture and the inability to provide arterials and freeways to meet the demand (nor will they ever) has resulted in the automobile becoming the greatest Weapon of Mass Destruction (WMD) the world has ever experienced. With lives lost, serious injury and the value of property damage exceeding that of | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | all of the wars we have ever been engaged in since 1776. The impact today is continuing the loss of life, serious injury, property damage, but is also affecting family life and our economy by the increasing time away from home of the "breadwinners" driving to and from their employment.<br>The CHSR Project must include immediate massive implementation of local and interurban convenient and affordable public transit design to easily access the CHRS. Our State Legislature contemplated this need in 1989 with the passage of a State Statute Section 65088 of the Government Code. I again state that I unequivocally support the CHSR with the addition of convenient and affordable local and interurban public transit. | | |
| W009 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Josh Morky | 1354 15th Street Santa Monica, CA 90402 | Great idea. | W009-1 | Acknowledged. |
| | | | | We obviously need a direct line from union station to LAX, but it would make so much more sense and be so much better for the community of Los Angeles if this were actually a light rail line or a subway. You don't really need to get from union to lax in 10 minutes. This type of rail would be great if it | W009-2 | Acknowledged. Please see standard response 6.39.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | were going through non-urban areas, but it is, so you might as well make it serve all those urban areas it goes through. I don't understand why it needs to be high speed rail. If we are already going to spend the money to build a new rail line, you might as well make it part of the current MTA Metrorail system, with occasional stops along the way from Union Station to LAX. It would obviously take a little bit longer, but it would serve all the people who live near the line, as well as decrease general traffic across Los Angeles, not just airport traffic. It would make it so that all the people who lived along the line could get to the airport without the use of a car, which would be much more effective. | | |
| | | | | If this were part of the Metrorail system, I would like to see transit oriented development along the line, as well as some changes in the zoning around the stops.<br>More people would use it (even for everyday chores and getting to and from work and school) if it were part of the current Metrorail system. More stations! More stations! | W009-3 | The proposed HST system would be very different from the current Metrolink commuter rail system in southern California. The primary purpose of the proposed HST system is to serve intercity travelers between the major metropolitan markets in California as opposed to shorter-distance local and regional commuter trips. As an intercity rail service, there is a practical limit to the number of stations that can be provided/served without constraining the capacity and competiveness |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | (travel time) of the various longer-distance intercity services (express, skip-stop, local, etc.). |
| | | | | How much would taking this train cost? | W009-4 | Please see standard response 4.4.1. The Authority's June 2000 Business Plan includes a table with the ticket prices for various station pairs (in 1999 dollars) that were assumed to develop the ridership and revenue forecasts. The Business Plan also states, "actual ticket prices will be developed by the operator based on market conditions such as distance; time of travel; advance purchase; and special discount fares for frequent travelers, families, and seniors." (page 60) The Business Plan is posted on the Authority's website (www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov). |
| W010 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Edward Reilley | 1136 Via Felicidad Escondido, CA 92029 | Few of the pdf files located on http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov/eir/report/EIR_TOC.asp at this time are accessable. My Acrobat reader reports a decoding error. | W010-1 | The various sections for the Program EIR/EIS document are saved as Adobe PDF files using Acrobat Version 6.0. Since you had trouble opening/printing the files, it is likely that your Adobe Reader is for an earlier version of Acrobat. A free upgrade for the Adobe Reader for Acrobat Version 6.0 can be obtained by visiting the Adobe website (www.adobe.com), and clicking on the button that reads "Get Adobe |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Reader." |
| W011 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Lamar Hayes | 24709 Singer St. Moreno Valley, CA 92557 | The proposed rail initiative is years behind schedule. The link between Northern And Southern California using a high speed rail system is something that should have been completed years ago. The whole high speed rail system linking the major cities in the Southwest is something that should be done as soon as possible. The economic stimulation it would give is something Californians need. | W011-1 | Acknowledged. |
| | | | | I support the idea of linking the North with the South, also with a high speed rail system linking Las Vegas to Southern California. | W011-2 | Please see standard response 2.36.1. |
| W012 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Dan Hapke | 12949 Lomas Verdes Dr., Poway, CA 92064-1250 | I have believed in high speed rail (HSR) for decades. For trips up to 500 miles it is very cost competitive with flying because commuter flights cost the most per mile. In our post 9/11 world HSR is also time competitive with flying. The costs mentioned to implement HSR must be looked at in the context of the airport improvements we will not need once HSR is widely used. Finally there is safety. Rail travel is very safe. Let's get going! | W012-1 | Acknowledged. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W013 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Kathy & Radon Tolman, Professional | 589 Crestwood Drive Oceanside, CA 92054-7485 | We believe that California is already in dire need of the proposed system. Planning, acquisition of rights-of-way and funding should be made available as soon as possible. Funding should come from a tax on gasoline. If the tax were $0.10 per gallon, it would be well within current fluctuations due to geopolitical forces, including OPEC and the war in Iraq, with the simultaneous benefit of encouraging higher fuel efficiencies and use of existing public transit systems. We support the efforts of the High-speed Rail Authority in solving these problems. | W013-1 | Acknowledged. The Program EIR/EIS summarizes the Business Plan prepared by the HSRA, which addresses possible financing mechanisms. Funding decisions will be made in the future and financing options are not part of the Program EIR/EIS. |
| W014 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Jason Dewees, writer/editor | 1326 Sixth Ave. San Francisco, CA 94122 | High-speed rail is essential to the economic development - even survival - of California, especially Los Angeles, the San Joaquin Valley, San Jose and San Francisco. I am pleased that the Authority has demonstrated the advantages of investing in a concept that has proven itself repeatedly in Asia and Europe. | W014-1 | Acknowledged. |
| | | | | In regard to the Bay Area-Central Valley alignment, I am concerned about the neglect of study of the Altamont Pass alignment. It is clear that this alignment would not only compete favorably in travel time with the Pacheco Pass and Diablo Range alignments, but also in habitat impact, connectivity with existing transit, and, | W014-2 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | most importantly, populations served (Modesto, Tracy, Livermore-Amador Valley, and Fremont-East Santa Clara County). The authority should provide an EIR/EIS for this alignment and a justification for its current neglect. Personally, I cannot support the bond with the current proposed alignments until I hear a compelling explanation, with the detailed report and statement, for not using the Altamont alignment. | | |
| W015 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Tracee and Wayne Harris, Business owners | 4032 Ballen Court Modesto, CA 95356 | We feel a high speed rail system is a must for California. The Central Valley is in desperate need of better transportation to the Bay Area. Traveling from Modesto to Oakland via auto can take up to 3 hours. | W015-1 | Acknowledged. |
| W016 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Weldon H. Jackson, Retired | 2789 Bardy Road Santa Rosa, CA 95404-8477 | I think it is very wrong to not have included the Altamont Pass in the route plan. The other mountain crossing plans are environmentally destructive and are probably more expensive. | W016-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |
| W017 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Linda Trettin, Retired | 214 McKinley St. Oceanside, CA 92057 | It's about time! We have been to many other countries that have high speed trains. They are wonderful. I think it should be free to ride and be built by a gasoline taxes. When people stop driving the massive vehicles with only 1 or 2 people in them, should there be a charge to ride. Would things change fast then? I think so! Hope it comes to past. | W017-1 | Acknowledged. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W018 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Jamie Swartz | 166 Great Circle Drive Mill Valley, CA 94941 | For the alignment options I do not think the Palmdale station and detour is necessary. It seems like a lot of money for rail that goes out of its way for one station. | W018-1 | Please see standard response 6.23.1. |
| | | | | Also, for the two options near San Jose in the Bay Area I think the train should take the northern option that excludes Gilroy. Gilroy is already served by CalTrain. Furthermore, to make the train faster and spend less money we should only stop at necessary places. | W018-2 | Please see standard response 6.3.1. |
| W019 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Dennis Junker | 24302 Mornington Dr. Valencia, CA 91355 | We need this thing yesterday. Gridlock is coming to every city in the state. What is the environmental impact of daily gridlock? | W019-1 | Acknowledged. The Draft Program EIR/EIS has evaluated the potential environmental impacts of the No Project and Modal (expansion of highways and airports) Alternatives, and the HST system proposed to address the future intercity travel needs of California. It is beyond the scope of this document to address the general environmental impact of gridlock in every city in California, although gridlock that results from local and daily commuter traffic generally contributes to local air pollution, loss of productivity, as well as increased energy consumption. The analysis in the Draft EIR suggests some reductions in highway congestion with the proposed HST Alternative, and improved mobility |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | between metropolitan areas. |
| W020 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Thomas Higby, Insurance Agent | Commuter Alliance<br>1018 Acaciawood Court Los Banos, CA 93635 | I think that a highspeed rail system is long overdue.<br>It will provide an efficient and cost effective way of interstate travel. In addition, to providing a more sensible means of commuting from the central valley to the larger cities where a large portion of the central valley population are already employed. | W020-1 | Acknowledged. |
| | | | | It is estimated that a third of Los Banos' population travels across the Pacheco Pass everyday commuting to work. The highspeed rail would reduce the traffic across Hwy 152 tremendously if the alignment is through the Pacheco Pass. As stated already an estimated third of Los Banos' population travels across the Pacheco Pass everyday commuting to work. If only a portion of the people took the highspeed rail it would greatly reduce the number of automobiles on the Hwys thereby improving the air quality.<br>I recommend the Pacheco Pass Alignment option because it is less expensive than the Diablo Alignment and at the same time would increase the ridership considerable. Due to the consistant commuters because the highspeed rail would provide an | W020-2 | Acknowledged. 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | effective commute option. I believe that the Pacheco Pass Alignment is the best option for a number of reasons. 1. The Pacheco Pass Alignment is less expense than the alternatives. 2. It would greatly improve the air quality. 3. It would reduce the congestion on the Hwys from the Central Valley to the larger cities. 4. It would also provide a safer and more reliable commute option for thousands of people on a daily basis. | | |
| W021 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Sherri Orland, Attorney | 11565 Badger Valley Rd. Wilton, CA 95693 | Please provide the contents of the chapter on-line, so that residents can be better informed and make educated comments. | W021-1 | The contents of the various chapters of the Draft Program EIR/EIS were provided online. The various sections for the Draft Program EIR/EIS document were saved as Adobe PDF files using Acrobat Version 6.0. Since you had trouble opening/printing the files, it is likely that your Adobe Reader was for an earlier version of Acrobat. To get the free upgrade for the Adobe Reader for Acrobat Version 6.0 please visit the Adobe website (www.adobe.com), and click on the button that reads "Get Adobe Reader." |
| W022 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Kevin Stankiewicz, Civil Engineer | 1449 Treat Blvd., #833 Walnut Creek, CA 94597 | There should be a transfer station where the California High Speed Rail crosses the Sacramento Folsom Light Rail line. To have these to major high capacity public transit systems cross | W022-1 | Several key factors were considered in identifying potential station stops, including speed, cost, local access times, potential connections with other modes of transportation, |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | but not connect would be a mistake. To expect people from Folsom and Rancho Cordova to ride light rail miles into downtown to get to the high speed rail station is asking too much, when they could transfer at CSUS. It would add another half hour to their trip. This station would also provide great highway 50 and CSUS access. It would attract a lot more riders than a Power Inn Road station with no light rail access and no freeway access. This should be a second Sacramento regional station, and not an alternative to a downtown Sacramento Station. This site should be studied. | | ridership potential, and the distribution of population and major destinations along the route. The co-lead agencies believe the appropriate HST station sites were investigated for this program level process. However, ultimate locations and the configurations of stations cannot be determined until the more detailed project-level environmental processes.<br><br>Downtown Sacramento, Stockton, Modesto, Merced, Fresno, and Bakersfield represent the most reasonable HST station sites based upon current knowledge, and they are consistent with the objectives of the HST system to serve the state's major population centers. There is a critical tradeoff between accessibility of the system to potential passengers and the resulting HST travel times. Additional or more closely spaced stations (even with limited service) would negatively impact travel times, frequency of service, and the ability to operate both express and local services. It is possible and likely that some of the preferred stations included in the Final Program EIR/EIS will not be built. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W023 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Dave Massen | 700 Church St., #313 San Francisco, CA 94114 | Please include an Altamont Pass/Livermore route among the study alternatives. It's more easily scalable than the Mt Hamilton/Henry Coe State Park area and should better serve existing population centers. | W023-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |
| W024 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Gary Jones | 36266 Toulon Dr., CA 92562 | As a retired career railroad officer, this sounds like a huge potential waste of taxpayer funds. We certainly need more passenger routes and equipment but not of the impractical maglev variety. We need to discourage all studies of maglev and encourage better and expanded uses of proven standard railroad technology.<br><br>A classic example of technology gone bad is the Bay Area's BART system. Wanting to be "new" and "modern", BART's engineers refused to accept and use known technology and designed from the ground (make that rail) up. They refused to even use standard track gauge and instead used a gauge a few inches wider for fancifully designed lightweight equipment. As I predicted, their 2nd generation cab cars were not shovel nosed but instead had diaphragms so that they could be coupled mid-train. The result was that they could not purchase readily available railroad equipment and required everything custom made for a system that was not compatible with | W024-1 | Please see standard response 2.10.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | any other commute passenger railroad. Nor could BART be expanded onto other existing systems. If BART had been forced into known and proven rail technology when built, it would already have been merged into a larger, greater and more effective bay area system. It would have cost far less to build or expand and would cost less to operate today. There would be less politics and fewer board of director members for taxpayers to support, etc. And most importantly, people would have a much better passenger rail system! | | |
| W025 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Walt Seifert, nonprofit director | 877 53rd St. Sacramento CA 95819 | Thanks for the opportunity to comment. I strongly urge high speed rail include the San Francisco to Sacramento route, if not now, at some point in the future. While Capitol Corridor service has improved in frequency, it could be much faster. These major population centers should be linked, just like Boston, NY, Washington, DC. | W025-1 | Please see standard response 2.16.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Stations should be accessible by all modes, including bikes, with provisions for bike parking. Roll-on, roll-off access for bikes should be provided like the successful CalTrain service. | W025-2 | Acknowledged. Determining details of station design such as the type of access for bicycles is beyond the scope of this program environmental process. Should the HST program move forward, this would be addressed in future more detailed studies. |
| W026 | between February and May 17, 2004* | John Sunshine | 3150 Solmira Place, Palmdale CA 93551 | MY WIFE AND I RECOMMEND THAT THE TRAIN GO THROUGH THE ANTELOPE VALLEY. | W026-1 | Please see standard response 6.23.1. |
| W027 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Donald Smith, Transit Planner | Sacramento Regional Transit District PO Box 2110, Sacramento CA 95812-2110 | Please replace David Melko as the representative for Sacramento Regional Transit District with Don Smith. dsmith@sacrt.com, (916) 321-2957. Thank you. | W027-1 | David Melko has been replaced as the representative for Sacramento Regional Transit District with Don Smith as requested. |
| W028 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Darlene Young | 28600 Palos Verdes Dr., E Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275 | Is there any consideration of a high speed rail line between So. Ca. and Las Vegas? Just looking at the 15 on any given weekend should be enough to at least make a case for a high speed rail line between these two areas. | W028-1 | Please see standard response 2.36.1. There is a separate maglev system which is being proposed between Las Vegas and Southern California for which environmental documentation is being prepared. The lead agencies are the State of Nevada and the Federal Railroad Administration. The Authority will provide input to this document and coordinate with this proposed system. Please see Section 2.3.3 of the Final Program EIR/EIS ("Related Projects"). |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W029 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Dennis/Pat Pfister, retired from U.P RR | 10040 Badger Pond Ct., Wilton CA 95693 | We live just 10 acres from the California Traction R.R in Wilton. We think the high speed rail is a great idea and better than the nature, hiking trail which would draw undesirable people and the homeless to our area. We need the RR even more now than ever before. This is country out here and we don't need hiking trails. We have lot's of open space. | W029-1 | Acknowledged. Please see standard response 6.12.1. |
| | | | | We need the R.R to transport people and goods. It is very important in the light of pollution and getting trucks off the road. Our vote is YES! Thank you, Dennis and Pat | W029-2 | Acknowledged. |
| W030 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Rich Schwerin, Software Marketing | Responsible Organized Mountain Pedalers (ROMP)<br>1120 Elmer St #4, Belmont CA 94002-2859 | I am an avid mountain biker, hiker, backpacker, and camper, and a member of ROMP - Responsible Organized Mountain Pedalers - a Bay Area mountain bike group. I'm writing to object to one of the route ideas contained in the EIR. Considering the 3 alternative routes through the Diablo Mountains to connect the Bay Area to the San Joaquin Valley, I'm strongly opposed to the option of running through Henry Coe State Park and the Orestimba State Wilderness Preserve. The land in and around Orestimba is some of the wildest area in Henry Coe State Park - a place of singular wildness with lush terrain, habitat, and wildlife. Instead, since you've already ruled out | W030-1 | Please refer to standard response 6.3.1. The only U.C. Berkeley study the co-lead agencies are aware of that investigated potential HST alignments ("CalSpeed" 1991-94, Institute of Urban and Regional Development) selected the Pacheco Pass (SR-152) as the connection between the Central Valley and the Bay Area (Working Paper 564, "High-Speed Trains for California", Leavitt, Vaca & Hall). |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | the best alternative - Altamont Pass - which a UCBerkeley study proved as the least expensive, serving the most Californians, and offering the fewest environmental impacts - that leaves only one smart alternative. The smarter alternative route that would not destroy designated wilderness within a state park is the route over Pacheco Pass following Highway 152. Please do NOT needlessly destroy Designated Wilderness on State Park property - it doesn't make any sense. Thanks for considering my opinion, Rich | | |
| W031 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Andrea Birdsall | 7833 Hurst Court Sacramento, CA 95829 | I agree with the need for this type of transportation. What I don't agree on is the location for the line to leave Sacramento. It makes much more sense to start the line from the downtown area and head south from there. People are accustomed to traveling to the downtown area for their transportation needs. Why would they drive to the country to catch a train? The disruption to a quiet way of life would be unbearable, let alone the safety hazard of having trains running at 200 mph through neighborhoods. This is not the city where one is used to hearing subways and buses. People moved out to the southeast county for a reason - quality of life and away from | W031-1 | Acknowledged. Please see standard response 6.12.1. More detailed study will occur as part of future project-level analysis which will address particular local resources. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | the hustle and bustle of a city. Developers and realtors gave assurances to homebuyers that the CCT tracks would not be used for commercial or high-speed trains. Is the authority willing to compensate the homeowners for their loss of property values and what price will they put on the degraded quality of life? Will they be able to bear the costs of litigation for accidents and broken promises? The south county desperately lacks wildlife corridors and trails. The CCT corridor has been included in several community masters plans as a potential recreation use. Please consider this a plea to chose the alternative route other than the CCT corridor for the high-speed rail line. Thanks<br>With all the development in the south county, the infrastructure has not kept pace. The roads are already congested enough. More disruptions from rail lines, especially with the number of proposed trains, will only make it worse. The noise and vibration from the electricity and trains will totally disrupt the quiet way of life people moved here for. Sound walls do nothing but provide a visual barrier to all the mechanics. The sound and vibration will still permeate the area. Livestock will also be negatively | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | affected by the noise and vibration.<br>We have enough in the area with the high-power electrical lines running through the south county. We were assured that the unused tracks would not be used for commercial nor high-speed trains. Most people would have never purchased homes and land near the tracks had they known they would be used for this. How can you plan high-end neighborhoods, parks and schools adjacent to a 200 mph train? | | |
| W032 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Joseph Martin, warehouse manager | 10024 Silver Legend Dr.<br>Sacramento, CA 95829 | The proposal to utilize the railroad track running past our neighborhood in South Sacramento County is unacceptable. When we moved into this area, we were told that the route in question was going to be converted into regional walking trail. Having a high speed rail track with 200 MPH trains flying past a residential neighborhood, is unacceptable.<br>While I do not object to the concept of high speed rail, I find it amazing that anyone of conscious would even propose using this particular route. It travels immediately adjacent to homes, alongside schools, etc. Please find a route for your track that will not put us and our children into immediate peril. If this cannot be done, please let the public know who is involved, so that we | W032-1 | Acknowledged. Please see standard response 6.12.1. More detailed study will occur as part of future project-level analysis which will address particular local resources. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | can vote against them in any way we can. | | |
| W033 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Tracy Kelly, Mother of 3 | 8272 Country Ranch Dr.<br>Sacramento, CA 95829 | I live in the Silver Legends Community of Sacramento and will be directly affected by the high speed train since my property backs up to the proposed site.<br>I am OPPOSED to high speed rail, not only because it will run through my backyard, but it will also cause safety concerns (passes too closely to schools where my children travel), and impacts our environment (goodbye hawks, ducks, raccoons, coyotes, jackrabbits, etc., who have made the area their home). I laugh out loud at the brilliant "marketing idea" that this high speed train will "help improve air quality," because people will take the train instead of drive. HA HA HA HA! What are you thinking? No one who lives in this area - predominately rural (or in fact, no one I know), commutes by train or light rail.<br>I would like to bet that if you took a vote, on whether the community would like to have a high speed train, or a recreational trail, can you guess what would win? I KNOW - RAILS TO TRAILS!! This is also a GREAT WASTE OF MONEY. | W033-1 | Acknowledged. The HST system would be fenced when at-grade, and completely grade separated so that there would be no intrusion into the right-of-way by pedestrians, vehicles or animals. The primary market of the HST system is intercity passengers between California's major metropolitan areas as opposed to shorter distance commuter trips. This environmental document characterizes potential impacts to the natural environment (including potential impacts to wildlife) at a program level of detail. Should the HST proposal move forward, environmental impact will be studied in detail in project-specific analyses. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | If you want to cut down on pollution and establish trains for commuting - you should, obivously, run a train within high traffic corridors (i.e., 99, 5, 50 and 80). Near shopping, restaurants, businesses, etc., not through quiet neighborhoods. I would like to bet that if you took a vote, on whether the community would like to have a high-speed train, or a recreational trail, can you guess what would win? I KNOW - RAILS TO TRAILS!! More nature, less high tech - PLEASE - HIGHLY OPPOSED to high-speed rail.<br>Tracy Kelly<br>Married, mother of 3 | W033-2 | Acknowledged. Please see standard response 6.12.1. |
| W034 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Patti Heberling | 8276 Country Ranch Dr.<br>Sacramento, CA 95829-8143 | Having bought this home and being told that the corridor would "probably be an environmental avenue for biking, walking, horseback riding" makes it more of a shock to now learn that there has been another plan all along! Talking with those who bought houses in the earlier phases years ago, they were told about this project. The newer houses along the corridor itself (mine included), were sold without this knowledge, even though questions were posed regarding the possible use of the corridor. There are too many hazards that could occur by placing the high-speed train in a residential | W034-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | neighborhood. HWY 5 would be a more logical choice for both transportation and safety reasons. I OBJECT to the plan to place this train through this corridor from Elder Creek to Lodi. If necessary, it be placed from Wilton to Lodi (more open space) or from Hwy 5 to Lodi (more open space). Residential neighborhood with one-lane roads, neighborhood schools and parks would be affected with back-up traffic at crossroads, high-speed fears regarding safety of crossing the tracks (children especially). There is too much traffic in this area as it is with all the new homes being built; stopping for train crossings will increase the congestion. Having a train running across the back of our home will destroy the quiet enjoyment of our living situation and affect the way in which we live. | | |
| | | | | There are too many health concerns that have not been adequately covered regarding electromagnetic fields, etc. I moved away from a home that had these elements within 50 feet of my home and I do not want to experience that underlying unease and fear again. When this plan was originally begun, there were no housing complexes in this area to speak of. | W034-2 | The potential impacts of electromagnetic fields were evaluated as part of the Program EIR/EIS. These studies concluded that the HST Alternative would introduce additional electromagnetic fields at levels for which no adverse impacts have been documented (Draft Program EIR/EIS, page 3.6-5). Section 3.6.5 of the Program EIR/EIS outlines issues related to |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | electromagnetic fields and potential electromagnetic interference that would be further evaluated as part of the project-specific analysis of an HST system. If the HST project moves forward, any potential health effects relating to electromagnetic fields would be evaluated in subsequent project-level environmental documents to the extent that new information is available on potential health effects of electromagnetic fields. |
| | | | | It would make much more sense to place this train in the area of Highway 5 where there is open land. If there were a derailment due to unforeseen events, there would be such a catastrophic impact on the homes along the tracks and no one can predict how much injury would result! | W034-3 | The Southern Pacific (SP) River Line/WPRR along the I-5 corridor was considered but rejected because it was determined to be impracticable as a result of major construction issues within the Sacramento urban area. The rationale for this decision is set forth in Section 2.6.9 Alternative Alignment and Station Options Considered in Screening Evaluation (Draft Program EIR/EIS, page 2-58). Utilizing the existing I-5 right-of-way through Sacramento was not considered to be a practicable option since the freeway right-of-way is completely constrained by land development within Sacramento. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W035 | between February and May 17, 2004* | P.E. Charles O'Connell, Ciivil Engineer | 25018 Smokewood Way Stevenson Ranch, CA 91381 | Having been in charge of the first HSP/MagLev study between LAX and Palmdale in the late 70s, I believe it is imperative that the alignment between Bakersfield and Sylmar go via Palmdale.<br>The Palmdale alignment provides tremendous benefits to Southern California and provides the option to serve the much needed Palmdale Intl Apt. The 5-10 minutes addition between LA and the Bay Area will be more than offset by more patronage and economic development and tax revenue and provide some relief to the LA 14 freeway. | W035-1 | Please see standard response 6.23.1. |
| W036 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Steven Seghers | 123 Test Street, CA 92614 | test, test, test | W036-1 | Acknowledged. |
| W037 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Mark Heckman | 425 East Yaney Street, Bishop CA 93514-2421 | Transportation is one of the most important aspects in California's economy and having a seamless transportation system throughout the state is important for the livelihood of its residents. For this reason, coupled to where I live in the state I find that public transportation is not an option for people who live in the Eastern Sierra region. All too often do public transportation, our legislative representatives, and the people of the State forget places east of the Sierra | W037-1 | Please see standard response 6.23.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | and the Tehachapis. The only concerns are how much water can be exported from here to other places in the State, how many votes can be secured, and "how is the skiing?"<br>Realize that census statistics show that the major population growth trends over the next 20 years will be the growth in outlying cities that border large, established cities like San Diego, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. This growth would be felt in areas like Fresno, Bakersfield, Palmdale/Lancaster, and Modesto.<br>Currently, the proposal to connect Bakersfield to Southern California offers two alignments-one parallels Interstate 5 and the other traversing the Tehachapis and adding a station in Palmdale. It is this alignment through Palmdale that should be chosen. The alignment that parallels I-5 ultimately eliminates any options of public transportation for those of us who live in eastern California. According to the document, the following are cited as the "Purpose and Need" of a high speed rail system in California:<br>▪ Maximize intermodal transportation opportunities by locating stations to connect with local transit, airports, and highways. | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Future growth in demand for intercity travel.<br>▪ Capacity constraints that will result in increasing congestion and travel delays.<br>▪ Unreliability of travel stemming from congestion and delays, weather conditions, accidents, and other factors that affect the quality of life and economic well-being of residents, businesses, and tourism in California.<br>▪ Increasing frequency of accidents on intercity highways and passenger rail lines in congested corridors of travel.<br>▪ Reduced mobility as a result of increasing demand on limited modal connections between major airports, transit systems, and passenger rail in the state.<br>▪ Poor and deteriorating air quality and pressure on natural resources as a result of expanded highway and airports.<br>If these are the needs of High-speed rail, then the best way to accomplish them is by situating a station in both Tehachapi and Palmdale to serve those communities but also the communities of Ridgecrest, Mojave, Lone Pine, Bishop, and Mammoth Lakes. If the | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | route parallel to I-5 is chosen then not only has this rail line just segregated a huge portion of the State's population, but it has also incurred more expense because of the numerous tunnels that would need to be built.<br>The ideal route for High-Speed Rail service in California is through Tehachapi and Palmdale. Please consider this as the most viable option to connect all of California with High Speed Rail. | | |
| W038 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Robert Mann, Retired Transportati on exec. | 234 Villa Di Este Terr, #104 Lake Mary, FL 32746 | As a part-time California resident I want to comment on CA.-HSR. Any final route should include access to Merced and a future slower speed route into Yosemite National Park. The bumper-to-bumper traffic within the park in the summer season may doom the park itself and there is no real alternative.<br>In the traditional Los Angeles Routing, there is the bonus of Amtrak connections via Barstow to Chicago and perhaps Las Vegas. The former SP cut-off from Lancaster-Palmdale over Cajon Pass to San Bernardino could also form a direct San Diego-San Joaquin Valley route via the old SP/SF route Bakersfield-Lancaster-Cajon-SanBernandino-Riverside-San Diego, BY PASSING LAX all together. In closing, please consider: | W038-1 | Please see standard response 2.36.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ So Please consider Yosemite Valley Service<br>▪ A Eastern By-Pass to LAX on a San Diego-Bakersfield-Bay Area route | | |
| | | | | Lastly, I am not convinced that a whole new system must be built. I think a greatly improved conventional system with trains running at 90-100 mph is plenty fast. Doing away with all grade crossings, double and triple track and increased speeds would bring nearly as many people back to the trains as would an entire new system. In closing, please consider:<br>▪ Possible conventional train service up grades | W038-2 | Please see standard response 2.9.1. |
