

CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED TRAIN

Project Environmental Impact Report /
Environmental Impact Statement

DRAFT

Scoping Report

Los Angeles to San Diego
via the Inland Empire
High-Speed Train
Project EIR/EIS

April 2010

California High-Speed
Rail Authority



U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Railroad Administration





CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED TRAIN PROJECT
(CAHST)

SCOPING REPORT

LOS ANGELES TO SAN DIEGO
VIA THE INLAND EMPIRE SECTION

April 2010



Table of Contents

Summary	S-1
1.0 Introduction	1-1
1.1 Description of Project	1-1
1.2 Project Alternatives	1-4
1.3 Purpose of Public Scoping	1-5
1.4 Notification of EIR/EIS Scoping.....	1-5
1.5 Public Scoping Process.....	1-7
2.0 Public and Agency Involvement During Public Scoping	2-1
2.1 Summary of Public Scoping Meetings	2-1
2.2 Summary of Outreach Activities.....	2-7
3.0 Public Scoping Summary of Issues	3-1
3.1 Scoping Summary of Alternative Alignments and Stations	3-2
3.2 Environmental Concerns	3-6
3.3 Technical/Engineering Concerns	3-8
3.4 Agency Responses to NOP/NOI	3-10
3.5 Summary Comment Tables	3-26
4.0 Next Steps	4-1

LIST OF TABLES

1-1	Published Public Notifications within the LA-SD Section
1-2	Public Scoping Meeting Locations within the LA-SD HST Project Area
2-1	Summary of Outreach Activities
3-1	Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Los Angeles County
3-2	Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Bernardino County
3-3	Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Riverside County
3-4	Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County
3-5	Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Regulatory Agency Meetings
3-6	Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Multiple Counties
3-7	Summary of Public Scoping Comments – General Comments

LIST OF FIGURES

1-1	Proposed California HST System
1-2	Los Angeles to San Diego HST Project Area

APPENDICES

A	Notice of Preparation
B	Notice of Intent
C	Public Scoping Meeting Announcements – Public Meetings and Residents within 500 feet of Proposed Alternative Alignments
D	Public Scoping Meeting Announcements in the Media (Display Ad and Legal Notice in Newspapers)
E	Media Coverage
F	Public Scoping Comment Card and Handouts
G	Public Scoping Comments – Los Angeles County
H	Public Scoping Comments – San Bernardino County
I	Public Scoping Comments – Riverside County
J	Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County

- K Public Scoping Comments – Regulatory Meeting
- L Public Scoping Comments – Multiple Counties
- M Public Scoping Comments – General Comments
- N Written Public Agency Responses to Notice of Preparation/Intent
- O Formal Public Scoping Meeting Attendance List
- P PowerPoint Presentation and Public Scoping Boards
- Q Corona Chamber of Commerce Form Letters

Summary

The purpose of this report is to summarize the public scoping process and comments received during the public scoping period for the Los Angeles to San Diego (LA-SD) via the Inland Empire Section of the High-Speed Train project. The report provides a brief project background, a description of the public scoping process and meetings, a list of other outreach activities, and a summary of the public and agency comments received during scoping.

In 2005, the California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) and the Federal Rail Administration (FRA) completed the Statewide Program Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the proposed California High-Speed Train (HST) System as the first phase of a tiered environmental review process. The Authority certified the Statewide Program EIR under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and approved the proposed HST System. FRA issued a Record of Decision on the Statewide Program EIR/EIS as required under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The Statewide Program EIR/EIS established the purpose and need for the HST System and compared the proposed HST System with a No Project/No Action Alternative and a Modal Alternative. In approving the Statewide Program EIR/EIS, the Authority and the FRA selected the HST Alternative, selected certain corridors/general alignments and general station locations for further study throughout the state, and incorporated mitigation strategies with design practices. Further measures were specified to guide the development of the HST System during the site-specific project environmental review that would avoid and minimize potential adverse environmental impacts. In the Statewide Program EIR/EIS, the Authority and FRA selected the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR)/I-215/I-15 corridor for the Los Angeles to San Diego (LA-SD) via the Inland Empire Section of the HST. This report summarizes the public scoping process for the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section of the HST project.

The Authority encourages broad participation during EIR/EIS public scoping and review of the draft environmental documents. Comments and suggestions are invited from all interested agencies and the public to insure the full range of issues related to the proposed action are addressed, including all reasonable alternatives. In particular, the Authority is interested in determining where there are areas of environmental sensitivity and where there could be a potential for significant impacts from the HST project.

On September 17, 2009, a California State Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the LA-SD HST Project EIR/EIS was distributed to the State Clearinghouse; elected officials, local, regional, and state agencies; and the interested public. A Notice of Intent (NOI) was also published in the *Federal Register* on September 24, 2009 for this section.

In the NOP/NOI, public agencies with legal jurisdiction were requested to advise the Authority and the FRA of the applicable permit and environmental review requirements of each agency, and the scope and content of the environmental information germane to the agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Public scoping meetings were announced and held as an important component of the public scoping process for both the state and federal environmental review.

During the public scoping period, 14 public scoping meetings were held between October 13 and November 3, 2009, with a total of 812 people attending the 14 meetings. The Authority and FRA received a total of 1,243 comments from agencies, organizations, and individuals regarding the proposed LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section HST project. Major issues identified as a result of public scoping are listed below in no particular order.

- Location of stations
- Location of the HST alignment
- Benefits of HST, including air quality, congestion relief, and economic development
- Connections to local transit
- Fast tracking the project
- Natural resource impacts
- Noise impacts

- Cost and financing of the system
- Power source and requirements
- Economic growth issues
- Benefits/impacts on local businesses
- Employment opportunities
- Ridership estimates
- Property acquisition
- Displacement of people
- Potential devaluation of property

Following the public scoping process, information based on the comments received during public scoping, including alternatives proposed in public scoping comments and from the alternatives analysis (AA) will assist to determine which alternatives should be fully evaluated through the EIR/EIS process.

The analysis of existing conditions and potential impacts of project alternatives will then be synthesized into the Draft EIR/EIS, and the FRA and the Authority will publish the Draft EIR/EIS. Publication is anticipated in 2012. A 60-day comment period will begin following publication of the Notice of Availability in the *Federal Register* and after filing a Notice of Completion with the California State Clearinghouse. The Authority will distribute notices of availability to those on the project mailing list and to potentially affected property owners. In addition, the EIR/EIS will be posted on the Authority's website. Public hearings will be provided in the project area to provide the public the opportunity to discuss the project based