| | | | | In closing, please consider:<br>▪ Merced as a direct passenger stop | W038-3 | Acknowledged. The Authority has identified Merced as a potential HST station location. The Castle Aviation and Development Center and Downtown Merced have been identified as potential HST station sites for further investigation. |
| | | | | Stockton as a direct passenger stop | W038-4 | Acknowledged. The Authority has identified Stockton as a potential HST station location. |
| W039 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Robert Wong, Registered Civil | Caltrans, 120 South Spring Street, MS 1-16 Los Angeles CA 90012 | The continue funding and staffing for each study phase of the project prior to going forward with programming the Design-Build contract will keep the project within the business plan. If this | W039-1 | Acknowledged. Funding mechanisms and phasing for the proposed HST system are beyond the scope of this Program EIR/EIS. Please also see standard response |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Engineer | | is not included already, the bond initiatives should have an avenue to cover the six years of Preliminary Engineering and Environmental clearance prior to the Design-Build contract. As this is one of the most massive transportation project in the world, there has to have a risk management element in each phase of this project development. The project infrastructure needs to consider the next generation of available advanced technology and feasibility to complement such shift. As the current funding mechanism of this project is by going thru statewide bond ballot election, the earlier involvement of public opinions not just thru Public Hearing, but include some statewide effort on public opinion on the funding mechanism will help avoid a surprise ending. | | 10.1.7 in regards to project phasing. |
| W040 | between February and May 17, 2004* | John Little, Teacher | St. Mary's High School 1252 Sheridan Way Stockton, CA 95207 | This is exactly what California...and the rest of the country...needs! Keep up the good fight and let us in the public know how we can help...who we can contact, where and how we can lend support. | W040-1 | Acknowledged. |
| W041 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Jesse Wolfe | 1103 Barbara St. D, Redondo Beach, CA 90277 | An essential component of this system has to be the ability to carry passengers' cars. This system would be great way to cut travel times to the Northwest. I predict that if you rely on | W041-1 | Please see standard response 2.7.1 |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | public transport to carry passengers to and from this system, it will not be successful. I often travel to some family property in a semi-rural area of Oregon from my home here in Los Angeles. If I could take this train to Sacramento, and be able to take my auto as well, it would cut many hours from the drive. The problem, if autos cannot be carried, is that arriving in Sacramento or another destination, many passengers need to travel to areas which are often not served by public transport. Even if one's destination is served by public transport from station to destination, one's destination and, for example, the city center are not well connected. I think that by including car carrying capacity, this rail system could revolutionize travel here on the Pacific coast. | | |
| W042 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Jim Dodd, Engineering consultant | JD&A<br>PO Box 178648<br>San Diego, CA 92177 | The EIS/EIR fails to address the Homeland Security issues of creating yet another high-value target without advance security preparation. If you want more explanation, please consider the recent attack in Madrid, and also the bombs the Spanish and French authorities are finding. What will you do to prevent attacks on the high-speed trains? | W042-1 | Please see standard response 2.8.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W043 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Anne Defazio, Future Librarian with SDPL | 1752 Malden St. San Diego, CA 92109 | I support the plan for High-Speed Rail in California which will connect the major cities. | W043-1 | Acknowledged. |
| W044 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Christophe Paux-Courrouges, researcher | 6679 Placerville Drive Placerville, CA 95667 | High-speed rail is a very reasonable alternative to further development of the automobile. | W044-1 | Acknowledged. |
| | | | | Current "state of the art" shows conventional high-speed rail solutions to be capable of reliable, environment-friendly operations at speeds of 180-210 mph, with a positive ROI already achieved in the case of France and Japan, and most probably to be achieved within short time-span in the cases of Spain (AVE) and Korea (KTX), not, however, in the case of Germany (ICE). Maglev projects must be considered as technologically hazardous, the Transrapid track in China eg being subject to track degradation after few months, and far less flexible, as they are absolutely non-compatible with any pre-existing systems and thus not able to share existing rights-of-way. The investment is furthermore out of proportion with the traffic densities to be expected in California. | W044-2 | Please see standard response 2.10.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | The energy consumption typically for a high-speed TGV running at an average of 170 kmh is one third of what it would be in a typical American car traveling at 60 mph with its average complement of 1.4 persons on board. | W044-3 | The analysis of energy consumption concluded that comparing the energy required by each mode to carry one passenger 1 mile (1.6 km), an HST needs only about one-third that of an airplane, one-half that of an intercity automobile trip (2.4 passengers/automobile), and one-fifth that of a commuter automobile trip (Draft Program EIR/EIS, page S-15). |
| W045 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Lenora Rathbone | 909 Sutter #201 San Diego, CA 92103 | This sounds like a great plan. What a boon to those of us who travel up and down the freeways. | W045-1 | Acknowledged. |
| W046 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Scott Kinsey, Student | 17821 Lassen St., #133 Northridge, CA 91325 | I have reviewed the Draft EIR and I am satisfied with its findings. As a senior student of Geography and Urban Planning at California State University, Northridge, I believe this high speed rail project is absolutely vital to the transportation future of California; furthermore I do not believe that the No-Project Alternative or the Modal Alternative are acceptable for the well-being of California in the coming decades. | W046-1 | Acknowledged. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | While I greatly support this project and would be willing to have it built at any cost, I have several concerns that I would like to address regarding non-electrified HSR, aesthetics and visual resources, and alignment/station options. The last two are covered in their corresponding categories, but I will address the first here: I do not support the use of non-electrified HSR along the coast between Anaheim and San Diego; nor do I believe it is appropriate for the HSR project to share tracks with any other trains at any point. Both of these will increase travel time, decrease safety, complicate an otherwise customer-friendly and simple system, and generally defeat the purpose of this project in the first place.<br><br>The necessity of a transfer between an electrified HSR train and a non-electrified HSR train somewhere south of Los Angeles will significantly increase travel time, and will complicate the system for passengers.<br><br>HSR trains sharing tracks with Amtrak, Metrolink, and freight trains will decrease HSR safety and will increase travel time as HSR trains are forced to wait in traffic on shared tracks. I believe that non-electrified HSR trains running on shared tracks between | W046-2 | Please see Standard Response 2.21.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Anaheim and San Diego would be perceived to have little, if any, more viability than the current Amtrak and Metrolink trains, which are not known for their excellent service. If non-electrified HSR is to be selected for this admittedly secondary portion of the project, then this coastal segment may as well not be built at all, since it would likely be small improvement over what exists now. Instead, then, efforts should be concentrated on the Inland Empire alignment, since it will be electrified and will not share tracks with other services.<br><br>I urge you, in this segment and in the project as a whole, do not be tempted by the apparent ease of using LOSSAN corridors and shared tracks. This HSR project needs its own exclusive right-of-way everywhere. If you forestall this happening, you will end up wasting vast quantities of taxpayer money on a system that is little better than existing rail service, both in reality and passenger perception. | | |
| | | | | I wish to address the aesthetic and visual impacts of this project in urban areas, namely the Los Angeles Basin. It is my opinion that this project should make use of aerial guideways whenever possible. Quite to the | W046-3 | The series of figures in Section 2.7 of the Program EIR/EIS show that at a conceptual level of design the HST Alternative would have a considerable amount of aerial structure expected through the |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | contrary of the belief that this would introduce visual blight upon the city, I am sure that using aerial guideways would visually integrate the HSR system into the cityscape in a beneficial way. This is important both for the riders and the residents: the riders would have a much better time watching the city speed by from above than they would staring at the blurred walls of a concrete trench, and the residents would be able to visually place the system route in their personal perceptions of the city. The HSR train, sliding quietly above the city on its aerial guideway, could even become a cultural icon. It has been proven time and again that attempting to hide passenger transportation infrastructure out of sight benefits no one, while visual integration, via aerial guideways, pleases nearly everyone.<br><br>Additionally, aerial guideways are safer for the community than at-grade or trench alignments since they are quite inaccessible, being up in the air out of reach. I understand that tunnels and trenches are necessary to traverse some parts of the urban area, but I urge you to make use of aerial guideways wherever the project has that option. | | urban areas in California. This is largely a result of right-of-way constraints in urban areas, potential conflicts with existing freight operations, and/or the need for a fully grade-separated HST infrastructure. However, to minimize potential environmental impacts (primarily visual and noise) and costs, at-grade construction would be the first choice where feasible in urban areas. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | First, I wish to impress upon you my belief that at-grade alignment crossings absolutely must be avoided wherever possible, at any expense. Nothing will damage the goals of this project more than an attempt to integrate it onto the street level in urban areas, where cars will pile up and wait at train crossings; accidents will be unavoidable. Community opposition would also be strong. | W046-4 | Please see standard response 2.8.2. |
| | | | | Having said that, I wish to address the alignment option north of Los Angeles--I support the Antelope Valley option over the Tehachapi Mountains option. While the Tehachapi pass option will decrease travel time, it will deny HSR access to the quickly-growing communities in the Antelope Valley. An alignment to the Antelope Valley could do much to relieve freeway congestion along SR-14, and would significantly decrease travel times to and from Los Angeles for Antelope Valley residents. The Tehachapi alignment would serve no population and would do nothing to decrease traffic congestion. Clearly, the Antelope Valley alignment should be chosen. | W046-5 | Please see standard response 6.23.1. |
| W047 | between February and May 17, | Chris Durbin | 14480 Arnerich Rd., Los Gatos, CA 95032 | I support HSR, and for the Northern Mountain Crossing, strongly prefer SR152. I wouldn't want to see Henry Coe Park, or the Diablo Range there | W047-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2004* | | | split by a train route. It is gorgeous semi-wilderness, and should remain that way. Pacheco Pass is already a transportation corridor, please make use of that.<br>Thank you very much, sincerely, Chris Durbin | | |
| W048 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Hhoma Karimabadi | 12837 Caminito Del Canto Del Mar, CA 92014 | I am disgusted by the lack of consideration for all the concerns that the private citizens have expressed. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to know that double tracking is a horrible idea for our community. How can you justify running more diesel and train traffic through our community and expect it not to affect the noise level, pollution level, not to mention the aestethic issues. How would you like it if I were to put a railroad in front of your house. | W048-1 | Please see standard response 6.42.1 |
| W049 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Elizabeth Nash | 2130 Via Mar Valle Del Mar, CA 92014 | This report is so full of ****. It is clear that the decision has already been made to double track through our lagoons despite all the community objections. It is also abundantly clear that you guys are bunch of morons that come up with stupid, short sighted solutions that ruin communities. I hope you all die horrible deaths.<br>In the business plan, there is no mention of how this will impact del mar's already fragile economy, or how | W049-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | the homes in the affected area would lose their value. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to know that having more trains go through our community will have a significant impact on the air quality. We are already being affected by all the jets and helicopters and existing trains. **** you all. There is mention of sound barriers. Don't you morons understand that we don't want such **** in our community? We are trying to preserve our town, not turn it into a grand central station. You tried to put a freeway through our city and failed. And now you are coming back with this. What a bunch of **** morons. | | |
| W050 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Robert Kellogg, Software engineer | 2254 Del Mar Scenic Pkwy<br>Del Mar, CA 92014 | The massive scale of the double-tracking proposal you've decided to adopt, and its long-term disruption of an entire section of coastal life, both human and wld, makes your rush to glory all the more unscrupulous. This is a huge undertaking at enormous cost for dubious reasons. The unstable nature of the cliffs you're proposing to tunnel through has already ensured that the existing tracks will need to be removed. So years of heavy machinery, demolition and erth movement in the town of Del Mar and the Penasquitos state wildlife preserve for whose benefit. beyond that of the | W050-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | construction companies? I urge you to seriously explore other options like shared right-of-way with freeways. Preserve our preserves. | | |
| W051 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Melchor Balaguer | 2229 Caminito del Barco<br>Del Mar, CA 92014 | The very idea of INCREASING the already destructive diesel railroad traffic through fragile and irreplaceable wetlands and State Preserves is environmentally heinous, morally deplorable and intellectually bankrupt. Add to this the likelihood that the claimed future ridership of passenger trains along this coastal route will never materialize, and that other routes, such as in the existing Interstate-5 Transport Corridor, and what we have here is a political boondoggle shameless in its duplicity and appalling in its stupidity. | W051-1 | Please see standard response 6.42.1. |
| W052 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Karen Lare, managing director LPL Financial | 526 Stratford Court #b<br>Del Mar, CA 92014 | Times have changed and life moves forward in Southern California. Improvement is needed in the public transportation alternatives for San Diego. But these improvements cannot be done in a way that is not well thought out. The current plan for Del Mar is a perfect example. There is an alternative that is not even on the table. Take the train off the coast before it gets to Del Mar and run it along I-5. This could be done in several areas the best being outside the Oceanside area - the worst being in Encinitas. The options to increase the | W052-1 | Please also see standard response 2.30.1 and standard response 6.42.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | tracks through the environmentally sensitive lagoons are not viable options. To tunnel under the lagoon and come up and run alongside the lagoon is not an option either as you would have to be kidding if you did not think that high speed rail would not have an adverse impact on sensitive bird species that are already impacted by the I-5 traffic, let alone the impact if you exposed them to rail traffic. The bluffs worked well for the trains for over a century just as old highway one was fine along the coast for a century. Just as I-5 had to be built inland of the old road, it is now time to move on and realize that the new tracks must be built in a different area. Another option must be studied - one that can be supported by residents of San Diego coastal towns. Move the trains off the bluffs and run them along I-5. | | |
| W053 | between February and May 17, 2004* | James Reed | 12850 Via Grimaldi Del Mar CA 92014 | There are only 6 wetland lagoons in San Diego County. Double tracking through either the Penasquitos or the San Dieguito lagoons is preposterous! Those open areas, and wetlands are essential to the quality of our lifestyle, and to the ecology of the Southern California bight. I strongly object to the plans to double track either lagoon. | W053-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W054 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Marc Gevinson, Software Exec | 2225 Del Mar Scenic Parkway Del Mar, CA 90214. | How can you waste Billions of our tax dollars on a project no one wants and no one will take advantage of because people will still drive to work? How can you possibly be planning to double track on our lagoons, our environment, our neighborhood and our back yard? | W054-1 | Acknowledged. The HST system is proposed to serve intercity trips rather than local commuter trips. 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. Please also see standard response 6.42.1. |
| | | | | How can you possibly be planning to double-track on our lagoons, our environment, our neighborhood, and our back yard? At the last meeting the Caltrans rep said double tracking would increase people going to work in San Diego. This is why the double track is needed, he said. We asked him (120 of us who showed up) what the projected increase in ridership/day would be. Neither he, nor none of his associates knew the answer to this basic question. Do you have ridership increase projection based on the increase of riders on the double track? What's your projection? What is the increase into San Diego each day? What is the daily train ridership from Oceanside to San Diego each workday? What is the ridership on Saturday? On | W054-2 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Sunday? What will the increase in ridership from Oceanside to San Diego cost each taxpayer per rider based on the total cost of building the double track, over the first 10 years of the program??????? Don't waste our money nor our precious environment. Find a better way to justify your jobs. | | |
| W055 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Steven Bergen, Architect | 2549 Via Pisa Del Mar, CA 92014 | Cease and desist with this inappropriate approach to rail service in San Diego and California! Any change, other than the removal of the rail from our lagoons is a grave mistake and goes against the residents here, and the future generations of people living and visiting San Diego and California. Do not present an EIR stating that your proposal to tunnel through the cliffs and double track over Los Penasquitos is acceptable environmentally, aesthetically, or socially. It is not, Any such statements should be treated as criminal activity.<br><br>Surveys and studies show there is not enough ridership to support any expensive increases in rail infrastructure. Where is the money and the riders to support double tracking and tunneling. | W055-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Where is the money and the riders to support double tracking and tunneling? If there really is money available and a ridership base than use the I-5 corridor and the I-15 for expansion of rail service. This is where the riders are now, and makes sense programmatically with future growth expectations. Do not maintain an aging mistake, running the rails through the lagoons. If the rail service is to undergo a change for the best future, than please put it where the riders will be, the existing high volume corridors of I-5 and I-15. | W055-2 | Please see Response 2.30.1 regarding use of the I-5 corridor. Although non-electric conventional improvements to the existing LOSSAN rail corridor are included as part of this program environmental process, the I-15 corridor (via Inland Empire) has been identified as the preferred corridor to link Los Angeles and San Diego with direct HST service. Please also see standard response 6.42.1. |
| W056 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Francisco Wong | 13061 Caminito del Rocio<br>Del Mar, CA 92014 | I live close to Panasquitos Lagoon and am alarmed and totally against putting a double track railroad through this area and under the city of Del Mar. Such a project would cause irreparable harm to the beauty, peace and harmony of this neighborhood. | W056-1 | Please see standard response 2.30.1 and standard response 6.42.1. |
| | | | | Please consider another path such as along I-5. | W056-2 | Please see standard response 6.42.1 and standard response 2.30.1. |
| W057 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Antoinette Wong | 13061 Caminito del Rocio,<br>Del Mar, CA 92014 | Please no double track railroad through Penaquitos Lagoon and Marsh. The peace and beauty of our lovely marsh would be forever ruined. | W057-1 | Please see standard response 2.30.1 and standard response 6.42.1. |
| | | | | Why don't you build it along I-5? | W057-2 | Please 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W058 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Peter Jensen, Editor | 2243 El Amigo Road Del Mar, CA 92014 | Expanding heavy diesel rail through our remaining coastal wetlands, including Penasquitos Lagoon State Preserve, is a disastrous reliance on 19th century technology which will result in cost inefficiency and overruns (longterm cost to taxpayer), degradation of lagoon environment as well as LOSS of several acres of actual habitat, visual blight (wider "slash" across lagoon). We should be trying to get the train out of the lagoon by now, not widening the tracks!<br><br>Disastrous impacts during construction. Vents along Del Mar; increased rail traffic; degradation of air quality; MINIMUM effect on actual cars per day traffic.<br><br>Gaping tunnel, massive abutments, another 75 years or more of tracks stitching the lagoon. | W058-1 | Please see standard response 6.42.1 and standard response 2.30.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | When will you make public the TOTAL accounting of this project, and what we, the taxpayer, will be paying PER RIDER PER YEAR over the first 25 years of its operation. I believe this cost to be astronomical per year. | W058-2 | There are too many unknowns and it would be too speculative to attempt to determine "TOTAL accounting of this project". As part of its Business Plan, the Authority did a cost/benefit analysis that concluded the benefits of the project would outweigh the costs by at least a factor of two. For more information, please see the Business Plan and supporting technical reports on the Authority's website (www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov). |
| W059 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Merritt, Norris | 12980 Via Esperia, Del Mar CA 92014 | Shame on you for failing to adequately inform the public of the 4/20/2004 meeting in San Diego, and for scheduling it at a time which guaranteed that few real members of the public could attend even if they knew about it. I'm sure this was a deliberate tactic. Very few members of the real public showed up precisely because you failed to properly notice the public of this meeting.<br><br>Jeff Ristine, author of a Union Tribune article about the meeting, later privately conceded to Don Billings that the "public" who spoke in favor of the plan were basically only staff of other transportation agencies, their consultants, and political supporters. By contrast, an evening meeting held in Carmel Valley on March 10, 2004 was | W059-1 | Please see standard response 8.1.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | attended by an overflow, standing-room crowd all of whom were opposed. Stop putting about the fiction that this project enjoys strong public support. | | |
| W060 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Marie Merritt | 12980 Via Esperia Del Mar, CA 92014 | We are strongly opposed to any plan to construct any sort of rail expansion through Penasquitos Lagoon State Preserve. This project belongs well in-land and has no business being constructed in fragile coastal wetlands. | W060-1 | Please see standard response 6.42.1. |
| W061 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Scott Anderson | 2124 Caminito Del Barco Del Mar CA | I am in favor of a high-speed rail system in California. There is currently a propsal to put double tracks along the coast between San Diego and Oceanside. One of my main concerns is that there are very limited local stops for the coaster and that this is limiting ridership. I was wondering if it would be feasible to have some trains that have several local stops, particularly I'm interested in being able to go downtown San Diego for special events such as Padres baseball games and to be able to go to and from nightclubs. One such spot would be at the I-5/I-56 freeway interpass. | W061-1 | As defined in the Program EIR/EIS, the proposed HST system would not extend along the coastal corridor any further south than Orange County (Irvine). South of Irvine, only conventional rail infrastructure improvements are considered. Improvements to accommodate commuter and intercity rail service along this corridor are being addressed by the California Department of Transportation in the LOSSAN, Los Angles to San Diego Rail Corridor Improvements Program EIR/EIS. Commuter and conventional intercity rail services are provided by other state or regional agencies based on the market demand. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | I'm also concerned about minimizing any impact that may occur to the local wetlands. I would rather the tracks avoid going through the middle of wetlands, particularly in the Penasquitos Lagoon. In particular, I would like it to stay close to Torrey Pines Road or I-5 if one of these end up being the route taken. I think a high-speed rail system with limited stops combined with local rail systems, trolleys and subway systems with more frequent stops would prove useful in the long run. Also, I would like to see more effort in reducing the vibrations that occur when a train passes, maybe with maglev systems. I think the State of California and the Federal Government need a long-term strategic plan. The current plan is too limited in scope because it neglects tie-in to local transportation, but it does address some of the long distance transportation issues. | W061-2 | Please see standard response 6.42.1. More detailed study to integrate and coordinate public transit systems with the proposed HST system would occur in project-level environmental documents, if the development of the proposed HST system is pursued. The development of a long term strategic plan is beyond the scope of this Program EIR/EIS. |
| W062 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Timothy Smith Ph.D., Scientist | US-Japan Consortium for Health and Technology Initiatives<br>Thomas J Long School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences<br>University of the Pacific, Stockton, CA | RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA SECTOR<br>Response to EIR/EIS with regard to Health and Comprehensive Environmental Impact | W062-1 | Acknowledged response 10.1.7 in regards to the phasing of the HST system, and standard response 6.1.4 in regards to service to the Bay Area. The Draft Program EIR/EIS describes the potential of the proposed HST system to reduce air pollution, relieve congestion, and improve travel safety. Please see standard |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 95211 | INTRODUCTION<br>The development of a high-speed railway system for passenger transportation in California is one of the most important transportation initiatives to be advanced as we move into the 21st century. The positive implications of this system extend well beyond the movement of people from one place to another. These include enhancing the general health of the population, a more balanced approach to energy utilization, better resource management, economic stimulus and protection of both natural and man-made environments. In response to the EIR/EIS, this document will itemize and discuss with appropriate background information, suggestions for modification of this system as well as parallel initiatives with a focus on Northern California.<br>ITEMS OF INTEREST AND SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS<br>Enhancing the health of the general population. An electrically-driven high-speed rail passenger transport system reduces fossil fuel emissions in highly populated areas. These emissions play an important role in the deterioration of respiratory and general health (1,2). In addition, the reduction of single-user motor vehicle use in parallel | | response 1.1.5 regarding coordination with public transit systems. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | transportation routes reduces commuter stress due to traffic congestion and lost time in transit. The safety record of a well-designed high-speed passenger rail system (as is the case in Japan) will reduce deaths due to transportation-related accidents (3). The incorporation of high-speed rail into other public transportation modes will enhance the attractiveness of public transportation in general. Enhanced use of public transportation behaviorally encourages the shift from a sedentary lifestyle involving total dependence upon small motor vehicles into a more organized transportation system encouraging enhanced cardiovascular health with a pedestrian focus (as seen in Europe and Asia).<br>Integration of High-Speed Passenger Rail Service (HSPRS) into existing systems. The general public will not use a public transportation system, unless it is convenient. Stations in the HSPRS must fully integrate with other rail, air, auto rental, bus, subway and other commuter transportation systems. Since the personal automobile will not be eliminated, commuters must have adequate parking space near a station that is safe and clean. To encourage commuter use, both long-term and | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | short-term rentals of specialized commuter cars is to be an essential component of the station design. To fully utilize the reduced environmental impact of electrically-driven systems, these commuter cars should be primarily electric. Another important aspect of integrated systems is the sequential construction of HSPRS to enhance existing public transportation systems. In Northern California, this could dramatically reduce both the initial and total cost of HSPRS at a time when budgetary concerns are a major deterrent to construction of this system. A prime example of the sequential approach to construction is the integration of the Bay Area Rapid Transit system (BART) with HSPRS as a link to the Central Valley. Currently, BART can connect San Francisco International Airport with downtown San Francisco within a system that extends to Dublin/Pleasanton from the East Bay. | | |
| | | | | The use of HSPRS to link Dublin/Pleasanton with the Central Valley via the Altamont Pass provides a less expensive and highly efficient link to the Sacramento-Stockton-Modesto area, one of the most rapidly growing regions in Northern California. This linkage will encourage continued | W062-2 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | improvement of the BART system. This linkage to the Central Valley will dramatically reduce commuter traffic on I-5, I-80 and I-580; a highly visible commuter path to Northern California voters. Although a HSPRS route parallel to I-580 was eliminated in the EIR/EIS presentation, it is interesting to note that recent widening of I-580 and the increased traffic that it encourages was not considered to have adverse environmental impact. The Altamont Pass alternative must be reconsidered. | | |
| | | | | Balanced Energy Utilization and Resource Management. The use of an electrically-driven HSPRS reduces the reliance upon fossil fuels, especially considering the potential for alternative energy resources to be used to power the electrical grid for the system (4). In addition, the use of rechargeable battery-powered automobiles for rental (short-term and long-term) at selected stations is an efficient use of the system and encourages less reliance upon fossil fuels for commuter traffic. | W062-3 | The HST Alternative would be expected to reduce emissions from fossil fuels and reliance on petroleum. The use of rechargeable battery powered automobiles for rental at selected stations could be beneficial and would be considered as part of future, project-level environmental documents. |
| | | | | Economic stimulus. The design, construction and continuous development of HSPRS would provide billions of dollars in economic stimulus to the California economy. As seen in Japan, the development of large residential high-rise construction near | W062-4 | The co-lead agencies acknowledge the comments related to HST station serving as an economic stimulus and helping to reduce automobile dependent commuting and promoting pedestrian lifestyle. The agencies would like to note that |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | railway stations reduces dependency upon automobile-dependent commuting and promotes a healthier pedestrian lifestyle. In addition to residential high-rise construction, these stations serve as a magnet for retail service centers which offers unparalleled convenience and efficiency for commuters. | | worldwide experience indicates that rapid transit and HST station can be a magnet for a wide variety of development. Research conducted for this PEIR/EIS and documented in Section 3.3 of the technical report on economic growth effects suggests that HST stations tend to attract office and residential development prior to retail development. |
| | | | | Environmental Impact. Among all transportation options, electrically-driven HSPRS is among the most environmentally friendly transportation systems; reducing fossil fuel emissions. An elevated viaduct system can be used for electric energy grid distribution without the use of large transmission towers and lines which obstruct the landscape view and present a hazard for small private aircraft. The elevated systems have an improved safety feature by eliminating interaction with motor vehicle traffic and increase service reliability during floods in the Central Valley. Alternatively, an embankment or levee system for railway support could be used as a component of a flood control system. The concentration of populations into high-rise residential construction around the HSPRS stations reduces | W062-5 | An electric-powered HST system could lead to a reduction in fossil fuel emissions and is the most environmentally sensitive alternative to help meet California's future intercity travel needs. The HST system would be completely grade-separated and protected against intrusion (fenced) in segments that are assumed to be constructed at grade—so there would be no interaction with motor vehicle traffic throughout the HST system. The Program EIR/EIS concludes that the HST alternative would result in denser development patterns than the No Project or Modal Alternatives as a result of more transit-oriented development around HST station areas (see Chapter 5, *Economic Growth and Related Impacts*). |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | suburban sprawl and conserves land for agricultural use, public recreation and wildlife refuge.<br>RELATED REFERENCES<br>Polosa R, Salvi S, Di Maria GU. Allergic susceptibility associated with diesel exhaust particle exposure: clear as mud. Arch Environ Health 2002 May-Jun;57(3):188-93.<br>Colburn KA, Johnson PR. Public health. Air pollution concerns not changed by S-PLUS flaw. Science 2003 Jan 31;299 (5607):665-666.<br>Kasai Y. Tokaido Shinkansen Reaches Technical Perfection. International Railway Journal, Jan 2000 v40 i1 p30.<br>Pimentel D, Herz M, Glickstein M, Zimmerman M, Allen R, Becker K, Evans J, Hussain B, Sarsfeld R, Grosfeld A, Seidel T. Renewable energy: current and potential issues. BioScience, Dec 2002 v52 i12 p1111(10). | | |
| W063 | between February and May 17, 2004* | Robert KALI Gomez | 2619 Driller Ave. Bakersfield, CA 93306 | Inclusive planning is a primary concern for a project of this type and care should be taken to inform all groups. Efforts should be made to make special considerations to notify and include as many Native American groups as can be identified within the project area and beyond. | W063-1 | During this program-level process, the co-lead agencies have made a special effort to notify and include potentially affected Native American groups. Consultation was initiated with the Native American Heritage Commission for a search of their Sacred Lands file and lists of Native American contacts. The contacts |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | 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 |

**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. |
| | | | | 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:<br>▪ 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.<br>▪ 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.<br>▪ Under no circumstances should any funerary or burial remains be | W063-2 | Please see standard response 3.12.1.<br>See standard response 10.1.4. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | subjected to any type of scientific analysis such as radio carbon dating etc.<br>▪ 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.<br>▪ 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.<br>▪ 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 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:<br>▪ Bay checkerspot butterfly (Euphydryas editha bayensis)<br>▪ Butte County meadowfoam (Limnanthes floccosa ssp. Californica) California condor (Gymnogyps californianus)<br>▪ Coastal California gnatcatcher(Polioptila californica californica) Conservancy fairy shrimp (Branchinecta conservation)<br>▪ Contra Costa goldfields (Lasthenia conjugens)<br>▪ Delta smelt (Hypomesus transpacificus)<br>▪ 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Greene's tuctoria (Tuctoria greenei)<br>▪ Hairy Orcutt grass (Orcuttia pilosa)<br>▪ Hoover's spurge (Chamaesyce hooveri)<br>▪ Least Bell's vireo (Vireo bellii pusillus)<br>▪ Longhorn fairy shrimp (Branchinecta longiantenna)<br>▪ Quino checkerspot butterfly (Euphydryas editha quino (=E. e. wrighti))<br>▪ Sacramento Orcutt grass (Orcuttia viscida)<br>▪ San Bernardino Merriam's kangaroo rat (Dipodomys merriami parvus)<br>▪ San Diego fairy shrimp (Branchinecta sandiegonensis)<br>▪ San Joaquin Orcutt grass (Orcuttia inaequalis)<br>▪ Slender Orcutt grass (Orcuttia tenuis)<br>▪ Solano grass (Tuctoria mucronata)<br>▪ Tidewater goby (Eucyclogobius newberryi)<br>▪ Vernal pool fairy shrimp (Branchinecta lynchi)<br>▪ Vernal pool tadpole shrimp (Lepidurus packardi) | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Colusa grass (Neostapfia colusana)<br>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.<br>Kirk_waln@r1.fws.gov (Ventura)<br>Greg_goldsmith@r1.fws.gov (Arcata)<br>Joni_Mitchell@r1.fws.gov (Sacramento)<br>Tony_mckinney@r1.fws.gov (Carlsbad)<br>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- | | |

**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 though 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 | 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.<br>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 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | farmland should be saved for food production.<br>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 | | 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. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 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. | | |
| | | | | 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. | W066-2 | Seven pubic 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 |

**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 Neveda 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | 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 *Tunneling Issues Report* (California High Speed Rail Authority, January 2004)." (Draft Program EIR/EIS, pages 2-10). The *Tunneling Issues Report* 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 |

**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<br>1128 The Alameda<br>Berekeley CA 94707 | The EIR assumes the service competes with airlines rather than enhanced rail corridor services from traditional providers. The $25B budget could instead:<br>▪ Provide 140mph, double tracked service in the San Joaquin corridor;<br>▪ Lightrail for every major central Valley community creating a managed armature for growth rather that having communities compete for sprawl inducing access; and<br>▪ Connect the systems to SF and LA rail networks.<br>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 that traditional rail that will compete | 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 "Ecomonic 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.<br>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<br>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 unserviced 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 | 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 *Alternative Alignment and Station Options Considered in Screening Evaluation* (Draft Program EIR/EIS, page 2-71).<br><br>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 |

**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.<br>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.<br>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 Altamount 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<br>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.<br>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.<br>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<br>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 forsight 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<br>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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 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 are soils constraints in this area that caused this railway to be abandoned in the first place.<br><br>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.<br><br>This area is composed of small (2 to 20) acrage 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.<br><br>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 | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | developed. The introduction of the HST to this area would help to further erode the farmlands used for agriculture.<br>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.<br>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.<br>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. | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 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.<br>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.<br>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. | | |
| 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 Rodriquez, Geologist | 17215 Oak Leaf Dr.<br>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<br>Fresno, CA 93716 | California High-Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L Street Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>** Ph. (916) 324-1541<br>Attn: California High-Speed Train - Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments<br>925 L Street, Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814 Fax: (916) 322-0827<br>Chairperson: Joseph E. Petrillo<br>Vice-Chairperson: Fran Florez<br>Board Members:<br>▪ 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Donna Andrews,<br>▪ Rod Diridon,<br>▪ Bob Giroux,<br>▪ Lynn Schenk,<br>▪ Tom Stapleton<br>Executive Director:<br>▪ Mehdi Morshed<br>▪ Dan Leavitt (Deputy Director)<br>▪ Carrie Pourvahidi (Deputy Director)<br>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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | and the attractiveness of the State of California as a whole.<br>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.<br>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 | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | win almost every time, if one were to judge on aesthetics.<br>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.<br>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. | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 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.<br>Thank you.<br>Yours truly,<br>David Wells, Executive Director | 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,<br>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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 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…"<br>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. | | |
| | | | | 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 | W087-2 | Please see standard response 6.23.1. Please also see Chapter 5 "Economic Growth and Related Impacts". |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | causes, not the least of which is urban sprawl – something that this project should encourage? | | |
| | | | | 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.<br><br>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 | W087-3 | 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. |

**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. | | |
| | | | | 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.<br>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 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 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. | | permits an appropriate comparative analysis of the impacts of these system alternatives. Please also see Response to Comment O024-31. |
| | | | | 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 | W087-5 | Please see standard response 6.3.1.<br>Please also see responses to Comment Letter AL072. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 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 in1991 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, it 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.<br>The Grasslands is a critical area for Pacific Flyway waterfowl populations, providing wintering habitat for 20 | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 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.<br><br>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 | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 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.<br>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 | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | helped fund that effort, and has identified the same area as a potential addition to the National Wildlife Refuge System. | | |
| | | | | The proposed high-speed train system includes options for stations in Los Banos and Merced, which are located adjacent to the Grasslands. It also proposes a station in Gilroy, another fairly small, agriculturally-based community. However, the focus of the "Estimated Total Travel Times 'Door-to-Door' Between Cities", as indicated in the table on page 2 of the document, is on Los Angeles, San Francisco, Fresno, San Diego, San Jose, and Sacramento; there is no mention of these smaller communities. In fact, the focus of the entire Draft Program EIR/EIS is on these major cities and their transportation needs. Yet, the severe growth-inducing and environmental impacts of these three proposed stations are nearly ignored in this EIR/EIS – Los Banos is not even listed under "List of cities where libraries will have document available".<br><br>If the proposed stations in these small communities are constructed, the small communities will bear the brunt of explosive growth due to the quick and easy commute to major metropolitan areas. Any such long-distance | W087-6 | The co-lead agencies respectfully disagree with the contention that small communities were overlooked in the Draft Program EIR/EIS. The potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of system alternatives, HST alignment options, and HST station options were explicitly analyzed and reported in the Draft Program EIR/EIS. In particular, the assessment of growth inducement and indirect impacts in Chapter 5 of the Draft Program EIR/EIS considered potential program-level impacts around every station, and the hectare grid scale of analysis for indirect impacts allowed a fine-scale review of conditions in small communities. The co-lead agencies acknowledge that in the presentation of background data items, greater attention was given to examples for California's larger cities. This attention is due to the fact that larger cities (Sacramento, San Francisco, San Diego) are the terminal points for the services or serve as a major transition point between alignment options (e.g. San |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | transportation improvements result in explosive growth. This is clearly evident from recent history. When Pacheco Pass was widened from two lanes to four lanes in the late 1980's, the population of Los Banos jumped from 12,000 to nearly 30,000; there are now an estimated 5,000 people commuting daily to the San Jose area. Further widening Highway 152, as suggested in this document, would clearly aggravate this issue. In light of this near-tripling of the population of a small town due to a single transportation system improvement, the minimal population growth attributable to the high-speed train – as projected in this EIR/EIS does not appear to be valid.<br>"Increased suburban sprawl" is identified as a negative environmental impact under Alternative 2, the "Modal Alternative". However, it is highly likely that the high-speed train system will have even greater negative impacts in this regard. "Some route alternatives diverging to avoid impacting communities" is mentioned in the EIR/EIS; yet, again, no mention of environmental and growth-inducing impacts to small towns. The table on page S-14 indicates that the Modal Alternative will encourage urban sprawl | | Jose, Los Angeles), and it therefore makes sense to report summary system statistics between these cities. This focus within Chapter 2 in no way affected the analysis methodologies for direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts, and the Draft Program EIR/EIS includes all relevant information for all system alternatives, alignment options and station options.<br>The co-lead agencies concur with the commenter's contention that transportation access can be an important influence on growth patterns, although it is one of many influences. Travel demand model results that were used for the growth inducement analysis indicate that the accessibility barriers that exist between Northern Central Valley housing and Bay Area jobs is largely overcome with the highway improvements included in the No Project Alternative. Hence, as shown in Tables 5.3.1 and 5.3.2, the Northern Central Valley experiences population and employment growth from 2003 to 2035 that is two to three times higher than the Bay Area for all alternatives. These results mean that the Northern Central Valley is an attractive housing |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | throughout the Central Valley, and the high-speed train only around Merced. This does not make sense – there will be urban sprawl anywhere there is a train station and there is room to grow. The EIR/EIS claims that the high-speed train will "result in denser development…on less land". This would not be the case in these small communities. The table on page S-11 lists under Land Use that the train would result in "controlled growth around stations, urban in-fill; compatible with transit-first policies". This model may fit for major metropolitan areas, but does not fit for small towns. Under Mitigation Strategies, there is discussion of sound walls, visual buffers/landscaping, etc. This is extremely narrowly-focused and misses the "big picture" negative effects.The study results cite "improved travel options in parts of the state with limited bus, rail and air transportation service". However, it was not identified in the EIR/EIS that certain communities desire "improved travel options". Under Section S.4.4. Areas of Controversy, the EIR/EIS states that "the Authority would take into account potential impacts on natural resources, cost, effects on travel time and ridership, and public and agency input". However, social impacts and growth- | | location for Bay Area job seekers under all system alternatives, and the major differential effect of the HST Alternative is to shift housing location for a few long-distance commuters from San Joaquin and Sacramento Counties (under the No Project and Modal Alternatives) to Stanislaus and Merced Counties (under the HST Alternative). This net effect would be a housing shift within the San Joaquin Valley rather than a housing shift from the Bay Area to the Central Valley.<br><br>The co-lead agencies would like to note that divergence of an HST route around some communities would not likely result in significant growth inducement nor related indirect impacts since it would be predominantly station location, rather than alignment location, which would influence transportation accessibility and result in related growth inducement potential. The influence of alternative station locations on growth inducement potential was assessed and summarized in Section 5.3.5 of the Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br><br>The co-lead agencies believe that the summary Table S.6-1 accurately reflects the fact that the Modal |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | inducing impacts to small towns and urban sprawl could very well be the most damaging negative impact of this high-speed train. | | Alternative increases accessibility, and therefore increases growth inducement potential, throughout the Central Valley. These summary conclusions are supported by analytic results that show that the urban footprint increases in all areas where the Modal Alternative provides increased highway capacity. The commenter is correct in noting that growth patterns for the HST Alternative will differ from the other system alternatives wherever an HST station exists. However, the analysis presented in the Draft Program EIR/EIS and the technical report on economic growth effects demonstrated that, under normal market forces, HST services would lead to a slight development densification in the immediate station area even in the absence of targeted land use and zoning regulations. Please see standard response 5.2.1 for further information related to development density assumptions for this analysis.<br><br>Please see standard response 5.2.1 for issues related to measures to address potential for growth inducement and indirect impacts. Furthermore, the co-lead agencies recognize that growth can present |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | challenges for small communities. However, the analysis results indicate that the HST Alternative would not lead to adverse indirect impacts from growth inducement at a program-level of analysis. Please see Section 6B of the Final Program EIR/EIS in regards to design principles for transit-oriented development around high-speed train stations. |
| W088 | 8/10/2004 | Robert Ringland | 12957 Caminito del Canto<br>Del Mar, CA 92014-3756 | The EIR/EIS Brochure and Summary show a 20% improvement (HST over existing) in travel time between LA and SD by 2020 with ill-defined (but no electrification) improvements to the "LOSSAN corridor" (CalTrans responsibility) with which the high speed train (HST) system would connect either in LA or Orange County. And when the traveler gets to San Diego from LA (or vice versa) he/she still needs local transportation. With this small time advantage most people will still choose their car over the HST option unless maybe fuel costs go up by, say, an order of magnitude. And for this benefit Caltrans proposes to spend the kind of money required (and as yet not quantified) to tunnel under I-5 or Camino Del Mar. This doesn't seem to be a reasonable return on investment. | W088-1 | Please see standard response 6.42.1 and standard response 2.9.4. In addition, conventional freight services could not operate over the steeper gradients (up to 3.5%) needed to make HST tracks practicable along the I-15 corridor. Future project specific studies will address issues related to more specific impacts should the high-speed train proposal move forward. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | The Summary contains two sentences pertaining to concerns in the San Diego area: "And concerns have been raised regarding potential impacts from double tracking (adding a second track adjacent to an existing track) sensitive coastal lagoons for non-electric service in San Diego County." (Page 9 under C. Impacts on Public Parks, Wildlife Areas, and Recreational Resources) and "In addition, there are concerns regarding the design options under Camino Del Mar or I-5 to bypass the Del Mar coastal bluffs" (Page 9 under D. Impacts on Coastal Communities). This reflects the study's relative neglect of issues in the southernmost part of the state and in particular, San Diego County's coastal communities.<br><br>Map 12 shows LOSSAN improvements considered from Solana Beach to Mira Mesa to be 1) tunnel under Camino Del Mar and aerial through Penasquitos Lagoon, or 2) grade level through San Dieguito Lagoon and tunnel under I-5. Neither alternative is acceptable to locals because of visual and noise impacts (heavy and more frequent freights use the same tracks) not to forget wetland environmental degradation. There is no consideration of using I-5 from Carlsbad (Cannon | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Road) to Mira Mesa (Carmel Mountain Road) or of an electrified continuation (not LOSSAN) of what is proposed for the rest of the state. Yet such a routing would better serve the local population while reducing the impact on coastal communities. Electrification would eliminate the need for transfers between HST and conventional (non-electric) trains.<br><br>In the trade table we see that "relocation assistance during future project-level review" may be provided for people impacted by the routes ultimately chosen. Really? I doubt this applies in the event the Penasquitos Lagoon route is chosen. Elsewhere there are worries about impact on farmland 50 feet on either side of the tracks. What about urban areas? Presumably this is where the relocation assistance, noise barriers, etc. come in. The noise of heavy train traffic is significant well beyond 100 feet either side of the center of the right of way, particularly on elevated structures. Check it out on Carmel Valley Road just east of Camino Del Mar with existing rail traffic. "High visual contrast" is noted for the aerial sections. A great euphemism for "eyesore." This observer prefers the appearance of the old-style wooden trestles. | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | No attention appears to have been given to transition issues -- how we get from where we are today to the glorious future envisioned in this EIR/EIS. Leaving aside the disruption caused by construction, it would appear that we will be experiencing greatly increased freight traffic on the LOSSAN shared use corridor indefinitely, at least until an I-15 route becomes available for freight. And this will never be the case if the I-15 route is designed only for lighter weight passenger traffic envisioned in the study for the HST system.<br><br>In particular, I would like to see a study of the alternative routing possibilities for increasing the freight carrying capacity between San Diego and Los Angeles; also the justification of need inasmuch as the freight trains this observer sees now on this route are largely empty. Then maybe one could evaluate the merits of joint (freight plus passenger) vs separate use (which might admit the possibility of alternate technologies to steel-wheel-on-steel-rail for passenger travel). | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W089 | 8/10/2004 | John Bergmen, Farmer/ Banker | 4901 W. Modoc Ct Visalia, CA 93291 | I just want you to move forward with the project. Think of what is best for the people of this state and our country. Mother Nature has a way of equalizing inequities in the environment and I am a strong believer in a higher and greater power who is in charge of our destiny than the environmental issues that seem to stifle progress. Do not be discouraged in your work, keep the alignment where it serves the people who will use it. . . (i.e., the U.P.R.R. alignment). Let's let common sense overrule the few who would like to stop progress in the name of EIR's etc. Keep on chugging and Thanks for listening. John Bergman | W089-1 | Please see standard response 6.15.4. |
| W090 | 8/12/2004 | Juan Gallardo, Enlisted | 1443 N. Michael St Porterville, CA 93257 | I am a U.S. Marine assigned to Camp Pendleton CA. There are thousands of Marines from all over the central valley and cities north of Los Angeles stationed there as well. The current rail system provided by Amtrak makes it a nightmare to get to destinations like Fresno or Tulare county. There's a short train ride followed by a bus ride and another train ride, making the total commute time exceed 6 hrs at times. This new rail system would not only allow people such as myself to visit home more often but it would encourage more and more people stationed at San Diego are bases to | W090-1 | Acknowledged. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | buy homes in places like Tulare County or Kern County. With a shortened commute and the prices of homes in the central valley it would make sense to do it. I think this is a great plan and you will find that many people are willing to back it. | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W091 | 8/18/2004 | Lynn Wilson | 737 College Ave.<br>Menlo Park, CA 94025 | I hope you are considering MagLev, which is much cheaper to build and operate than light rail, carries its own electricity safely (no unightly overhead cables), is silent to operate, does not interfere with motorists (so no problems at rush hour), is much safer than rails (for passengers, pedestrians, and motorists) and is also safer from threat of terrorist attack. There are several systems in operation now, all over the world, and construction technology is very advanced; passengers and motorists love them, as do people who live near the guideways. It would be a shame to reject this better, safer, and cheaper technology.<br><br>MgLev is a much better alternative thn light rail, reglar rail, or anything else available in the world. | W091-1 | Please see standard response 2.10.3. |
| W092 | 8/18/2004 | Jim Reese, Assistant City Manager | City of Newark<br>37101 Newark Boulevard<br>Newark, CA 94560 | On behalf of the City of Newark, I would like to express strong opposition to the alignment referenced on page 1-8 of the EIR/EIS entitled "Hayward Branch through Niles Junction to the Mulford line. We feel that the rail should follow the right-ofway of I-880 between Oakland and San Jose.<br><br>On behalf of the City of Newark, I would like to express our strong opposition to the alignment referenced | W092-1 | Please see standard response 6.2.2. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | on page 1.8 of the EIR/EIS entitled "Hayward Branch through Niles Junction to the Mulford LIne. We feel that the rail should follow the right-of-way of I-880 between Oakland and San Jose. | | |
| W093 | 8/19/2004 | Lois Wright, Gov't & Community Affairs | 1150 Glen Aulin Ct. Carmichael, CA 95608 | ▪ This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>▪ The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>▪ An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in | W093-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>▪ This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>▪ Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>▪ Sincerely,<br>▪ Lois Wright | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W094 | 8/19/2004 | Alan Gordon, Senate Consultant | 965 54th Street Sacramento, CA 95819 | The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento | W094-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Alan Gordon | | |
| W095 | 8/19/2004 | James Israel | POB 162429<br>Sacramento, CA 95816 | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended | W095-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 -Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>James Israel | | |
| W096 | 8/19/2004 | Matthew Peak | 2181 East Foothill Blvd<br>Pasadena, CA 91107 | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits: | W096-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Matt Peak | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W097 | 8/19/2004 | Paul Rosenberg, Writer/Editor | 800 Pacific Ave #403 Long Beach, CA 90813 | Based on my own experience as a journalist covering EIS/EIR processess in the LA Harbor area, I am most concerned about the proper consideration of alternatives, which has the greatest possibility of substantially improving the both the overall ratio of benefits to costs, and the equitable distribution of costs and benefits, not just to existing groups and individuals, but to those who will have to live with our decisions in the future.<br><br>Although I have lived in Southern California for some time, I was raised in Northern California, in Davis and Campbell, and still return frequently to visit my mother in San Jose. Trips to the Lick Observatory atop Mt. Hamilton were always a special treat for me as a child. I still recall counting 416 turns on the road to the top. I am thus quite familiar with the different possible alternative routes, and their potential impacts, as laid out specifically below. I would also personally be far more likely to use this transportation if it were aligned through Altamont pass.<br><br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay | W097-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas, with all the resulting envioronmental impacts this entails<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record. | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment. | | |
| W098 | 8/19/2004 | Shirley Schmelzer, Ret. | MERG, Audubon<br>4512 Varain Rd.<br>Mariposa, CA 95338 | No comment received. | | |
| W099 | 8/19/2004 | Therese Tuttle, Attorney | 318 Brook Way<br>Modesto, CA 95354 | Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park | W099-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Therese Tuttle | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W100 | 8/19/2004 | Elizabeth Patterson, Vice Mayor | City Council of Benicia<br>1215 West Second Street<br>Benicia, CA 94510 | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>First, I would like to note that I am a regular train commuter and also use the trains (to the extent they are available) for travel, especially to Southern California. Secondly, I am an urban and regional planner. Thus my comments are based on personal and professional standards.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits: | W100-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments. | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Sincerely,<br>Elizabeth Patterson, AICP Vice Mayor City of Benicia | | |
| W101 | 8/19/2004 | M. Beitscher | 2105 Yacht Daphne Newport Beach, CA 92660 | I urge the creation of high-speed rail between San Francisco, L.A. and San Diegosuch line should be designed to impact uninhabited areas at a minimum. | W101-1 | Acknowledged. |
| W102 | 8/19/2004 | April Vargas | P.O.Box 370265 Montara, CA 94037 | Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness | W102-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>April Vargas | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W103 | 8/19/2004 | Max Chaplin, retired | 26250 Rinconada Drive<br>Carmel Valley, CA 93924 | This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment. | W103-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |
| W104 | 8/19/2004 | Kari Smith | 1971 Hopkins<br>Berkeley, CA 94707 | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br><br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br><br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br><br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br><br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits: | W104-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely, | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W105 | 8/19/2004 | Dale Means | 3417 10th Ave.<br>Sacramento, CA<br>95817 | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands | W105-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Dale Means | | |
| W106 | 8/19/2004 | Lilly Okamura | 2467 Country Lane Santa Maria, CA 93455 | ▪ Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>▪ This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>▪ The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to | W106-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>▪ An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion. | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment. | | |
| W107 | 8/19/2004 | James Salsman | ReadSay<br>1910 Mt. Vernon Ct. #3<br>Mountain View, CA 94040 | Reduced reliance on automobiles will encourage the use of public transportation in urban areas. Can this effect be quantified by examining the behavior of existing rail users?<br>It is essential to quantify the extent that reduced reliance on imported oil provides cost savings for national strategic defence. I ask the Authority to estimate California's portion of national cost savings for oil-related defense expenditures, based on (1) the number of barrels of oil saved, (2) the total demand expected, (3) California's portion of the national tax burden, and (4) DoD estimates of annual expenditures associated with U.S. strategic oil interests. Neglecting to consider this quantity would be irresponsible. | W107-1 | The number of barrels of oil saved (4.8 to 5.3 million fewer barrels of oil as compared to the No Project Alternative annually by the year 2020) and the total demand expected is presented in the Program EIR/EIS in Section 3.5. Although reduced oil consumption can be projected, it is beyond the scope of this EIR/EIS to predict how any related cost savings may be applied, the impacts on California's portion of the national tax burden and the impacts DoD estimates of annual expenditures associated with the U.S. strategic oil interests. |
| W108 | 8/19/2004 | Gary Patton, Executive | LandWatch Monterey County<br>Box 1876 | Post Office Box 1876,<br>Salinas, CA 93902<br>Website: www.landwatch.org | W108-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Director | Salinas, CA 93902 | August 19, 2004<br>Mr. Joe Petrillo,<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed, among other reasons, because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>In addition, there is not an adequate analysis of the terrific growth inducing impacts that the proposed project could have throughout the Central Valley and all along the route.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments. | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W109 | 8/19/2004 | Darlene Berry | PO Boz 4815<br>Carmel, CA 93921 | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands | W109-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Darlene M. Berry | | |
| W110 | 8/19/2004 | Stephen Wathen, Research | 611 Lessley Pl. Davis, CA 95616 | Please excuse me, but there is no excuse for not building more rapid transit paralleling our current transportation system.<br>Please see the new film The End of Suburbia, available for sale on the web http://eos.postcarbon.org, to | W110-1 | Acknowledged. While it is an objective of the Authority to "maximize the use of existing transportation corridors and rights-of-way, to the extent feasible" the Authority believes there may be some areas where alignment |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | understand how drastically we need to build alternatives reduce energy use before our oil and natural gas reserves are gone. More information can be found at http://eos.globalpublicmedia.com. Thank you for doing this. | | constraints necessitate use of a new alignment in order to have a feasible and practicable HST system. |
| W111 | 8/19/2004 | John Schick, Attorney | San Joaquin Audubon<br>343 E. Main Street #901<br>Stockton, CA 95202-2990 | Mr. Petrillo,<br>I am thrilled that the concept of high speed rail is being considered for the connection between the central valley and the Bay area. I am disappointed that the areas being considered are those where there is a great concentration of state parks, natural areas and good birding spots.<br>Our Audubon group regularly uses the Pacheco pass area and the parks in that area are an asset of the state. I urge you to consider using an Altamont Pass route. This area is better suited for a rail, would not involve the extra work the tunneling in the Pacheco /Mt. Hamilton area would. I look forward to hearing that a high speed rail that does not seriously iimpact wildlife and state parks is on the drawing board.<br>Thank you for listening to my concerns.<br>John Schick | W111-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W112 | 8/19/2004 | Dana Michaels | 7356 Marani Way<br>Sacramento, CA<br>95831 | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed, because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas, to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA). It just makes more sense!<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands | W112-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record (and anyone with the common sense to compare the two proposals!).<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>I can't understand why it's taken so many ballot initatives, bond sales, and studies to get a high-speed rail system in California. The idea has been around for decades, and it doesn't take a genius to realize that we need one. Stop the delaying tactics, and sneaky ways of funneling money into campaign contributors' pockets, and JUST DO IT! | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Dana Michaels<br>Native Californian, sick of seeing my State wrecked by overpopulation! | | |
| W113 | 8/19/2004 | Ron Kilcoyne | 24001 Cape May Court Santa Clarita, CA 91355 | The HIgh Speed Rail Porgram must not be sprawl inducing. It must support in-fill and intensification of existing urban areas.<br>The stations suold be located in existing urban areas to encourage in-fill development and not encourage sprawl. The alignments chosen should allow for minimmal locating of station in greenfield areas. Stations should only be located where dense mixed use develpment is esists or is zoned to be built. | W113-1 | Please see standard response 2.1.12. |
| | | | | The alignment should not zig zag to serve every community that seeks service. | W113-2 | Please see standard response 6.23.1. |
| | | | | The I-5 alignment should be built between LA and Bakersfield and Merced must be served direct because of UC Merced. | W113-3 | Please see standard response 6.23.1.<br>Please see standard response 6.19.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W114 | 8/19/2004 | Gary Danielson, Land Use Consultant | Sierra Land Use Group<br>P.O. Box 1849<br>Jamestown, CA 95327-1849 | Mr. Joe Petrillo, Chair California High Speed Rail Authority 925 L St., Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times | W114-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>GARY W. DANIELSON, Executive Director<br>SIERRA LAND USE GROUP, UNA/NGO | | |
| W115 | 8/19/2004 | Wendell Anderson, Retired | 200 Estates Dr. Apt. A Roseville, CA 95678-2342 | Cost-benefit analysis vs negative impact | W115-1 | A cost-benefit analysis is beyond the scope of this program EIR/EIS process. However, a cost-benefit analysis was included as part of the Authority's Business Plan (June 2000) and is available on the Authority's website. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W116 | 8/19/2004 | Christina Wong | 5130 S Land Park<br>Sacramento, CA<br>95822 | No comment received. | | |
| W117 | 8/19/2004 | Alan Craig, Wildlife Biologist | PO Box 16361<br>Portal, AZ 85632 | Mr. Joe Petrillo,<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>Is the California High Speed Rail Authority going to do a new EIS/EIR giving full consideration to the Altamont Pass alternative alignment? I strongly urge you to do so!<br>Although I am living temporarily in Arizona, I lived in California for 42+ years, I graduated from U.C. Berkeley, and I visit family in Sacramento, Davis and the Bay Area as often as possible.<br>The Altamont Pass alignment seems much more logical from the standpoint of cost to taxpayers and its potential to relieve traffic congestion.<br>Many thanks for considering my comments, and for your work on this critically important project.<br>Best regards,<br>Alan Craig | W117-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W118 | 8/19/2004 | Casey Coates Danson, Env Designer/ Activist, | Global Possibilities<br>1955 Mandeville Canyon Rd.<br>Los Angeles, CA 90049 | No comment received. | W118-1 | |
| W119 | 8/19/2004 | Edh Stanley | Box 247042<br>S'o, CA 95824 | Consider, too, that the Altamont Pass route will decrease highway traffic on I-205. | W119-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |
| W120 | 8/19/2004 | Edh Stanley | Box 247042<br>S'o, CA 95824 | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br><br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br><br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br><br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA). | W120-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Traffic congestion on I-205 and I-5<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment. | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Edh Stanley | | |
| W121 | 8/19/2004 | Pete Holloran, student at UC Santa Cruz | 350 Oxford Way<br>Santa Cruz, CA 95060 | The DEIR/S is flawed because it neglects to consider an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area.<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment. | W121-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Thank you for your consideration. | | |
| W122 | 8/19/2004 | Mark Newhouser | 4277 Wake Robin Dr.<br>Glen Ellen, CA 95442 | Gen: High speed rail is fine if developed to improve air quality and decrease automobile use and oil consumption. However, it should not be developed where it will cause environmental degradation or spawn real estate speculation in previously uninhabitated areas. Controls must be put in place to prevent the birth of new towns along new corridors, especially in environmentally senstive areas. | W122-1 | Please see standard response 2.1.12. |
| W123 | 8/19/2004 | Howard Kastan, Retired | 3085 Twin Oaks Road<br>Cameron Park, CA 95682 | No comment received. | | |
| W124 | 8/19/2004 | Jeffery Garcia | PO Box 1166<br>Mendocino, CA 95460 | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair,<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the | W124-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | for public comment.<br>Sincerely,<br>Jeffery Garcia | | |
| W125 | 8/19/2004 | Clayton Mansfield | 217 15th Ave. #4<br>San Francisco, CA 94118 | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine | W125-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Clayton Mansfield | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W126 | 8/20/2004 | Scott Plambaeck, Associate Planner | City of Morgan Hill<br>17555 Peak Ave<br>Morgan Hill, CA 95037 | The City of Morgan Hill would like to provide comments on the High-Speed Train Draft Program EIR/EIS in relation to the potential impacts to the City of Morgan Hill.<br>The City requests the Authority further study the following potential impacts:<br>▪ Right-of-Way acquisition. According the Draft EIR, the HST will require 5'-70' of additional right-of-way acquisition along the CalTrain corridor. The Draft EIR does not discuss the location of the right-of-way acquisition or the impact the acquisitions would have on adjacent land uses. The Draft EIR states that the Monterey Highway corridor north of Cochrane would need to be realigned to the east and reconstructed. The Authority needs to further study the impact the right-of-way acquisition will have on adjacent land uses. | W126-1 | The location of right-of-way acquisition and the impacts of acquisitions are beyond the scope of this program EIR/EIS process, but would be studied in future project-level documents. The potential impacts of proposed right-of-way acquisition on adjacent land uses would be determined in future project specific studies should the HST project move forward. |
| | | | | ▪ Direct Tunnel Routes. The City opposes all routes that go through or impact Henry Coe State Park. | W126-2 | Please see standard response 6.3.1. |
| | | | | ▪ Noise. As describe in the Draft EIR additional trains on the tracks will cause more noise. Further, if sections of the HST right-of-way are elevated, the noise impact will | W126-3 | A more detailed study of potential noise impacts from the proposed HST system on the City of Morgan Hill is beyond the scope of this program EIR/EIS process, but would |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | be greater than grade level right-of-way. A noise study detailing the impacts the HST will have on the City should conduced if the Pacheco Route is chosen. | | be included in future project specific studies should the HST project move forward. |
| | | | | ▪ Downtown HST station. The Draft EIR states that a downtown station would be a two or three story aerial structure. Although the City's General Plan encourages transit stops in the downtown an aerial structure would have significant impacts to the downtown. Impacts included visual, traffic, parking, growth inducing impacts, and impacts to adjacent land use. If a station is built in the downtown, additional environmental study will need to be completed for the downtown station. | W126-4 | Additional project specific studies and environmental documentation would be required before a HST station could be constructed in Southern Santa Clara County. |
| | | | | ▪ Visual/Aesthetic. If sections of the HST is elevated there is potential for visual/aesthetic impacts throughout the City. If the Pacheco route is chosen, these impacts need to be studied further.<br>▪ Historic/Cultural Resources. The existing CalTrain right-of-way is adjacent to existing and potential significant historical and cultural sites. The realignment of Monterey Highway has a high probability to | W126-5 | Please see standard response 6.3.1. Should the HST proposal move forward, the Authority and the FRA will continue to work with the City of Morgan Hills as part of future, more detailed studies. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | impact potential and existing cultural sites in the Madrone area of Morgan Hill. The Madrone area is a historic area of the City bound by the CalTrain right-of-way to the west, Highway 101 to the east, Cochrane Road to the south, and the City Limits to the north.<br>▪ In addition, the realignment of Monterey Highway will impact the historic Walnut Trees along Monterey Road, which Santa Clara County has listed in their historic inventory. If the Pacheco route is chosen, the potential impact to historic and cultural resources will need to be further studied.<br>▪ Biological/Natural Resources. The City of Morgan Hill has a burrowing owl mitigation plan. The purpose of the plan is to protect existing owls and mitigate the lost of habitat. The City's burrowing owl mitigation applies to projects on lands that are below 600 feet elevation above sea level that support any grassland and/or mixed herbaceous vegetation upon which an activity is proposed that defined as a "project" by CEQA and is not statutorily or categorically exempt. Depending on the location of the future HST right-of-way | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | acquisition, there could be a taking of burrowing owl habitat, thus triggering the mitigation listed in the mitigation plan.<br>▪ Significant trees are protected and defined in section 12.32 of the Morgan Hill Municipal Code. The future HST right-of-way may impact significant trees. Once the alignment is chosen, the impact to trees will need be further studied.<br>If you have any questions, please feel free to contact, Scott Plambaeck, Associate Planner with the City's Community Development Department at (408) 779-7247 or scottp@morgan-hill.ca.gov.<br>Please add the City to your mailing list for future information.<br>Sincerely,<br>James B. Rowe<br>Interim Community Development Director | | |
| W127 | 8/20/2004 | Dennis Jackman | 504 Laurel Avenue<br>Modesto, CA 95351 | High Speed Rail in California can be an improvement for transportation and agricultural needs. The paradox of ease of access versus the need to protect the most productive agricultural area the world has ever known is before us. A transfer of travelers from private automobiles on existing | W127-1 | Acknowledged. The development of a document or policies that seek to prevent the elimination of productive farmland from urban development throughout the Central Valley of California is beyond the scope of this document. The authority has adopted objectives for the system to |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | freeways to a rail mass transit system will improve capacity for the movement of goods from the Great Central Valley to world markets. The ease of access to more affordable land may result in the reduction or elimination of significant farmland acreage near rail terminals and could result in a loss of ecomomies of scale for production agriculture in local arenas.<br><br>At present no document or policies exist that prevent the elimination of productive farmland from urban development throughout the Central Valley of California. The productive ability of land and the value of the products it can produce is not factored in the determination of change of use of the land. Local land use policies are subject only to short term criteria based on general plans that can and have historically urbanized at the direction of urban developers. Long term society desires need to be established and the value of those choices granted to the property owner. Until it is determined where we are not going to build the tenative condition of productive agriculture will not provide a food security that is critical to our national security. | | maximize the use of existing transportation corridors and rights-of-way (to the extent possible) in order to reduce impacts to agricultural lands and natural resources, to locate stations in developed areas in order to connect with local transit and airports, and to be sensitive and protective of California's unique natural resources. If the HST proposal should move forward, further analysis as part of future project level studies would be needed to further define agriculture design practices and to determine appropriate mitigation measures from specific segments of the proposed system. Please refer to Section 6B of the Final Program EIR/EIS in regards to design principles for transit-oriented development around HST stations. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Location of HSR terminals in downtowns and the use of existing rail corridors could minimize negative growth-induced impacts. | W127-2 | Please see standard response 2.1.12. The BNSF rail corridor has been identified as the preferred alignment between Bakersfield and Stockton, and the UP rail corridor between Stockton and Sacramento. However, some segments of new alignments are necessary to maintain high-speed operations throughout the Central Valley. In the Central Valley, downtown stations have been recommended at Sacramento, Stockton, Fresno, and Bakersfield. The Modesto Amtrak station site, and Castle Air Force Base to serve Merced have also been selected as preferred HST station locations and are multi-modal transportation hubs. Please also see standard responses 6.12.1 and standard response 6.15.4. |
| W128 | 8/20/2004 | Martin Engel, Ret. | PF III HOA<br>1621 Stone Pine Lane<br>Menlo Park, CA 94025 | 20 August 2004<br>CHSR Program Draft EIR/EIS<br>Gentlemen:<br>My wife and I object, in the strongest terms, to the contents of the CHSRA DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.<br>The document fails on the grounds of | W128-1 | The Authority and the FRA respectfully disagree with your assessment. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | full disclosure.<br>It enters economic domains (train ridership, profitability, development and construction costs, etc.) that are beyond its jurisdiction. | | |
| | | | | In rejecting the Altamont alternative, it accepts inappropriate political decisions beyond its jurisdiction. | W128-2 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |
| | | | | It fails to address ALL the significant implications for and consequences of HRS on the Peninsula from SF to SJ. These include environmental factors such as private property acquisition and imposed easements, right-of-way expansion, aesthetics, noise pollution, residential quality impact, tree loss, and protracted construction. | W128-3 | Determining private property acquisition and imposed easements, tree loss, etc. is beyond the scope of this program level EIR/EIS process. If the HST proposal moves forward, more detailed project-specific analysis will be required. The design option for the proposed HST service along the Caltrain corridor considered in the Program EIR/EIS assumes and integrates infrastructure that would be fully grade-separated and electrified, and would increase trackage on the right-of-way (4 tracks between San Jose and San Francisco). |
| | | | | It fails to assess the environmental/ecological impact of ALL alternative routes.<br>It is an advocacy, promotional document reflecting the interests of the HSRA and its interests at the expense | W128-4 | Please see response to Comment W128-1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | of both urban and rural consequences throughout California, and totally fails on grounds of objectivity and neutrality. | | |
| | | | | It perpetuates the arbitrary and distorting separation of three environmental rail issues that need to be integrated to acknowledge their interaction and interdependence:<br>Grade separations along the Peninsula and other urban areas.<br>Electrification<br>The overlay of rail multiplication (additional trackage) on the CALTRAIN/JPB right-of-way. | W128-5 | Chapter 2 of the Draft Program EIR/EIS clearly described the HST Alternative and alignment option for the Caltrain corridor as being fully grade separated, electrified, and requiring additional tracks on the Caltrain corridor (pages 2-28, 2-51, & 2-52). |
| | | | | It does not consider other alternative routes; for example, a route to Fremont/Sacramento with trunk lines south to San Jose and north, cross-bay, to San Francisco, and therefore without extending the highly damaging route through the totally urbanized Peninsula. | W128-6 | Please see standard response 2.36.1. Available studies indicate that use of the Bay Bridge, or a new Transbay Tube would not be feasible or practicable options for the proposed HST service. Please see the findings of the following MTC studies, which provide substantial evidence to support this conclusion: Structural Assessment of Rail on the Bay Bridge, October 22, 1999; MTC Bay Bridge Feasibility Study, July 2000; and San Francisco Bay Crossings Study, July 2002. However, please also see standard response 6.2.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | On these, and numerous other grounds, we condemn and reject this DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.<br>Respectfully,<br>Martin and Judith Engel | W128-7 | Acknowledged. |
| W129 | 8/20/2004 | Maureen Hill, Urban Planning Consultant | 18813 Aspesi Drive Saratoga, CA 95070 | Please provide careful and thoughtful analysis for an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to the Pacheco Pass/Mount Hamilton alignment. The Altamont Pass, is within a high traffic corridor of the San Francisco Bay area and already serves as a connection to the Bay Area from the Central Valley and Sacramento. Fewer natural resources could be effected by this alignment and there is a potential for fewer growth inducing impacts to the area.<br>The Altamont Pass alignment is a logical consideration, the Draft EIS/Eir is a flawed document without a thorough comparative analysis of this alignment with the preferred alignment and other project alternatives.<br>Maureen Hill, Principal<br>Owens Hill Consulting<br>18813 Aspesi Drive<br>Saratoga, CA 95070 | W129-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W130 | 8/20/2004 | Martin Engel | 1621 Stone Pine Lane<br>Menlo Park, CA 94025 | 20 August 2004<br>CHSR Program Draft EIR/EIS<br>Ladies and Gentlemen:<br>My wife and I object, in the strongest terms, to the contents of the CHSRA DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.<br>The document fails on the grounds of full disclosure.<br>It enters economic domains (train ridership, profitability, development and construction costs, etc.) that are beyond its jurisdiction, which is, ostensibly, Environment.<br>In rejecting the Altamont alternative, it accepts inappropriate political decisions beyond its jurisdiction.<br>It fails to address ALL the significant environmental implications for and consequences of HRS on the Peninsula from SF to SJ. These include environmental factors such as private property acquisition and imposed easements, right-of-way expansion, aesthetics, noise pollution, residential quality impact, tree loss, and protracted construction.<br>It fails to assess the environmental/ecological impact of ALL alternative routes. | | Repeated comments from W128. Please see responses for Comment Letter W128. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | It is an advocacy, promotional, marketing document reflecting the interests of the HSRA at the expense of both the urban and rural consequences throughout California, and totally fails on grounds of objectivity and neutrality.<br>It perpetuates the arbitrary and distorting separation of three environmental rail issues that need to be integrated to acknowledge their interaction and interdependence:<br>▪ Grade separations along the Peninsula and other urban areas.<br>▪ Electrification<br>▪ The overlay of rail multiplication (additional trackage) on the CALTRAIN/JPB right-of-way.<br>It does not consider other alternative routes; for example, a route to Fremont/Sacramento with trunk lines south to San Jose and north, cross-bay, to San Francisco, and therefore without extending the highly damaging route through the totally urbanized Peninsula.<br>It does not consider and assess the option of terminating the Bay Area "west leg" of the HSR at San Jose, which is connected to San Francisco by the Baby Bullet trains; i.e., an already existing local high-speed rail | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | connection.<br>In other words, it supports the Bay Area Peninsula JPB/CALTRAIN agenda for reckless rail right-of- way expansion down the Peninsula, regardless of the destructive consequences to residential communities through which it passes.<br>This document promotes pork-barrel politics at its most egregious. On these, and numerous other grounds, we condemn and reject this DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.<br>Respectfully,<br>Martin and Judith Engel | | |
| W131 | 8/20/2004 | Steve Boland | 970 Geary<br>San Francisco, CA 94109 | just wanted to put on record my strong preference for an altamont alignment. | W131-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |
| W132 | 8/20/2004 | Rajesh Krishnan | 155 Gifford Ave., Apt. 1<br>San Jose, CA 95110 | Consider Altamont. Bias towards the fastest routes. Learn from the Baby Bullet good story up in the Bay Area. | W132-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |
| | | | | Keep the total travel time end to end below 2.25 hours by reducing stations. Don't turn this into a white elephant like San Jose VTA. Short travel time is the best way to ensure happy riders. | W132-2 | The Authority agrees that it is critical to keep the end-to-end travel times between major markets as quick as possible and this is reflected in the performance objectives for the proposed HST system. The system is being designed so that intermediate stations would not impact the speeds of express service |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | operations. The HST system could have a variety of levels of service, including non-stop trains between end points. Please also see standard response 2.31.4. |
| W133 | 8/20/2004 | Dan Silver | Endangered Habitats League<br>8424-A Santa Monica Blvd, #592<br>Los Angeles, CA 90069 | The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley | W133-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br><br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments. | | |
| W134 | 8/20/2004 | Bob Whitney, Conservation & Economic Planner | Golden State Land Conservancy<br>23801 Iris Terrace<br>Willits, CA 95490 | An Altamont Pass alignment must be considered as an alternative. Tunneling through Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas is far more damaging to the conservation values of the region; as well as more expensive.<br>The Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission. An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following | W134-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion. This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use.<br>▪ Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment. | | |
| W135 | 8/21/2004 | Linda Cain | 1438 Everett St.<br>El Cerrito, CA 94530 | I would like to express support for the development of High Speed Rail in heavily traveled urban and suburban areas of our state.<br>As traffic gets worse and worse every | W135-1 | Acknowledged. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | year, driving has become a nightmare in areas like mine (the I-80 corridor from San Pablo to Berkeley). The rush hour lasts for up to 3 hours going into and leaving San Francisco. It frequently take over an hour to go 15 miles - even on the weekend! And the pollution from cars is very bad for our health. I am a regular BART rider so I am putting my money where my mouth is! I strongly support the development of High Speed Rail whereever feasible to give more commuters a viable alternative to driving (and polluting) on the roads and freeways. | | |
| W136 | 8/22/2004 | David Ewert | 1785 Crestwood Cir<br>Stockton, CA 95210 | We need to set an example with the high-speed rail in California. Not only are we sadly behind the rest of the industrialized world as far as public transportation, we need to demonstrate that we will begin the transition from fossil fuel to electric power (or other types of energies).<br>I vote a resounding 'Yeah' for the proposed high-speed rail system in California - the sooner the better.<br>David Ewert | W136-1 | Acknowledged. |
| W137 | 8/22/2004 | Don Wood, Energy Programs Advisor | Pacific Energy Policy Center<br>4539 Lee Avenue<br>La Mesa, CA 91941 | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814 | W137-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>I see a number of problems with the draft EIR/S.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it ignores the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment. | | |
| | | | | Any new high speed rail projects should address the following key goals:<br>▪ Avoid subsidizing new sprawl housing subdivision developments.<br>▪ Prevent any loss of existing agricultural lands or open space areas.<br>▪ Reinforce existing commuter transportation corridors, by removing single driver vehicles from existing freeways and roads and putting them on the trains.<br>▪ Enhance and widen green belts | W137-2 | Acknowledged. The Authority has adopted objectives for the system to maximize the use of existing transportation corridors and rights-of-way (to the extent possible), locate stations to connect with local transit and airports, and be sensitive and protective of California's unique natural resources. Please also see standard response 2.1.12 regarding the selection of preferred station locations. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | through which the trains travel when they are outside urban core areas. Reinforce service to existing cities and towns, while helping limit sprawl development into rural areas.<br>Of course, the new system should be designed to use the least energy possible. If you first design as energy efficient and clean a system as possible, you will reduce the amount of fuel needed and pollution generated over the life of the entire project. Keep in mind that electricity needed to move the trains will be generated by powerplants. Please make sure that the fuel used in those plants are as clean as possible. Look carefully into the possiblity of building solar energy systems into the trains themselves, so that they generate their own energy as much as possible. New generations of amorphous silicon paint are being developed which could allow the trains to generate much of their own power as they do daylight runs.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>See above. If the new train system just becomes another excuse for generating more sprawl development, it will be | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | opposed my most Californians. | | |
| W138 | 8/22/2004 | Lawrence Garwin | 718 El Granada Blvd<br>Half Moon Bay, CA 94019 | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas | W138-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Lawrence Garwin<br>PS: Please make this form more usable by enlarging this text window so I can see what I have typed. | | |
| W139 | 8/22/2004 | Peter Leaf, Owner | City Cabinetmakers<br>353 Winfield St.<br>San Francisco, CA | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority | W139-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 94110 | 925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Peter Leaf | | |
| W140 | 8/23/2004 | Sue Field, School district superintendent | 4814 Comfrey Place<br>Santa Rosa, CA 95405 | I am in favor of Bart-type rail from Santa Rosa or Cloverdale (or as north as practical) to San Francisco (to connect with Bart) that would utilize the existing transportation corridor to the extent possible. I am not in favor of impacting park land. To be utilized, there must be easy access on/off with convenient park and ride parking lots. I would use itas long as it had good interface with existing or new public | W140-1 | Please see standard response 2.36.1 regarding a potential HST link to Santa Rosa. A "BART-type" rail system would be for local and regional commuter services and would not be able to achieve the speeds needed for longer distance intercity markets. Such a service would be the responsibility of local and regional transportation agencies. Please also see standard response |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | transportation options making it easily navagatible. | | 2.9.1. The Authority has adopted objectives for the system to maximize the use of existing transportation corridors and rights-of-way (to the extent possible), locate stations to connect with local transit and airports, and be sensitive and protective of California's unique natural resources. |
| W141 | 8/23/2004 | Susan Belloni | 202 La Jolla Dr.<br>Santa Barbara, CA 93109 | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor. | W141-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely, | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Susan Belloni | | |
| W142 | 8/23/2004 | Debbie Hertz | 31901 9th Avenue Laguna Beach, CA 92651 | Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the High Speed Railway.<br>I am concerned about the alignment that is proposed for the Hamilton and Pacheco Pass. A new EIR/S should be obtained comparing the Altamont Pass alignment to the other alignment options and then open for public comment.<br>We need to preserve our wilderness areas! Even though their are benefits to having a high speed railway, we don't need to counteract these benefits by having it travel though the Orestimba Wilderness area. The Altamont Pass alighnment would not impact as much wetland area either. A very important part of concervation.<br>So I hope you will take these comments into consideratino before making your final decision. | W142-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |
| W143 | 8/24/2004 | Lewis Lipton | 426 W. Ocean View Ave.<br>Del Mar, CA 92014 | I find the two proposed routes for double-tracking the LOSSAN corridor unacceptable. One route will significantly affect the Peñasquitos Lagoon and the other will do likewise for the San Dieguito Lagoon. Neither one of these lagoons can be replaced, and both offer habitants for a variety of birds and other life. Moreover, the Peñasquitos Lagoon provides a | W143-1 | Please see standard response 6.42.1. Please also see standard response 10.1.7 in regards to the phasing of the HST system. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | stunning visual panorama which helps define the southern border of Del Mar, and which frames the Torrey Pines State Reserve and Torrey Pines State Beach. Meanwhile, the San Dieguito Lagoon is undergoing a cleanup process, and promises to be as much an asset to the northern boundary of the Del Mar area as Peñasquitos is on the south.<br><br>Given my objection to both proposed routes, it seems clear that the better choice is to align the tracks along the I-5 corridor, from southern Del Mar to as far north as practical. The best solution would be to align it to Cannon Road on the north. I recognize that would require creating a new station in Solana Beach, but I submit that the land on which the existing station is built could be sold for a sum far larger than the station and land originally cost, and the money received from the sale could be used towards the cost of replacing the station.<br><br>If alignment to Cannon Road cannot be accomplished, the next best solution would be to align the tracks along the I-5 corridor on the south and then move back to the existing alignment on the northern side of the San Dieguito lagoon by passing through the Del Mar Fair Grounds. I recognize that the Fair | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Grounds is owned by the State of California and administered by the 22nd Agricultural District. The Agricultural District may not be especially pleased at loosing some of its land for the railroad, but perhaps that problem could be overcome by offering a seasonal station in the Fairgrounds. Such a plan has the added advantage of possibly reducing the traffic flow on I-5 and through Del Mar during the peak fair and racing seasons.<br><br>Barring a solution to double tracking in the LOSSAN corridor as outlined above, I would personally prefer the "No Build Option". Indeed, it seems to me that a case for the necessity of double tracking in the first place has not been made. The data I have shows that the Coaster carries about 4,500 passengers/day, an amount which could be accommodated on three full round-trip trains. If the number of passengers on Amtrak is comparable, you can add an additional three trains. But in fact, there are twelve combined trains (Coaster and Amtrak) in the morning and evening, each, meaning one every half-hour. That hardly amounts to a requirement for double tracking.<br><br>Looking at the bigger picture, the CHSRA plan for high-speed rail through | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | the State of California currently ends the high-speed portion in Orange County. The official position of the planners is that a San Diego addition to the high-speed system would be built some unspecified number of years after the original line is completed, and that extension would go down the I-15 corridor. I submit that a high-speed link to the rest of California is something that must include San Diego in the first place; after all, San Diego is the second largest city in California, and a city which is continuing to grow rapidly. Moreover, the planners propose to place this extension where it belongs, namely, where the population lives, which is inland, nearer the I-15 corridor than the I-5 corridor. That is where this area needs rail transport, not along the coast, with its precious wetlands and limited population.<br><br>So in the big picture, the "No Build Option" has a lot to recommend it: it saves money now by not building a double track where none is required, and allows the saved funds to be used in support of a high-speed transportation system sooner than now planned, and which might actually serve the needs of the San Diego area. What's not to like? | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W144 | 8/24/2004 | Anthony DeRiggi, Physician | 932 46th Street<br>Sacramento, CA 95819 | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands | W144-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Anthony De Riggi, M.D. | | |
| W145 | 8/24/2004 | Charlie Cho | 435 N. Second St.<br>#326<br>San Jose, CA 95112 | The Altamont alignment into the Bay Area must be studied. It appears to be a superior alignment which costs less to build and serves a much larger population along its route. What is the CHSRA afraid of? | W145-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W146 | 8/24/2004 | Rick Jali | Box 1717<br>Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546 | High Speed Rail is an important transportation element which should have been looked at and started long ago. This is especially important in the urban corridors of Southern California andthe Bay Area, but applies to certain other areas as well (e.g., the Valley between Sacramento and Bakersfield). | W146-1 | Acknowledged. |
| W147 | 8/24/2004 | Richard Morrison. Retired | 1414 Eagle Point Court<br>Lafayette, CA 94549 | No comment received. | | |
| W148 | 8/25/2004 | Margaret Petitjean, former legal secretary to then Congressman Paul McCloskey | H.A.L.T. (Homeowners Against Loud Trains)<br>489 Waverley St.<br>Menlo Park, CA 94025 | As the occupant owner of rental units along the S.F. to San Jose Peninsula and the owner of 13 acres of land in the E.Mission Valley area of San Diego I am particularly concerned with impacts of the HST. One might say that I'm between a rock and a hard place. (Would you like to buy my land just off Hwy.15 in so.Cal?<br><br>I recognize the purpose and need objectives since I was born and raised in London, England and appreciated the greater train transit there and throughout Europe. My concern would be in adding HST to the present illegally loud, diesel spewing, blasting horns of the Caltrain which has seriously injured many residents. Adding to this system, as is, would be even more disastrous. We need quiet, non-polluting trains, if any running | W148-1 | Please see standard responses 6.1.5 and 6.2.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | alongside residences and back yards 5′ from the tracks. We have petitioned for "quiet zones" allowed by the amendment to the Swift Act to halt the blasting horns which assault us day and night<br>Must be quiet, modern, non-polluting, completely grade-separated to reduce congestion and noise now present at the crossings.<br>We are subjected to noise and vibraton from the present system of Caltrain diesels and Union Pacific freights which have increased without any environmental impacts (culminating in an illegitimate Baby Bullet without an EIR/EIS. The HST would not be as injurious but its cumulative effects must be considered<br>This is of concern in that there is already a power line running alongside my property and I have electrical boxes for the building behind my bedroom. Would HST a few feet the other side increase any danger of EFMs?<br>A few $1-3m homes are along the tracks in Atherton and Menlo Park. Most, however, are condos and apartments along the Caltrain Corridor. The present noise of the Caltrains, blasting horns and freights are already unlivable and require us living like rats | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | with closed windows, no air conditioning and no noise reduction windows. There should be a moratorium on new housing anywhere near this present system of diesel Caltrain and heavy freights. The Federal Railroad Administration has published a Noise Assessment of the Horns that shows there is a "severe" impact 660' from the tracks and a "serious" impact over 1,000'. These must stop by establishing "quiet zones" as a number one priority. Grade separations would accomplish this.<br><br>It would be irresponsible to add any further service along the Caltrain Corridor without extensive mitigation measures taken at the outset of HST. Recognizing that there would be some adverse environmental impacts, there must be, initially, Triple-paned noise-reduction windows for those within a couple of hundred feet from the tracks. Sound walls are necessary unless all systems are electrified and quiet, although we understand that people move away from Bart due to that low-frequency noise which can become a health hazard. | | |
| | | | | Our City staff of Menlo Park has written a comment asking for answers to quetions regarding the EIR. It's recommendation to the council was to | W148-2 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | oppose the consideration of an Altamont Pass route although I do not see that as an option. Two or three residents asked the council to oppose any route through Menlo Park and then the "executive director", a little upstart named Margaret Okuzumi attended the councilmeeting asking for an EIR of the Altamont Route and rejection of Henry Coe Park route. Following her was the activist all the way from Sacramento with the glossy brochures (these two are at every meeting with their persuasive misstatments) demanding that the HST take the Altamont Route. These are not residents of our City but the Council then changed the Resolution prepared by staff to be sent to you.<br><br>It appears that the mayor had also been swayed by the Town of Atherton who does not want HST through their affluent area although they, nor Menlo Park has had a public hearing to hear the opinions of the general public. Since the staff who had read the Draft EIS/EIR and recommended your chosen route, it would seem proper to discount the mayor's Resolution. She is a novice first-time councilperson never having served on even the planning commission. Blonde's do get more votes! | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | One more experienced councilman/attorney, Nicholas Jellins, opined that the city should not get into questioning the route or the subject of Henry Coe Park. Perhaps you could get the tape of that councilmeeting? It is in our library. The four councilpersons present (with one absent) then voted unanimously to follow the mayor's suggestions. I have not seen the final resolution but in the local Almanac newspaper of today 8/25/04 it states "Council: High Speed rail report insufficient" | | |
| | | | | Why should Menlo Park residents care about plans for a statewide high-speed rail train system? Because there could be critical impacts on the city, members of the City Council agreed August 17. With the California High Speed Rail Authority circulating a draft environmental ipact report on the project, the council decided to pass a resolution with comments on the report. The council agreed unanimously, with Paul Collachi absent, that the report is so general that it doesn't sufficiently look at many possible impacts to cities the high-speed trns could run through, including increased noise, local traffic ciculation, aesthetic concerns and tree removal. The council suggests that the authority | W148-3 | Acknowledged. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | look into not runnig the new trains up the Peninsula, instead having them stop at a connection with BART in the East Bay or Caltrain. This could cut costs and reduce impacts on cities, said Councilwoman Mickie Winkler after the meeting." Of course, they haven't read, nor do they understand the draft or the concept of HST and went against the original resolution to oppose further study of the Altamont Pass route.<br><br>Additionally, it would take over another hour from San Jose to S.F. and be completely counter-productive to a continuous system which we understand is already being planned to meet up with a Trans-Bay Terminal. We can only hope that the incompetents will be ignored and that the mischief makers such as BayRailAlliance will not defeat your purpose. They,incidentally, are trying to run Caltrain and have ensconsed themselved in the Samtrans headquarters in San Carlos for their meetings. Radical activists and environmental extremists should not be given special privileges not available to others. Our taxes should not accommodate them and their bicycles, each one taking up 3 spaces. They should pay for three spaces that could be used for other passengers. We are | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | sick of their demands for transit and routes "their way" and the undue influence the have upon transit boards just because they have nothing better to do than attend meetings and lobby to serve their own self-serving agendas. These holier-than-thou should also be ignored together with city councils who do not do their homework but thwart the efforts of their staff and the majority of residents without public hearings required by law. | | |
| W149 | 8/25/2004 | Sylvia Cardella | 4570 Blufftop<br>Hydesville, CA 95547 | This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park | W149-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Sylvia Cardella | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W150 | 8/25/2004 | Charles Malarkey | 212 Illinois Street<br>Vallejo, CA 94590 | Mr. Joe Petrillo,<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is inherently defective because it fails to consider an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. The Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>The discarding of the Altamont Pass alternative based on after-the-fact, paid-for experts' letters (see "Bullet Train to Nowhere," by Sean Holstege, Oakland Tribune, August 22, 2004) is not merely questionable process. It is also based on a shortsighted view of intra- and inter-urban mass transit and political reality. The Altamont Pass alignment is the only alternative that makes full use of Bay Area mass transit | W150-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | connections. Oakland, which is 15 min. on BART from San Francisco, does not require an HSR stop. Your assertion in the Draft Program EIR/EIS that implies otherwise ('Altamont' alignment requires three lines in Bay area') is nonsense.<br>As for politcal reality, if you really want a bond to pass, you can't afford to lose the support of the more transit-conscious Bay Area. I don't believe you will get this when people realize that Central Valley real estate interests and others decided in favor of promoting sprawl and their private interests (see "Bullet Train to Nowhere," by Sean Holstege, Oakland Tribune, August 22, 2004) over maximizing the public benefit of a major infrastructure investment.<br>An Altamont Pass alignment includes the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness;<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas;<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands;<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times; | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project;<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680;<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento;<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>A new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Charles Malarkey | | |
| W151 | 8/26/2004 | John Carpenter | 905 W. Middlefield Road, #915<br>Mountain View, CA 94043 | Attn: California High-Speed Train Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments<br>925 L Street, Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Mr. Joe Petrillo, Chair:<br>As this document serves to fulfill legal requirements for Federal funding of the California High Speed Rail (CA HSR), and is based upon ongoing documents for the Program, my comments for this document would only be general in | W151-1 | This is a repeated copy of Comment Letter I116 (sent as both a letter and an e-mail). Please see responses to Comment Letter I116. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | scope.<br>There needs to be more of a scope statement so that it may be clearer to those who may be reviewing (or commenting) on this document. It seems to me that at this Program level, we are talking about Corridors that may be needed for running high speed trains of the sort that are to provide scheduled high speed rail service and nothing else. So the input of this process should be a selection of viable corridors and the product of this should be a subset of these corridors that can be carried over to the various Project levels.<br>Corridors should be represented as a swath where routes and then alignments can be located and should not look like a particular alignment.<br>For example, the Pacheco Pass would be a corridor about 5 to 10 miles wide and thus would allow for choosing an route within the median of CA-152 as well as to being along one side of Henry Miller Road. Another example would be the East Bay that is so developed that the corridor would be represented as being split in two with each split being no wider than one of the two possible routes. This should allow those who are concerned about environmental issues to realize that | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | sensitive areas can be avoided to the greatest extent possible if the swath provides for several route options or consider mitigations if the swath is too narrow as to be more like a singular route option.<br>These Corridors should be those necessary to provide rail service that not only takes demand away from the highway but also from airline services. It should be clear that addressing proposed rail service that only reduces the demand from the highway is outside of the scope of this Program even though this may be funded from either the approximately $1 billion of residuals of the CA HSR ballot measure and/or from CA HSR operational proceeds. For example, the accumulation of corridors to provide rail service between San Jose and Los Angles would be within the scope, but any corridor that serves only to best provide service between the San Francisco and Sacramento would be outside the scope. The latter corridor, nevertheless, can be developed at a Project level in its own right and would be eligible to use the resources of the CA HSR measure or proceeds.<br>It would be good for Corridor evaluations to have concurrences with those who have designed and/or are | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | operating existing and successful high-speed rail systems such as in Germany, France, and Japan.<br>These should be in writing with CA HSR Authority responses in an appendix to this Program document. An important item for concurrences is, for example, the dropping of the Altamont Corridor (Would these other entities do the same thing if they had the same type of problem?).<br>Respectfully,<br>John D. Carpenter | | |
| W152 | 8/26/2004 | Joseph Steinberger | 353 Prospect Avenue San Francisco, CA 94110 | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity | W152-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely, | | |
| W153 | 8/26/2004 | Elizabeth Doty | 926 Madison Street<br>Albany, CA 94706 | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>First of all, I would like to say I strongly support any program to create effective and timely public transportation. Having lived and traveled the Boston-Philadelphia corridor, I can attest to the appeal of high-speed rail as an alternative to driving.<br>Secondly, I am concerned that the DEIR/S omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity | W153-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA) -- and is attractive due to its proximity to current residential communities.<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>I belive this Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Elizabeth Doty | | |
| W154 | 8/26/2004 | Emily Hall | 165 Brown Drive, Unit B<br>Pacheco, CA 94553 | How can a supportive, forward-thinking Californian with ambition to see this project to fruition before years or, more likely, decades of bureaucratic stagnation drives the projected costs ever higher? Willing to be a proactive force for the California High-Speed Rail system.<br>Sincerely,<br>Emily Hall | W154-1 | The proposed HST system would not be built in California until financing for construction is secured and environmental laws and regulations have been complied with in order to obtained any needed permits and entitlements. Completion of the program EIR/EIS is the first step; however, project-specific documents will be required to obtain the permits needed to proceed with the project. Funding to prepare project specific documents has also not yet been provided. The Governor and Legislature have placed a bond measure [SB1169(Murray) amending SB1856 (Costa)] on the November 2006 ballot that, if approved by the voters, would provide $9 billion towards the construction of HST in California and $1 billion for improvements to other existing conventional rail services that would compliment and provide feeder |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | services to the HST system. |
| W155 | 8/26/2004 | Patricia Walker | 300 Arlington Way Menlo Park, CA 94025 | The point of public transportation is to locate them where the population is. Failure to consider the Altamont Pass route is failure to avoid and mitigate environmental impacts. The Altamont alignment will avoid impacts to the Henry Coe park wilderness and other protected lands, induce less sprawl and provide better links to publicy transit systems. Henry Coe Park is a wonderful wilderness area, much bigger than most of the Bay Area parks. We are so lucky to have it and we should do everything we can to protect it. I urge you to consider an alternative rail route over Altamont Pass. | W155-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |
| W156 | 8/26/2004 | James Fujita | 28512 Vista Madera Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275 | I highly support the idea of building a TGV-style high speed rail line between Los Angeles and the Bay Area. | W156-1 | Acknowledged. |
| | | | | However, I hope the the High-Speed Rail Authority will consider using Altamont Pass. Altamont Pass would be faster with less of an impact on undeveloped areas. | W156-2 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |
| W157 | 8/26/2004 | Wendy Constantine , Manager | 1118 Garden Lane Lafayette, CA 94549 | High speed rail between LA and SF is a fabulous idea, and will place CA on the map internationally as technologically advanced and environmentally friendly. | W157-1 | Acknowledged. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | But impacting one of the Bay Area's best parks is a huge step backward. Please route the train down existing transportation corridors instead. Many generations of Americans will thank you! | W157-2 | Please see standard response 6.3.1.<br>Acknowledged. |
| W158 | 8/27/2004 | Mike Toney | 6747 Heathfield Drive<br>San Jose, CA 95120 | California High Speed Rail Authority Draft EIR/EIS Comments for the Proposed California High-Speed Rail Train System<br>Dear California High Speed Rail Authority,<br>These are these comments concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Proposed California High-Speed Rail Train (HST) System; please place my comments in the public record for this report/statement. The draft EIR/EIS is badly flawed because it fails to meaningfully consider the impacts that two of the alternative alignments would have on Henry Coe State Park. It also fails to consider a hybrid alternative alignment that would greatly mitigate environmental impacts. The draft EIR/EIS needs to be rewritten to more fully consider the impact on Henry Coe Park and to seriously consider the hybrid alignment. | W158-1 | Please see standard response 6.3.1.<br>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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Several of the options in the draft EIR/EIS will pass through Henry Coe State park both at grade and through tunnels. This will create a severe disruption to a California State Park and a California Wilderness Area and will have significant impact on the environment of this park. Despite these severe impacts, the draft EIR/EIS lacks meaningful detail when discussing potential environmental impacts to the park; indeed, it does not even consider that the alignments will pass through the Orestimba Wilderness Area. Hence, the public has inadequate information concerning the impact of the HST system on Coe Park. The draft EIR/EIS needs to be rewritten to adequately consider the impact of the HST system on Henry Coe Park.<br><br>The "Tunnel under Park" alternative is misleadingly titled and falsely described. On Page 6-16, this alternative is stated to pass "under Henry Coe State park completely in a tunnel". In actuality, this alternative only tunnels under a portion of Henry Coe Park; this is shown in Fig. 6.2-3, where it is apparent that the alignment is at grade through much of the Orestimba Wilderness –a part of Coe Park. This alternative must be given a title that is more descriptive of the | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | actual alternative and must be accurately described.<br>Another alternative alignment for the HST system could go through Merced and proceed first west and then southwest to Pacheo Pass. Such an alignment would significantly reduce environmental damage to the Diablo Range (and Coe State Park) and to the floodplains, wetlands and streams near Los Banos. This alternative provides some significant advantages over the alternatives described in the draft EIR/EIS, and hence, a new draft EIR/EIS needs to be written to seriously consider this potential alternative alignment.<br>Sincerely,<br>Dr Michael F Toney<br>6747 Heathfield Drive<br>San Jose Ca, 95120 | | |
| W159 | 8/27/2004 | Adrian Brandt | 257 Grand St.<br>Redwood City, CA<br>94062-1633 | The DEIR/S is unacceptably deficient in that it fails to thoroughly and co-equally study and consider the improperly rejected Altamont Pass alignment. As you are well-aware, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA). It's wholly unjustified | W159-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | elimination from further study is a gross disservice to the taxpayers of this state and to the future success and utility of any future resulting high-speed rail project.<br>An Altamont Pass alignment roughly follow the existing highly congested Dumbarton Bridge / I-680 / I-580 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Vastly faster, shorter and more convenient service between the Bay Area and the greater Sacramento/Stockton areas.<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay, "Tri-Valley" and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Urgently needed traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>As a long-time (early) supporter of a California high-speed rail system, I again urge you in the strongest terms possible to do what's right and fair on behalf of citizens of this state and do what I believe is obviously the right thing: fully and fairly study the Altamont Pass alignment.<br>Sincerely,<br>Adrian Brandt | | |
| W160 | 8/27/2004 | Russell Weisz | 319 Laguna St.<br>Santa Cruz, CA 95060 | Reconsider the Altamont Pass alignment option.<br>The Altamont Pass Alignment option may avoid impacts to wilderness, induce less sprawl, reduce project costs by up to $2 billion, attract more riders and provide better links to other public transit systems. It would also provide | W160-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | much faster service between Sacramento and the Bay Area than the options included in the EIR/S. | | |
| W161 | 8/28/2004 | Kevin Holsinger | 190 E. O'Keefe St. #9<br>Menlo Park, CA 94025 | The EIS/EIR must consider the Altamont pass alignment.<br>That alignment follows an existing transportation corridor, has the least environmental impact, is closest to the most potential riders, and would reduce travel time from San Francisco to Sacramento (compared to the "South Bay" routes). This alignment has the fewest miles of track, leading to reduced maintenance costs. It requires the least tunnelling. | W161-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |
| | | | | The Hamilton/Diablo option is completely unacceptable. There is no reason to put any high-density transportation corridor through these mostly undeveloped regions -- especially not through state park lands. The environmental impact of this alignment is unmitigatable.<br>The Pacheco Pass alignment also has significant environmental impact -- of all the options, it impacts water resources the most. Furthermore, it does not serve an existing large population base and would result in longer travel times from the Peninsula to Sacramento.The goal is not just to get from the Peninsula to Los Angeles | W161-2 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | as quckly as possible -- the goal is to serve as many people as possilble, optimizing the overall travel times.<br>Putting a railroad in a relatively unpopulated area means that fewer people can use it. This would be a waste of money. The EIS/EIR must be rewritten to include the Altamont pass option.<br>Thank you for your attention. | | |
| W162 | 8/29/2004 | Ed Fernandez | 6000 Scenic Meadow Lane<br>San Jose, CA 95135 | Mr. Joe Petrillo<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA). | W162-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments. | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Sincerely,<br>Ed Fernandez | | |
| W163 | 8/29/2004 | Richard Allsop | 975 Nora Way, Apt. 201<br>South San Francisco, CA 94080 | The California High Speed rail project has the potential to reshape the state the way the Interstate Highway system or the California Aqueduct did. In the case of the highway system and aqueducts, Californians are living now with the consequence, both good and bad, of decisions made decades ago, and we will live with the consequences of our decisions on the High Speed Rail project forever. | W163-1 | Acknowledged. |
| | | | | The DEIR/S is not adequate for making decisions about a project of this scale and permanence. In particular, the discussion of the route connecting the SF Bay Area to the Central Valley is totally inadequate. | W163-2 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |
| | | | | It doesn't include one viable alternative (the Altamont Pass route) and the discussion of the remaining alternatives doesn't cover some significant problems. The discussion of the Northern Diablo alternatives ignores problems of construction access, tunnel ventilation, and the potential impact on biodiversity in northern California. The Pacheco Pass routes follow an existing transportation corridor, but they will also exacerbate sprawl in the Central Valley and the Sierra foothills and | W163-3 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | worsen the associated problems of energy waste, habitat loss, and fire suppression. | | |
| | | | | The Altamont Pass route has its own problems, including potential impacts on wetlands near the San Francisco Bay, but it should not have been eliminated at this step in the process. It certainly should not have been eliminated when two routes through a State Park wilderness area were included. | W163-4 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |
| | | | | I've camped several nights at the mouth of Pinto Creek in the Orestimba Wilderness of Henry W. Coe State Park. The proposal of routes through an area set aside for Californians to enjoy and appreciate forever should cause all Californians to have serious reservations about the judgment of the people planning the High Speed Rail project.<br>The DEIS/R needs to be done over again. The revised report must inventory all the resources that are going to be impacted by the project, especially in the Diablo North options, and it must include a discussion of the Altamont Pass alternative. | W163-5 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W164 | 8/29/2004 | Kimball J Cranney | 2807 Regent Street Berkeley, CA 94705-2111 | The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area.<br>As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680 | W164-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br><br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments. | | |
| W165 | 8/29/2004 | Lisa Pampuch, Technical Editor, Columnist | 735 Barrett Avenue Morgan Hill, CA 95037 | Any route that would take the proposed bullet train through Henry W. Coe State Park, or through any protected lands, should be eliminated. Despite promises of "mitigation," the construction and presence of bullet trains in our dwiindling and threatened protected lands woud only cause harm. Let's honor the definition of protected and the intent of the legislation that set aside these lands. No bullet trains in Coe Park, or any other protected lands. Anything else is environmental blasephemy. | W165-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W166 | 8/30/2004 | James P Thompson, General Manager | Visalia Convention Center<br>303 E. Acequia Ave.<br>Visalia, CA 93291 | I believe that the best alignment for the high-speed rail line is through Visalia. I know that the City of Visalia is serious about controlled growth and that you would find them extremely cooperative in routing the alignment through Visalia and in finding suitable land for a maintenance facility. | W166-1 | Please see standard response 6.15.4. and 6.21.1. |
| W167 | 8/30/2004 | Russ Peterson | Citizens For Improved Rail<br>466 Felton Dr<br>Menlo Park, CA 94025 | To: High Speed Rail Authority<br>Frm: Citizens for Improved Rail (CFIR)<br>Dt: August 30, 2004<br>Re: Response to California High Speed Rail Draft EIR/EIS<br><br>The members of CFIR take this opportunity to comment on the California High Speed Rail Draft EIR/EIS and project proposal ("The EIR"). We suggest that the EIR be rejected in its current form, and that any new EIR should take account of the following points: | W167-1 | Acknowledged. |
| | | | | The EIR is too vague to adequately describe the environmental impact of high speed rail ("HSR") in the San Francisco Bay Area. Greater detail needs to be provided regarding right-of-way acquisition (temporary and permanent), construction, noise, screening landscape, local traffic circulation, and aesthetics. | W167-2 | Please see standard response 3.20.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | The EIR does not consider the Altamont Pass route, which has in the past been considered the best possible route for HSR through the Bay Area. The Altamont Pass route has an existing railroad right-of-way, while the two routes considered by the EIR cut through sensitive ecological areas where no train has ever traveled before.<br><br>The EIR cites economic reasons for the exclusion of the Altamont Pass route. This assessment is misleading and based on poor analysis. The Altamont Pass route would make HSR accessible to nearly one million people in and around the communities of Livermore, Tracy, etc., while excluding only a population of perhaps one hundred thousand in the area of Los Banos. In any case, an economic analysis is of questionable relevance in a report designed to evaluate environmental impacts. | W167-3 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |
| | | | | The various environmental impacts of HSR are addressed only individually, but in many cases these various impacts would add up to far more than the sum of their parts. The analyses of grade separation, electification, and HSR overlay on existing commuter rail systems must be integrated to obtain a | W167-4 | Please see Section 3.17 "Cumulative Impacts Evaluation". Additional evaluation of cumulative impacts will be provided in the project level analysis, should the HST proposal move forward. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | picture of the true environmental impact. | | |
| | | | | The EIR provides no justification as to the need for two HSR systems running through the peninsula Caltrain corridor. As the two alignments proposed by the EIR run through San Jose, it would be practical and environmentally advantageous to use the current Caltrian system to reach San Francisco. This option is never explored by the EIR. | W167-5 | Please see standard response 6.1.4. |
| | | | | The EIR does not address the specific environmental impacts that would affect any particular community or crossing. This prevents local residents from making an informative review of the EIR or from working with the High Speed Rail Association to resolve or mitigate particular impacts.<br>Consideration of these six points would help to make the EIR into an effective document for understanding the environmental impact of HSR on the San Francisco Bay Area and Peninsula Caltrain corridor. Until these points are addressed, CFIR cannot support the EIR as a complete study.<br>Regards,<br>R. Peterson<br>President, Citizens For Improved Rail | W167-6 | The program EIR/EIS is done at a conceptual level of detail. Should the HST proposal move forward, more detailed project specific studies will be required. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W168 | 8/30/2004 | Keri Litchfield | 303 E. Acequia Ave<br>Visalia, CA 93277 | I strongly believe that the High Speed Rail alignment should run through Tulare County with a station near the Highway 99/198 intersection in Visalia. | W168-1 | Please see standard response 6.15.4. |
| | | | | The City of Visalia is very supportive of the Rail, and I hope you take that seriously, and strongly consider running it through Visalia, Tulare County.<br>Thank you.<br>Keri Litchfield | W168-2 | Please see standard response 6.21.1. |
| W169 | 8/30/2004 | Teresa Villarrial | 1432 N Giddings<br>Visalia, CA 93291 | Visalia is an excellent choice for a station for the High Speed Rail. The intersection of 99/198 highways is very accessible and you will find Visalia very willing to assist you in finding suitable land for a maintenance facility. | W169-1 | Please see standard response 6.15.4, standard response 6.21.1, and standard response 2.35.1. |
| W170 | 8/30/2004 | Kathy Fraga | 4146 W. Iris Ave<br>Visalia, CA 93277 | Visalia is an excellent choice for a station for the High Speed Rail. The intersection of 99/198 highways is very accessible and you will find Visalia very willing to assist you in finding suitable land for a maintenance facility. | W170-1 | Please see standard response 6.21.1. |
| W171 | 8/30/2004 | Anil Chagan, President | Equitable Hotels<br>210 E Acequia Ave<br>Visalia, CA 93291 | Please make a stop in Visalia. We need the service.<br>With Tulare County serving so many people and Visalia been the heart of the valley, I suggest that the High Speed Rail make a stop in Visalia. The need and difficulty of reasnable transportation to Los Angeles and San | W171-1 | Please see standard response 6.21.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Fransisco is a another major reason to stop here. | | |
| W172 | 8/30/2004 | Molly Bambl, General Manager | Tharaldson (Fairfield Inn) 140 S Akers Visalia, CA 93291 | Gen: I think a tram would be great in Visalia | W172-1 | Please see standard response 6.21.1. |
| W173 | 8/30/2004 | Michael Handy | 601 N. Encina St Visalia, CA 93291 | Visalia is an excellent choice for a station for the High Speed Rail. The intersection of 99/198 highways is very accessible and you will find Visalia very willing to assist you in finding suitable land for a maintenance facility | W173-1 | Please see standard response 6.21.1. |
| W174 | 8/30/2004 | Robert Lee, Hospitality | Lamp Liter Inn 3130 W. Main Street Visalia, CA 93291 | Please run the High Speed Rail alignment through Tulare County with a station near the Highway 99/198 intersection. I believe that the best alignment for the high-speed rail line is through Visalia. I know that the City of Visalia is serious and you would find them very cooperative in routing the alignment through our fine City.<br>Visalia is an excellent choice for a station for the High Speed Rail. The intersection of 99/198 highways is very accessible and you will find Visalia very willing to assist you in finding suitable land for a maintenance facility. | W174-1 | Please see standard response 6.21.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W175 | 8/30/2004 | Mark Sweeney | 20328 Ave. 344<br>Woodlake, CA 93286 | i believe visalia is a good stop for the high speed rail, it is a growing community with lots of surrounding small towns. alot of these people cant afford to fly so are limited to greyhound and amtrak (where amtrak is available) | W175-1 | Please see standard response 6.21.1. |
| W176 | 8/30/2004 | RochelleTilton | 8337 Quail Springs Way<br>Sacramento, CA 95829 | As a property owner in Sacramento County who would be extremely impacted by the use of the Caltraction Railroad lines, I want to voice my opposition to using the CCT route. Although I realize the importance of a high speed rail, it seems that the CCT would not only be a longer and less indirect route to downtown but it is also more expensive and impacts a great number of citizens.<br>We moved into our home less than 2 years ago and were told at that time that the CCT was abandoned and would be used for a bike/ped trail. I fear that the EIR/EIS does not take into account the number of households that have been built in the past two years and the impact that the use of the CCT would have on these neighborhoods. | W176-1 | Please see standard response 6.12.1. |
| W177 | 8/30/2004 | Mike Hammes | 10910 Northsky Sq.<br>Cupertino, CA 95014 | Mr. Joe Petrillo Chair, California High Speed Rail Authority 925 L St, Suite 1425 Sacramento CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the | W177-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | California High Speed Rail Draft Progam EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommendation of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commision, the predecessor to HSRA.<br>An Altamont PAss alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corrodor, with the following benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest park in California.<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped land<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles - San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase 1 of the project<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel time between | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 biliion , according to documents in the DEIR/S<br>The Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather please fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Mike Hammes | | |
| W178 | 8/30/2004 | David Clark | 2355 Rancho Del Oro Rd., #52<br>Oceanside, CA 92056-1750 | I believe this EIS is a technically sound document. I think it thoroughly studied the impacts of the high speed rail. I believe the California High Speed Rail is a necessary project for this state, and is worthy of state support. It would definately be a great asset to this state. | W178-1 | Acknowledged. |
| W179 | 8/31/2004 | Lisa Clark | 8543 Culp Drive<br>Gilroy, CA 95020 | This train MUST NOT go through Henry Coe Park. It is protected land which should remain protected. I actually use areas of this park frequently and it would a terrible shame to see any of it disturbed to build a train which in itself is a waste of taxpayer dollars. I do not support the train and I especially do not support a route through a pristine, protected wilderness. | W179-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W180 | 8/31/2004 | Kevin Standlee, Logistics Solutions Engineer | PO Box 64128 Sunnyvale, CA 94088-4128 | The CAHSR project is vital to the transportation future of this state. Proceeding with it would be a visionary step comparable to the building of the state highway system and the state higher education system that has made California a world leader. Although I'm not completely satisfied with all of the options being studied - in particular the Central Valley-Bay Area connection - the project as a whole is worthwhile, and I support it and would support reasonable increases in sales tax, income tax, or gas tax to fund it.<br><br>We can no longer simply build more roads or assume that airlines will solve all of our intercity transportation problems. Airplanes have a larger environmental impact than most people think. Expanding airports to handle the steadily-increasing intrastate traffic is at least as expensive as the HSR project, and the apparent "profitability" of short-haul air carriers such as Southwest is misleading, as they don't have to pay for much of their external costs. Rail is a much better mode choice for travel in distances envisioned by this project. | W180-1 | Acknowledged. |
| | | | | I encourage the Authority to not expect to be able to deliver anything better than existing HSR performance such as the existing TGV/Eurostar 300 kph (186 | W180-2 | Please see standard response 2.12.2. The Authority concurs that HST is a proven technology and that California should build upon what |

**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.<br><br>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<br>To whom it may concern:<br>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:<br>▪ 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.<br>▪ 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:<br>City of Laguna Niguel<br>Community Development Department<br>27781 La Paz Road<br>Laguna Niguel, CA 92677<br>Attention: John Morgan, Associate Planner<br>Should you have any questions regarding the above comments, please contact me<br>Sincerely,<br>Community Development Department<br>Robert P. Lenard, Director<br>_____<br>John Morgan<br>Associate Planner<br>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<br>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.<br>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.<br>However, please see standard response 6.2.1. |
| W184 | 8/31/2004 | Thomas Walker, Legal Analyst | AARP240<br>5901 Broadway #71<br>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<br>PO Box 130215<br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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.<br>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.<br>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.<br>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?<br>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.<br><br>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.<br>Thank you for your consideration. | | |
| W186 | 8/31/2004 | Scott Peters, San Diego City Councilman | City of San Diego<br>202 C St MS 10A<br>San Diego, CA 92101 | Gen: August 30, 2004<br>VIA FACSIMILE AND US MAIL<br>Attn: California High-Speed Train Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments<br>925 L Street, Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Re: Draft Environmental Impact Report for Proposed High-Speed Train System<br>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.<br>LOSSAN Corridor For Additional Diesel Trains Not Electric High Speed Trains<br>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.<br>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.<br>Insufficient Environmental Analysis of Increased Train Traffic's Environmental Affects On The Lagoon<br>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.<br><br>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.<br>"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<br>The environmental analysis above is insufficient in its analysis of routing diesel trains through coastal estuaries with sensitive biological resources.<br>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.<br>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<br>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.)<br>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.<br>Sincerely,<br>Scott H. Peters<br>SHP:rg<br>- I have also faxed a copy of this letter. | | |
| W187 | 8/31/2004 | Tricia Altree | Airport Coalition<br>3635 Elliott St.<br>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.<br><br>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.<br>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<br>1000 Union Street<br>#207<br>San Francisco, CA<br>94133 | Comments included below are also mailed to the Authority.<br>30 August, 2004<br>Re: Comments on DEIR/EIS for the proposed California High Speed Rail Project<br>To whom it may concern:<br>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.....<br>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.<br>I would be very happy to meet with staff and consultants to further clarify my questions and comments.<br>-Michael Kiesling<br>Notes on CHSRA DEIR/EIS<br>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 | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| 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:<br>▪ 2.1.1 No Project Alternative - assumes planned improvements to the existing transportation infrastructure<br>▪ 2.1.1 Modal Alternative - "potentially feasible" highway and aviation system improvements<br>▪ 2.1.2 High Speed Train Alternative - "reasonable and feasible" alignment and station options.<br>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?<br>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?<br>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?<br>2.5.2 Modal Alternative Carried Forward Highway Component<br>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?<br>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?<br>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)?<br>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?<br>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?<br>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."<br>Why are travel times and environmental impacts ignored when the decision was made to completely drop the Altamont Alignment from consideration?<br>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?<br>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?<br>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?<br>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?<br>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 publiclly-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?<br><br>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.<br><br>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?<br>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?<br>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?<br>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?<br>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?<br><br>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?<br>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?<br>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?<br><br>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?<br><br>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 | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| 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?<br>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?<br>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?<br><br>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?<br>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.<br>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?<br>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?<br><br>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?<br>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<br>1000 Union Street #207<br>San Francisco, CA 94133 | Comments below also mailed to the Authority.<br>August 28, 2004<br>Re: Comments on DEIR/EIS for the proposed California High Speed Rail Project<br>To whom it may concern:<br>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.<br>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. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| 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:<br>▪ 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?<br>▪ 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?<br>▪ 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?<br>▪ 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?<br>▪ 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?<br>▪ 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?<br>▪ 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?<br>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.<br>Sincerely,<br>for RAFT<br>M. Kiesling | | |
| W191 | 8/31/2004 | Ralph Petty, Community Developme nt Director | City of Millbrae<br>621 Magnolia Ave<br>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.<br>Please also see standard response 6.2.1. |
| W192 | 8/31/2004 | Sheri Lubin | 38775 Stonington Terrace<br>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.<br>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. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | no justice in summarily taking one of the last wilderness areas left in the Bay Area.<br>Based on personal experience, ( I am a conservation biology graduate student at San Jose State University) 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 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. | | |
| | | | | The route would be slightly longer, but the Altamont Pass route is superior in many ways environmentally.<br>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.<br>Please rethink this hasty decision. | W192-2 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W193 | 8/31/2004 | Jean Bennett, Consultant (Optics) | Planning and Conservation League<br>1275 Sage Court<br>Ridgecrest, CA 93555 | My comments on this Draft EIR/EIS<br>Mr. Joe Petrillo,<br>Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas | W193-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Jean M. Bennett, PhD | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W194 | 8/31/2004 | Edward Thompson, California Director | American Farmland Trust<br>260 Russell Blvd, Suite D<br>Davis, CA 95616 | Formal comments of American Farmland Trust will be sent 8-31-04 via e-mail to dleavitt@hsr.ca.gov and cpourvahidi@hsr.ca.gov. Please contact [email address omitted to protect privacy] to acknowledge receipt. Thank you. | | Acknowledged. |
| W195 | 8/31/2004 | Mark Birnbaum, CPA | 10 Meadowbrook Ct.<br>Novato, CA 94947 | Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness | W195-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment. No further decisions or work on the project should be done, until such time as this EIR/S is prepared.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely, | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W196 | 8/31/2004 | Bill Hough, Transit Planner | 238 East 30th Street #2F New York, NY 10016 | I support the position of The California Department of Parks and Recreation in urging your rail planners to drop the proposal to tunnel through the Henry W. Coe State Park and instead reconsider a track over the Altamont Pass. | W196-1 | Please see standard response 6.3.1. |
| | | | | By eliminating the Altamont route, the CHSRA made this a deeply flawed EIR/EIS which should not be adopted in its present form. | W196-2 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |
| W197 | 8/31/2004 | Amanda Evans, Student | 1142 Bel Air Court Modesto, CA 95350-5527 | I am a single middle-aged mother of two dependent children. I have one child who is grown and on his own. I am attending California State University Stanislaus, and am planning on graduating next spring with a BA degree in Communication. As we prepare for the coming school year I realize the importance of expressing my opinion during the extended public comment period for the EIR for the planned High Speed Rail in the Central Valley of California. My understanding is that the official comment period is open through August 31st, 2004.<br>I live in Modesto, and have for most of my 46 years. I am aware that our area is the worst air quality designation that can be given. Like southern California, we are rated Extreme non-attainment. The plan to build steel wheel on steel | W197-1 | Acknowledged. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | rail high speed trains is better than no plan to build high speed rail. Rail is the most efficient and least polluting mode of travel compared to automobiles and especially air travel. Air travel is the most polluting mode of travel there is. | | |
| | | | | MagLev would be a better choice. Solar Energy can power MagLev. It is low maintenance because the train is magnetically levitated and does not have the friction of conventional steel on steel. If we apply Solar Technology, not only will we be improving air quality by moving people without burning fossil fuels, we will reduce carbon dioxide emissions into the atmosphere. Maglev can help reduce the impacts of global warming. Designing Solar into the project will make this project an example of environmental sustainability. MagLev trains can also carry freight.<br><br>Concerning connectivity, the number of miles traversed by the proposed trains is more than those in the Bay Area. Also, Southern California is building MagLev from Riverside to LAX, and there are considerations for Nevada and for Baltimore. With increasing populations, we need to utilize the power of the sun. If we consider seven generations into the future as many indigenous peoples did and increasing | W197-2 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | numbers of thinking planners and designers do, solar power is the preferred choice.<br>MagLev is better for turns and grades, so it is good for helping preserve the environment, due to ease of conforming to the terrain. If we design solar energy into the project, this project alternative should be the best yet.<br>When it comes to State of the Art Technology, MagLev wins. Much of the time in my own life when I have paid less, I have purchased an inferior product. I have frequently wished I had spent the few dollars more and received a higher quality product. If we build steel on steel, will we ask ourselves if we have built an inferior rail system? The savings in maintenance and environmental health of the planet outweigh the higher initial investment required to build a significantly better train. I urge planners, thinkers, designers, and decision-makers to consider the benefits of Solar powered MagLev.<br>Thank you,<br>Amanda Evans<br>Copies will be sent to elected officials including Governor Schwarzenegger, and Senators Feinstein and Boxer | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W198 | 8/31/2004 | Larry Miller, Business Consultant | San Joaquin Valley Rail Committee<br>1584 East Utah Ave.<br>Fresno, CA 93720 | The letter regards the proposed inclusion of a connecting High-Speed Rail link from the Stockton-Manteca region of the Sacramento – Bakersfield Corridor to the Bay Area Rapid Transit terminus in Livermore.<br>CAHSRA<br>Pursuant to its enabling legislation, California High Speed Rail Authority's Draft Program EIR considers only one corridor of access to the Bay Area from Southern California. It has narrowed this option to what it calls the "Bay Area to Merced" alignment. Nonetheless the plan simultaneously calls for an additional spur carrying the remainder of the system through the Central Valley to Sacramento in a fashion that does not connect the northern section of the system to the Bay Area.<br>While the Bay Area to Merced corridor options yet under consideration by the Draft do appear to link Southern California with the Bay Area more expeditiously than an Altamont Pass alignment, nonetheless the nature of the San Jose alignment does effectively disenfranchise a very large population of Northern California from direct access to the Bay Area. One could argue that as many as 5 million people from the already heavily populated and | W198-1 | Please see response 2.36.1. In addition, the Authority does not consider the direct link to Sacramento a "spur"; the preferred corridor between the Bay Area and the Central Valley would connect Sacramento and the Northern San Joaquin Valley to the Bay Area with competitive HST travel times. Please also 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | rapidly growing Sacramento to Modesto region either are or will be excluded from direct access. The various coalitions of environmental groups, land speculators, and regional advocates who have sought to replace the Bay Area to Merced connection through San Jose with a alignment over Altamont Pass and on to the East Bay Area are testament to the immensity of this prospective disenfranchisement.<br><br>I believe it would a tragedy not to find a way to facilitate both a northern and southern access to the Bay Area for the system. One only needs look at how the same conundrum has hamstrung Amtrak's San Joaquin service. Since Amtrak's San Joaquins must follow the Burlington Northern Santa Fe and Union Pacific lines from Stockton to Oakland via Pittsburgh and Martinez, the service is so circuitous that it attracts only a tiny fraction of its latent ridership. Amtrak and its sponsor CalTrans call the service "leisure" rather business quality service because it is so indirect and slow. My own experience of the service and its operations leads to me to conclude that ridership would increase immediately and by a factor of as much as 10 times--if the route simply had a safe, reliable direct access from the Valley to the Bay Area at a | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | speed of 70 mph or greater.<br>While I do not see the value for HSR in trading the limitations of the San Jose access for even more limitations with access via Altamont Pass, I do believe a very workable and very cost-effective alternative exists. Namely, I am persuaded that it would be easily possible and economically desirable to develop (in addition to the Merced-San Jose corridor) a short link of approximately 40 miles of High Speed connection between the Sacramento to Bakersfield corridor in the Central Valley and the Bay Area Rapid Transit terminus in Livermore. Given schedule and platform compatibility, this short link would add quality access to the Bay Area from Northern California as well as Southern California.<br>This rail link could follow the existing Western Pacific Rail Road route that runs south from Stockton and turns west near the city of Lathrop and Manteca to travel into Livermore only a few miles from the BART station. This route rises at only a one-percent grade and has been used (and now under-used) for passenger rail service for well over a century.<br>The Altamont Commuter Express currently operates three round-trip trains per day on the route, which it | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | follows past Livermore to San Jose. ACE is limited by its infrastructure, its ability to raise capital and by the nature of its organization. ACE is therefore not in a position to purchase the corridor and assume the kind of powers delegated to CAHSR. Left to its own devices, ACE is likely to continue to expand its highly successful but very limited operations on a slow growth curve. HSR, however, need only connect its Central Valley line to BART in Livermore to interconnect several systems on a grand scale. And in so doing, HSR could provide for as much continuing expansion to the Bay Area as Northern California could support through its ridership for decades to come.<br>What I propose therefore is improving the corridor and providing High Speed Service or (at the very least) much higher speed service only from the Sacrament to Bakersfield HSR corridor to the BART station in Livermore. The route is already grade-separated at its crossings of Interstate 5 and Interstate 580 and Highway 120 and would need comparatively few grade separations and road diversions prior to entering Livermore, where it could connect with the existing BART line.<br>Thus for a minimum capital cost and | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | with minimum amount of construction, such a connection would allow for the maximal integration of HSR with existing Amtrak, ACE and BART services and it would more than double the system's connectivity to the Bay Area from the Central Valley and Northern California. I do not pretend to offer a program level cost estimate for this link, but I believe the cost could be well under $1 billion—and the link could be installed in such a way as to allow for nearly unlimited incremental future growth.<br><br>One attractive aspect of the Western Pacific Route is that this is one of the few rail corridors that Union Pacific Rail Road has publicly acknowledged that it would be willing to sell—or perhaps trade. Although the scope of the entire HSR project may originally have called for only one route of access to the Bay Area for the system, I urge CAHSRA and the Federal Railway Administration to consider the tremendous increases in value to the system for a comparatively minimum additional cost by adding this second corridor of access to the Bay Area.<br><br>Larry Miller<br>Fresno County Public Representative And Chairman Operations and Marketing Committee | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | San Joaquin Valley Rail Committee (By statute advising Amtrak and Caltrans on the San Joaquin Corridor service) | | |
| W199 | 8/31/2004 | Patrick Moore | Sierra Club, Loma Prieta Chapter 1129 Wright Ave Mountain View, CA 94043 | According to the Final EIR/S of the Transbay Terminal/Caltrain Downtown Extension/Redevelopment Vol. I pg 2-44, Caltrain is planning on running 132 trains/day. In the HSR Draft EIR/S document, the section that discusses the operation reasons the Altamont Pass corridor was eliminated from further consideration, there was no discussion of this congestion in the Caltrain corridor. | W199-1 | The capacity constraints of the Transbay Terminal were reported in Section 6.1 of the Draft Program EIR/EIS. Please also see standard response 2.18.1 in regards to the Altamont Pass. |
| | | | | The Altamont Pass would allow HSTs to depart the Caltrain (congested) main line 25 miles from downtown extension at the Redwood City Junction. Any Diablo Range/Pacheco Pass alternative would require competing with the 132 Caltrain trains the entire length of the Caltrain corridor. Furthermore, there is no discussion of Union City's planned intermodal station at the Union City Bart station. | W199-2 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. A multi-modal HST station at Union City was identified by the Authority is the preferred station location for a potential HST station serving Southern Alameda County. |
| W200 | 8/31/2004 | Doralee Boles, Private citizen | 1721 Kent Avenue Lodi, CA 95242 | In 1990 I was privileged to serve as a member of the High Speed Rail Study Group, which was commissioned among other things to study the various corridors and possible alignments for the development of a | W200-1 | The Authority has identified the Hayward Line/I-880 alignment as the preferred alignment option between Oakland and San Jose because it would have higher ridership potential and considerably less potential |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | high speed rail line to connect the Los Angeles basin with the Bay Area and northern California. At the time, I was the Program Director responsible for the development of the commuter rail service in the Altamont.<br><br>My comments are specific to the critical importance on a statewaide basis of the Altamont alignment for access to the Bay Area. Having worked for a number of years in a capacity which brought me in contact with the political realities of consensus building and financing structures, I am well aware that what is most beneficial and logical is not always what is politically correct or how decisions are made.<br><br>In making any argument for a decision certain parameters should be laid. Certain logical assumptions should be the basis for any conclusions. In my view, four critical factors emerge in the selection of a corridor for access to the Metropolitan Bay Area. They are Cost, Revenues, Population served and Environmental Impacts ·<br><br>Construction cost : The Altamont alignment when originally studied came in at a cost considerably lower than the other two alternatives primarily due to the fact that it is the shortest in total miles and requires only six miles of tunnels to build the line as opposed to | | environmental impact than the Hayward Line/Niles/Mulford, which goes through the Don Edwards National Wildlife Refuge. The Hayward line/Niles/Mulford option would result in considerably higher potential for environmental impacts (hydrology and water resources, biology and wetlands, visual impacts, and Section 4(f) and 6(f) parkland impacts) than the Hayward Line/I-880 alignment option. Please also see standard response 2.18.1 regarding the Altamont Pass. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 19 and 9 miles of tunnels for the other two alignments. Construction costs for the Altamont was estimated at 2 billion dollars less than the competing alignments·<br>Revenues: It was estimated that the revenues generated would be higher on an alternative alignment, what was not factored into that equation was the integrated commuter market which would be captured from the seamless amalgamation of BART, ACE, the Capitol Corridor, and the potential Dumbarton Caltrain line.·<br>Population: It has been well documented that growth in the great Central Valley of California is expected to explode over the next 25 years. The Altamont alignment will serve all three major population cores: the LA Basin, the San Francisco Bay /Silcon Valley and the great central valley of California and connecting to the State Capital. Over a million more people than either alternative which are proposed.<br>It is common knowledge that all of the successful high speed rail systems of the world integrate their other passenger rail services with their High Speed system to maximize the catchment areas and the financial benefits. To that end the Altamont | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | would include seventeen additional stations, two in the east Bay including Merced, Modesto, Stockton, Tracy, Amador Valley Livermore Pleasanton, Mineta San Jose International Airport, and Merced· I recently read that each weekday, about 50,000 San Joaquin County residents commute into the Bay Area. Capturing just 10% of that market would fill ten trains each way, each day, each one bringing workers into the Silicon Valley, and at 1/2 to 1/3 the time of the fastest alternative commute. This kind of information needs to be integrated into the projections for usage and resulting revenues. | | |
| | | | | Envirnonmental :I am unclear as to why the EIR appears to have no difficulty with building a new HSR alignment along the existing UPRR line through the South Bay wetlands. It would appear to me that the Mulford Line portion of Pacheco alignment would result in impacts from traversing 4 miles of the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge (within the existing tracks), a major wildlife and bird sanctuary."· However, this appears to be minimized while the Altamont e reconstruction of the Dumbarton crossing for HSR is characterized as next to impossible due | W200-2 | Please see standard response 6.2.2, and standard response 2.18.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | to its environmental impacts. | | |
| | | | | After visiting the High Speed Rail services of France, Spain and Germany and seeing the inherent potential for California as one of the world's major economies, I am convinced that it is imperative that we build "the right" system. By that I mean a system designed to accomodate the most Calfornians in the most effective manner. For that reason, I believe the Altamont is a critcal component of that system.<br>Thanks you for your kind consideration of my words,<br>A 5th Generation Californian | W200-3 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |
| W201 | 8/31/2004 | Russell Reagan | 927 Gregory Place Davis,CA 95616 | The EIR/S should include the Altamont route. The original BART system was planned with essentially no provision for connecting to future rail to cities just beyond the Bay Area: Sacramento, Stockton, Modesto. Again the CHSR system being planned is repeating this same mistake by squandering the opportunity to serve these shorter distance markets. If the Altamont routing were selected, the same HSR infrastructure could accommodate these shorter distance services and thus provide much greater value to Californians. Even though the primary target of the project is travel between | W201-1 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | northern and southern California, The HSR infrastructure could do so much more, following examples set by England's CTRL and the new HSR line in the Netherlands. Service between the cities of the Bay Area, and Sacramento, Stockton, Modesto, and intermediate points should be included in the scope of the markets to be served. | | |
| W202 | 8/31/2004 | Farm Bureau | Merced County<br>PO Box 1232<br>Merced, CA 95340 | MERCED COUNTY FARM BUREAU<br>PO BOX 1232<br>MERCED, CA 95340<br>209-723-3001<br>Attn: California High-Speed Train<br>Fax: (916) 322-0827<br>Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments<br>Attn: California High-Speed Train 925 L Street, Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>August 30, 2004<br>The Merced County Farm Bureau would like to submit the following comments on the California High-Speed Train Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>General Comments This is a statewide project with statewide impacts. This statewide project has the potential to negatively affect the working landscape of agriculture in the state of California. It is the only place on earth that has | W202-1 | See responses to Comment Letter O057. This (W202) is a repeated Comment Letter. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | the soil, water and climate to grow the diversity of crops we produce each year. We are a multi billion dollar industry for our region as well as our state.<br>The agricultural production in the San Joaquin Valley (Kern, Tulare, Kings, Fresno, Madera, Merced, Stanislaus, & San Joaquin Counties) is well over half of the total for California. It is an inadequate assessment to only measure the impact on farmland that will be lost through construction. The growth inducement that this project will have on the remaining farmland in the Valley needs to be studied and considered before this project is to move any further.<br>Statewide policies that encourage and reward smart growth policies is needed before we consider investing tax payers money into a project that will have a negative impact on our infrastructure (roads, schools, police/sheriff, fire, etc.) and our quality of life here in the San Joaquin Valley. We do not need to become the bedroom communities for southern California or the Bay Area.<br>This project has the potential to speed that growth without the needed safeguards in place. The acknowledgement that our precious farmland is irreplaceable and should be | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | mitigated with in-lieu fees is a necessity. The Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (LESA) from the State Department of Conservation should be used to evaluate the impacts and establish the fee so that land preservation policies could be implemented with adequate monetary resources.<br><br>We are also puzzled on why the Altamont was not studied as part of the Draft EIR/EIS. If it was not a feasible alternative, it should be shown to be not feasible with the documentation available to the public in the document.<br><br>CEQA Requirements Agricultural resources are a part of the existing physical environment subject to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). Any proposed action by the California High Speed Rail Authority ("Authority") that would potentially affect agricultural resources should have been subject to an impacts analysis, an alternatives analysis to avoid or reduce impacts, and adequate mitigation for unavoidable significant impacts.<br><br>Instead of conducting a proper analysis of the proposed project, the Authority continually deferred the required analysis to a "project-level" document. | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | This results in segmentation of the project and denies the public a full view of the potential impacts of the project.<br>The Draft Program EIR/EIS ("Draft PEIR/S") lacks a full discussion of potential measures to avoid, reduce and/or mitigate impacts on the existing environment.<br>CEQA requires agencies in every EIR to identify and focus on the possible significant environmental impacts of the project. Cal. Pub. Res. Code 21100(b)(1); 14 Cal. Code Regs. 15126, 15126.2.<br>The very purpose of an EIR "is to identify the significant effects on the environment of a project, to identify alternatives to the project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided. Cal. Pub. Res. Code 21002.1(a).<br>The purpose of an environmental impact report is to provide public agencies and the public in general with detailed information about the effect which a proposed project is likely to have on the environment; to list ways in which the significant effects of such a project might be minimized; and to indicate alternative to such a project. | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | CEQA requires agencies to include in every EIR a "detailed statement setting forth . . . significant effects on the environment of the proposed project," including both direct and indirect effects, as well as "growth-inducing impact of the proposed project." Cal. Pub. Res. Code 21100(b)(1).<br>In addition, CEQA mandates that agencies analyze the cumulative impacts of a proposed project. 14 Cal. Code Regs. 15130(a).<br>Specific Inadequacies Within the Draft PEIR/S<br>Conversion of Farmland<br>The Authority's discussion of the impacts caused by the conversion of farmland to other uses is inadequate.<br>"Station Locations: The selection of preferred station locations is anticipated to be controversial. The HST system would be limited in the number of stations it could serve compared to other rail transit systems. In this Program EIR/EIS, many more potential sites are being considered than would be practical for HST operations. Moreover, there are trade-offs in comparing the alternative station options. For example, downtown terminals that promote high ridership and connectivity often have | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | considerable construction issues and high cost." Emphasis added. (Pg. S-6)<br>If station locations are anticipated to be controversial – they should be discussed at each and every level of analysis.<br>Last sentence implies agency will be looking to locate stations in rural areas where costs will be lower. This will likely result in the conversion of agricultural resources and have growth-inducing impacts.<br><br>Direct and Indirect Impacts<br>CEQA requires the Authority to clearly identify and describe both direct and indirect significant effects of the project on the environment . . . giving due consideration to both the short-term and long-term effects. 14 Cal. Code Regs. 15126.2(a)<br>The Authority simply ignores the secondary effects of the HST, namely, increase urbanization drawn to the Central Valley resulting in the conversion of farmland to other uses.<br>"HST is the only alternative that would improve the travel options available in the Central Valley and other areas of the state with limited bus, rail, and air service for intercity trips." (Pg. S-8) | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Fresno to LA = 2:23<br>Sacramento to San Jose = 1:53<br>"The analysis shows that while the HST Alternative would have potentially significant environmental impacts on resources, including noise, biology, wetlands, and farmlands, the HST Alternative would have distinct benefits over the other alternatives in energy savings, reduced air emissions, and improved intercity travel conditions." (Pg. S-8)<br>Ignoring the fact that increased population in the Central Valley will increase emissions from local travel miles.<br><br>"The HST makes it that much easier for that growth to occur in the Central Valley thru the conversion of farmland." (Pg.3.7-6)<br>"Existing Land Use: The existing land uses along the potential routes of the HST Alternative is predominantly agriculture, reflecting the Central Valley's heritage as one of the richest, most productive agricultural regions in the world (as discussed in Section 3.8, Agricultural Lands). Much of the land in the vicinity of the highway and rail corridors in the region proposed for improvements is cropland and | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | orchards. Residential development comprises less than 10% of the land area, and commercial, service, and industrial uses together account for less than 10%." (Pg. 3.7-7)<br>Analysis needed for growth-inducing impact of HST.<br>Population is expected to increase by 46% (67 million) by 2020. <br>How does HST impact this projection?<br>Cumulative Impacts<br>CEQA requires that every EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considered. 14 Cal. Code Regs. 15130(a).<br>It is well established that one overwhelming consideration of CEQA is that environmental considerations do not become submerged by chopping a large project into many little ones – each with a minimal potential impact on the environment – which cumulatively may have disastrous consequences. Bozung v. Local Agency Formation Com., 13 Cal.3d 263, 283-84 (Cal. 1975).<br>"Should the HST advance to the next stage of analysis, subsequent phases of project development would include project-specific environmental analysis | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | for a segment or segments and station locations of the proposed HST system." (Pg. S-1)<br>These station locations are clearly related to the proposed Project, and in fact, are vital to the success of the Project. CEQA requires that the Authority perform an environmental analysis at this level.<br>"The Authority and the FRA continue to consider HST alignment and station options and have not identified a preference among those presented in this Draft Program EIR/EIS." (S-8)<br>The Authority is not required to identify a preference, but is required to the proper analysis of each alternative.<br>"The significance of potential environmental impacts would need to be further determined at the next level of environmental review, and specific mitigation measures identified." (Pg. S-9)<br>Corridor travels right through prime agricultural region of the state, therefore, Authority is required to do some kind of analysis on impacts to agricultural resources.<br>"The passenger cost for travel via the HST service would be lower than for travel by automobile or air for the same | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | intercity markets." (Pg. S-15)<br>All of these features make it more desirable to commute from Central Valley to metro areas.<br>"Will reduce "overall" air pollution." (Pg. S-15)<br>Great, but will likely increase and localize pollution in one of the areas of the state with the worst air pollution – San Joaquin Valley. Recently downgraded to "extreme" for ozone.<br>More local trips to shop, drop kids off at school, soccer practice, etc.<br>Loss of agriculture for development will decrease positive effects of crops on air.<br>"The HST is expected to result in slightly greater increase in population than the other alternatives." (S-15)<br>Higher density development is still development and still results in farmland conversion to urban – where is this likely to occur?<br>Greater increase in population – where?<br>This agency has no control over local growth decisions so should present worst case scenario – inform the public of potential impacts.<br>"In the Central Valley, one of the most active agricultural regions in the U.S., | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | the right-of-way requirements of the HST could potentially impact a maximum of 2,096 to 3,002 acres. Compared to the trend of farmland loss in California of 49,700 acres per year, or nearly 845,000 acres projected to be lost by 2020, the right-of-way needs of the HST would represent less than 0.4% of the total potential farmland loss. Furthermore, the indirect effect of the HST on urban growth would reduce conversion of farmlands by about 4,100 acres compared to other alternative." Emphasis added. (Pg. S-15)<br><br>Comparing farmland loss from urbanization to farmland loss from one construction project – deceptive.<br><br>Growth-Inducing Impacts<br><br>CEQA requires agencies to discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. 14 Cal. Code Regs. 15126.2(d), 15126(d); Cal. Pub. Res. Code 21100(b)(5). In analyzing whether a project will have growth-inducing impacts, courts consider whether the project has set in motion market forces that can create economic pressure for growth. See Stanislaus Audubon Soc'y. Inc. v. County of | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Stanislaus, 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 156-57 (Cal. Ct. App. 1995).<br>Here, the growth-inducing force of cheaper, faster travel is clear. The market forces driving economic and population growth due to the Project required the Authority to analyze the growth-inducing impacts of the Project.<br>"The number of passengers traveling intercity in California is forecasted to increase up to 63% over the next 20 years, from 155 million passengers to as many as 253 million passengers." (Pg. S-2)<br>"By 2020, the proposed service would include approximately 86 weekday trains in each direction to serve the study area intercity travel market, with 64 of the trains running between northern and southern California and the remaining 22 trains serving shorter distance markets." Emphasis added. (Pg. S-4)<br>22 trains serving shorter distance markets – where are stations?<br>"All but 20 will make stops in the Central Valley to service commuters heading both north and south." (Pg. 2-25) "Forecasted ridership for this system varies between 42 and 68 million passengers (up to 10 million riders as long-distance commuters) for | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 2020." (Pg. 2-98)<br>High growth-inducement for Central Valley towns with stations.<br>"Most passenger service is assumed to run between 6:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m." Emphasis added. (Pg. S-4)<br>There should be no assumption as to running times – it should be part of the information provided in the Draft PEIR/S.<br>The hours of service are "commuter" hours. Commuter hours require commuters . . . commuters desire/require affordable housing to make their commute worth while. For Bay Area and LA workforce, affordable housing will be in the Central Valley. Therefore, it is likely that more conversion of farmland will result from the proposed Project.<br>"HST: Statewide population will grow by 700,000 more than No Project. Urbanized areas will grow by 48%, 2,600 ac less than No Project. Transit-oriented development around stations; planned growth consistent with RTPs; growth around Merced." Emphasis added. (Pg. S-14)<br>If urban areas growing less, does that means rural areas growing more – address? | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Where are these additional 700,000 people going to reside? Is it safe to assume that since that figure is related to the Project, they will be commuters?<br>"Transit-oriented" development – discussion needed.<br>"Compared to the state's potential total or overall farmland loss of nearly 845,000 acres by 2020, the HST Alternatives would each represent less than 0.4% of the total potential farmland loss." (Section 3.8.3)<br>In reaching the 0.4% figure, the Authority compares 845,000 acres of farmland lost to urban development to between 1, 327 – 2,445 acres of farmland used for the construction of the HST. (3.8-11)<br>The Authority should conduct a proper CEQA analysis including the growth-inducing impacts of this project and then compare that number to the growth-inducing impacts (845,000 acres) without the project.<br>In its analysis of the Sacramento to Bakersfield Region, the Authority stated: "farmland severance impacts would potentially result, in addition to farmland conversion. While the precise amount of farmland potentially severed by the HST alignment options cannot be ascertained at this level of study. | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | the HST alignment options on new alignments traversing farmland areas would have the potential to sever the vast majority of parcels traversed due to the curving nature of the alignments." (3.8-14)<br>The public cannot make informed decisions from the Authorities lack of analysis – as evidenced here.<br>Mitigation<br>Lead agencies must adopt feasible mitigation measures in order to substantially lessen or avoid otherwise significant adverse environmental impacts. Pub. Res. Code 21002, 21081(a); Cal. Code Regs. 15002(a)(3), 15021(a)(2), 15091(a)(1). To effectuate this requirement, EIRs must set forth mitigation measures that decision makers can adopt at the findings stage of the process. Pub. Res. Code 21100(b)(3); Cal. Code Regs. 15126(e), 15126.4. Formulation of mitigation measures should not be deferred until some future time. Cal. Code Regs 15126.4(a)(1)(B).<br>"Subsequent Analysis: If the HST Alternative is selected, subsequent multimodal access and circulation studies could be conducted at proposed station areas along proposed alignments as plans for alignments. | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | stations, and operations are refined. Addt'l environmental analysis would be required . . . Station area circulation studies would be expected as part of project-level environmental documentation." (Pg. 3.1-24)<br>Stations, and their locations are essential to the success of this project – improper to defer analysis of impacts.<br>The Authority is advocating segmenting the proposed Project into smaller projects thus avoiding a full impact analysis.<br>Farmland section Includes only area within 50 ft on each side of alignment centerline (100 ft total). (Pg. S-9):<br>No Project: Continued loss of farmland in California at rate of 49,700 ac per year from population growth and urbanization (845,000 ac by 2020).<br>HST: Right-of-way needs could potentially impact a total of 2,445 to 3,860 ac of farmlands. New corridor alignments thru farmlands could have potential severance impacts.<br>Does not discuss loss of farmland as No Project does. Mitigation to avoid or reduce impacts – share existing rights-of-way to the maximum extent possible and avoid alignment options in established farmlands. Consider | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | farmland preservation strategy.<br>The problem with this strategy is that it is only concerned with farmland lost to construction of the project – it does not address the growth-inducing impacts that are inevitable.<br>"Potential impacts have been considered on a broad scale and on a system-wide basis . . . project-level review would analyze the potential for localized impacts." (Pg. 3.7-26) "No mitigation strategies were discussed - all discussion deferred to "project-level" review." (Pg. 3.7-26, 27)<br>CEQA requires more – segmentation of project avoids a full impacts analysis.<br>"Should the HST Alternative be selected, the subsequent environmental evaluations and project-level review of proposed segments and facilities would address the need for the following studies." (Section 3.7.6)<br>"Land use studies for specific alignment and station areas potentially impacted, including evaluation of potential land use conversion, potential growth, and potential community benefits."<br>CEQA intends EIR/EIS to provide information to the public – this documents defers its responsibility to provide any useful information | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

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

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

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

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |
| W203 | 8/31/2004 | Margaret Okuzumi | BayRail Alliance<br>3921 East Bayshore Rd<br>Palo Alto, CA 94303 | Gen: August 31, 2004<br>Attn: California High-Speed Train Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments<br>925 L Street, Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Re:Comments on the DEIR/DEIS for California HSR<br>Dear High Speed Rail EIR/EIS Staff:<br>BayRail Alliance wishes to submit the following comments on the draft EIR/EIS for California High Speed Rail. These are in addition to comments that we have made orally at public hearings on the EIR/EIS.<br>We would very much like to see HSR built. Two years ago we organized a community forum on California HSR with the help of the HSRA, the Mineta Transportation Institute and a number of industry partners. We believe that HSR is necessary for California's transportation future, and that it would provide great environmental and economic benefits for our state.<br>Now, two years have passed, and we are greatly disappointed to see what was presented in the DEIS/EIR. We believe that the draft needs substantial work and revision to provide information that is needed for the | W203-1 | See responses to Comment Letter O050.<br>This (W203) is a repeated Comment Letter. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

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

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

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

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

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

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

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

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

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

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

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

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

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

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

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

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

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

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | to "conventional" rail) would score better than the HST Alternative on this criterion.<br><br>In particular, I would emphasize that the HST Alternative seems likely to fuel a development boom in the Central Valley: In response to new faster rail connections, jobs and residents (whether new or existing) would shift from the state's established urban centers near the coast to lower-cost Central Valley communities. This is likely to cause large-scale conversion of prime farmland to urban uses. That conversion would be a highly undesirable misuse of resources: the Central Valley's prime farmland is some of the most productive in the world, and prime farmland is permanently lost once its fertile topsoil is cleared.<br><br>I urge decisionmakers to adopt the No Project Alternative, which (based on the EIR/EIS analysis) shows lower Aesthetics & Visual Resources impacts than the HST Alternative. I also believe that a more realistically defined Modal Alternative (omitting or minimizing highway and aviation capacity expansions, and focusing on incremental and feasible improvements to "conventional" rail) would score better than the HST Alternative on this criterion. | | Program EIR/EIS, supporting appendices, and technical reports for the capital cost assumptions as well as the Authority's Corridor Evaluation Report from 1999. The capital cost estimates draw upon years of HST investigation in California, construction experience within California, and the experience of HST systems worldwide. The Program EIR/EIS concluded that the No Project Alternative would result in slightly more urban area growth than the HST Alternative (please see Chapter 5 of the Program EIR/EIS). Please refer to Section 6B of the Final Program EIR/EIS in regards to design principles for transit-oriented development around HST stations. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | I urge decisionmakers to adopt the No Project Alternative, which (based on the EIR/EIS analysis) shows lower Cultural/Paleontological Resources impacts than the HST Alternative. I also believe that a more realistically defined Modal Alternative (omitting or minimizing highway and aviation capacity expansions, and focusing on incremental and feasible improvements to "conventional" rail) would score better than the HST Alternative on this criterion.<br><br>I urge decisionmakers to adopt the No Project Alternative, which (based on the EIR/EIS analysis) shows lower Hydrology & Water Resources impacts than the HST Alternative. I also believe that a more realistically defined Modal Alternative (omitting or minimizing highway and aviation capacity expansions, and focusing on incremental and feasible improvements to "conventional" rail) would score better than the HST Alternative on this criterion.<br><br>I urge decisionmakers to adopt the No Project Alternative, which (based on the EIR/EIS analysis) shows lower Biological Resources & Wetlands impacts than the HST Alternative. I also believe that a more realistically defined Modal Alternative (omitting or | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

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

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

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

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | "Hayward/Niles/Mulford Line" alternative. | | |
| W207 | 8/31/2004 | Georgia & Joseph Stern | 6870 Holsclaw Rd Gilroy, CA 95020 | The maps we were given for the proposed routes in the Gilroy area are at least 30 years old. We know this because buildings that have not existed for 30 years are shown on the maps and our house as well as many other homes and buildings in our area that have been built more recently (our home is 20+ years old) are not shown. We assume that the estimated cost of this project is based on the maps we received. Obviously, since the maps are not current and our Gilroy area has seen tremendous growth in the last 30 years, how accurate are the cost estimates for this project? | W207-1 | The capital cost estimates are based on the definition of the alternatives and on quantities derived from current geographic databases through the use of geographic information systems. Costs were not based on the same maps used to illustrate the referenced alignment options for various graphical purposes in the Program EIR/EIS. Right of way (property costs) were specifically based on recent (typically year 2000 or newer) existing land use data contained in available databases from local land use agencies. |
| | | | | It is obvious that the proponents of this high speed rail are trying to make the system more appealing to the constituency by including many "stops" that are not really in the best interest of the "high speed" idea. | W207-2 | Please see standard response 2.31.4. |
| | | | | Considering that the majority of growth outside the immediate bay area is directly west of Oakland, why isn't the route through the Altamont Pass being considered? This route is the most direct and would service the most people. Having traveled in Europe and used their bullet trains, the proposed | W207-3 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | system for a high-speed rail alternative falls far short of the ideal and should be revised. | | |
| | | | | 1. In order for a high-speed train system to be effective, there must be an infrastructure in place to support the commuters that will be arriving and departing via the high-speed train. Such an infrastructure exists, at least marginally, in the immediate bay area (BART, Valley transit etc.) No such support system exists in the south county and would need to be constructed in conjunction with the high speed rail in order for it be a feasible alternative to our existing highways and rail service. This aspect has not been addressed in the public forum nor has it been planned for. The costs of building infrastructure to support this rail system would be significant. How are you addressing these issues? | W207-4 | The Authority and the FRA respectfully disagree with your assessment. The detailed forecasts for HST ridersihp and revenue were done that did not assume the implementation of infrastructure to "support the commuters that will be arriving and departing via the high-speed train". Please also see standard response 2.1.2 in regards to the HST ridership and revenue forecasts. Please see standard response 2.1.12 in regards to the selection of multi-modal HST stations. |
| | | | | 2. Since the infrastructure needed for the commuters using this high-speed alternative exists to a larger degree in the immediate bay area, why are you not considering the Altamont Pass route?<br>The south county is the only area in our larger bay area, which still has an existing agricultural base. Using the | W207-5 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | proposed routes through the south county would encourage more urban sprawl and jeopardize the already struggling agricultural base. The Altamont Pass route would eliminate this problem. Why are you not considering the Altamont Pass route?<br>Using the proposed routes through the south county would encourage more urban sprawl and jeopardize existing open space necessary for many species currently listed on the endangered list. The Altamont Pass route would eliminate this problem. Why are you not considering the Altamont Pass route? | | |
| W208 | 8/31/2004 | Wilma Wheeler | P.O. Box 3208<br>Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546 | I support high speed rail in California. High Speed rail is already available and used consistently in Europe. It is time we developed a system here. It would save commute time and be cleaner for our air. It should be developed as soon as possible. | W208-1 | Acknowledged. |
| W209 | 8/31/2004 | Marcel Cary, Software Developer | 409C Cork Harbour Circle<br>Redwood City, CA 94065 | August 31, 2004<br>Mr. Dan Leavitt<br>Deputy Directory<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814 | W209-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Dear Mr. Leavitt:<br>As citizens of California and frequenters of our local State Parks, we are deeply concerned that the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS focuses heavily on possible train routes through Henry Coe State Park and does not include more alternatives that locate the route within existing transportation corridors.<br>The DEIR/S omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. This omission is especially serious and prominent given that the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br><br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Marcel M. Cary<br>Heather O'Hara<br>409C Cork Harbour Circle<br>Redwood City, CA 94065 | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W210 | 8/31/2004 | Heather O'Hara, Land Assistant | 409C Cork Harbour Circle<br>Redwood City, CA 94065 | August 31, 2004<br>Mr. Dan Leavitt<br>Deputy Directory<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Leavitt:<br>As citizens of California and frequenters of our local State Parks, we are deeply concerned that the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS focuses heavily on possible train routes through Henry Coe State Park and does not include more alternatives that locate the route within existing transportation corridors. | W210-1 | Please see standard response 6.3.1. |
| | | | | The DEIR/S omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. This omission is especially serious and prominent given that the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor. | W210-2 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely, | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Heather O'Hara<br>Marcel M. Cary<br>409C Cork Harbour Circle<br>Redwood City, CA 94065 | | |
| W211 | 8/31/2004 | Darrell Clarke | 339 10th Street<br>Santa Monica, CA 90402 | High Speed Rail is very important for California's future mobility. For it to succeed -- to gain the necessary public support -- there must be confidence by key stakeholders and the broader public that it is the right project, and that all appropriate alternatives were properly evaluated.<br>This is also what the California Environmental Quality Act requres. The Center for Transportation Excellence sponsored a conference on passing transportation ballot measures, in Tempe, Arizona, December 7-9, 2003 (see www.cfte.org). Their vivid message was that broad participation by public stakeholders is critical to building the necessary voter support.<br>The effort to pass bonds for High Speed Rail logically begins with its natural supporters, especially environmentalists and rail transit supporters.<br>Thus, the Altamont route alternative must be comprehensively studied, to meet both CEQA's requirements and public stakeholders' expectations, if California is to get High Speed Rail. | W211-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Darrell Clarke<br>Co-Chair,<br>Friends 4 Expo Transit<br>City of Santa Monica Planning Commission and former Chair (titles for identification) | | |
| W212 | 8/31/2004 | Susan Voss | 6860 Holsclaw Road<br>Gilroy, CA 95020 | The social justice section needs to be amended to comment on the loss of sustainable agricultural lands that will result from further subdivision of properties, particularly in the Gilroy Bypass section. The social justice section also needs to comment on the injustice to property owners in the Gilroy Bypass section who will be left with non-viable agricultural land that is restricted to agricultural uses.<br><br>The maps currently available for public viewing in the Gilroy Bypass section are at least 30 years old since they incorporate buildings that have been gone for at least that long. Any cost analyses that are based on these project maps will be fatally flawed since they do not show later developments. | W212-1 | Please see the response to W212-3 below. |
| | | | | In the Executive Summary it notes that the Altamont Pass alternative has been scraped largely because of the cost and routing issues. Why wasn't the Altamont Pass route considered with a terminus at Oakland? BART provides a viable link to San Francisco, bus and | W212-2 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | ferry lines could bring passengers into San Francisco and major markets could still be served. Local politicians might scream about being excluded, but this is a cost alternative that should be considered. A major impairment to the entire project that is never discussed is the lack of convenient supporting infrastructure, particularly in some areas. In the Santa Clara Valley mass transit is not a viable alternative to the automobile because schedules and routes between buses, trains, and trolleys are not synchronized to promote efficient travel. Infrastructure needs to be measured by the extent and efficiency that it serves the populace not by its mere presence and road miles. Without an efficient supporting infrastructure, the bullet train project will be under utilized and California's citizens will be paying for a frighteningly costly project without a hope of any real cost benefit. | | |
| | | | | The basic premise that underlies the entire impact report on the agricultural section is false, and it invalidates the conclusions and statements reached in that section. The author states on page 3 of Chapter 3 that " ... potential impact was limited to the geographic extent of the area needed for improvements only with no extra area | W212-3 | Further quantification of the loss of agricultural land that will result from subdivision of properties and the loss of viable, sustainable agricultural acreage is beyond the scope of this program EIR/EIS process. The Agricultural Lands section of the Draft Program EIR/EIS states "For purposes of this discussion, farmland |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

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

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | farmers' operating costs and discourage, if not end, any opportunity for sustainable agriculture within the Gilroy Bypass area. Farmers and land owners in the area will be left with large weed patches that are restricted to agricultural use without a hope of being able to use the land for viable agricultural.<br>The report needs to address the loss of agricultural land that will result from the subdivision of properties and the loss of viable, sustainable agricultural acreage. This measurement cannot wait for a later comparative analysis of the alternate routes, since failure to perform this analysis now will result in significantly understating the total loss of agricultural lands, particularly in any geographic areas which are characterized by smaller land parcels. | | |
| W213 | 8/31/2004 | Laurie Schwaller | 43857 S. Fork Dr. Three Rivers, CA 9327 | Please use existing rights of way, avoid Henry Coe State Park, etc. | W213-1 | Please see standard response 6.3.1. |
| W214 | 9/1/2004 | Suri Samson | 11320 Entrada Place Los Altos Hills, CA 94024 | I feel that building High Speed Rail through Henry Coe State Park and other completly undeveloped, reserved spaces is unacceptable. These places need to be preserved. | W214-1 | Please see standard response 6.3.1. |
| | | | | The biggest problem I have with major alignments of High Speed Rail is the connection between the Bay Area to the Central Valley. The fact that we are | W214-2 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | not going through the Altamont Pass does not make sense financially (requiring Billions of dollars more in capital expendatures for tunnelling), travelwise (taking significantly more time to travel between the Bay Area and the Sacromento Area), and population-wise (doesn't include enough people through which the corridor passes through, not as many people ride it, doesn't make enough money to cover costs). | | |
| | | | | A second problem I have with the Authority's proposal is with this conventional "non-electric" route from Los Angeles to San Diego via Orange County. Why is this route not electrified? Is this because of pressure from Orange County officials and residents? If that's the real reason, then that's unacceptable for such a small number of wealthy individuals to block the greater good of over 35 million Californians. | W214-3 | Please see standard response 2.21.1. |
| W215 | 9/1/2004 | Michael Kincaid | 1643 Edgewood Dr Palo Alto, CA 94303-2821 | Please consider the Altamont alignment fully and properly. It is the best solution and balance among competing needs, providing much better service to Sacramento and the East Bay. Though it may offend the political sensibilities of San Jose, it is not operationally impractical and deserves further study. | W215-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W216 | 9/1/2004 | Kristel Wickham, Director of Quality Assurance | 1102 Viscaino Ave.<br>Sunnyvale, CA 94086 | Mr. Joe Petrillo Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco | W216-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Kristel Wickham | | |
| | | | | Henry Coe State Park should be left intact and not disturbed by a high speed rail project.<br>Destruction of part of Henry Coe State Park is not an acceptable adverse environmental impact in my opinion. | W216-2 | Please see standard response 6.3.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| W217 | 9/1/2004 | T.K. Wang | 1465 Avon Park Ter.<br>Los Angeles, CA 90026 | High Speed rail should be situated to be close to the most potential users of the system.<br>Track right of way should not go into virgin areas of human development and resource preservation. The Henry Coe State Park is one of these areas. This park is not easily accessable for recreation and the rail line would not put recreation any closer but would damage the ecosystem.<br>Rail alignment close to existing outlying communities will increase the value of these communities and possibly renew such areas. | W217-1 | Please see standard response 6.3.1. |
| W218 | 9/3/2004 | Duane Sherman | 891 Post St., #205<br>San Francisco, CA 94109 | I am all for a high speed train connecting northern and southern california. This would reduce the seperation between the two important regions that our economy is based off of. it would promote more travel and hopefully give the state a little bit more income from the success of this project. | W218-1 | Acknowledged. |
| W219 | 9/6/2004 | Laura Cohen | 27706 Sinsonte<br>Mission Viejo, CA 92692 | Mr. Joe Petrillo, Chair<br>California High Speed Rail Authority<br>925 L St., Suite 1425<br>Sacramento, CA 95814<br>Dear Mr. Petrillo:<br>This letter presents comments on the California High Speed Rail Draft Program EIR/EIS. As a director of a | W219-1 | Please see standard response 2.18.1. |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | wildlife reserve facing possible destruction due to transportation infrastructure, I want to say how important it is to plan transportation with attention to preserving our natural heritage.<br>The DEIR/S is flawed because it omits the possibility of an Altamont Pass alignment as an alternative to tunneling through the more mountainous Mt. Hamilton and Pacheco Pass areas to connect the Central Valley to the Bay Area. As you may know, the Altamont Pass alignment was the recommended preferred alignment of the Intercity High Speed Rail Commission, the predecessor to the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA).<br>An Altamont Pass alignment would follow the existing I-580/I-680 corridor, with the following potential benefits:<br>▪ No impact on Henry Coe State Park, the second largest state park in California, including its pristine Orestimba Wilderness<br>▪ Less overall growth inducement in wilderness and undeveloped areas<br>▪ Less impact on wetlands<br>▪ Faster Los Angeles-San Francisco travel times<br>▪ Service to over 1 million East Bay | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

| Comment Number | Date Received | Name | Address | Comments | Number | Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | and Northern Central Valley residents in Phase I of the project.<br>▪ Traffic congestion relief on I-80 and I-580/I-680<br>▪ Much faster travel times between the Bay Area and Sacramento<br>▪ Cost savings of up to $2 billion, according to documents in the DEIR/S record.<br><br>This Program DEIR/S should not be used to decide which alignment to use. Rather, a new EIR/S should fully explore an Altamont Pass alignment, providing a complete and careful comparison to other alignment options for public comment.<br>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.<br>Sincerely,<br>Laura Cohen | | |

**Table of Web Comments Received for the HSRA EIR/EIS**

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

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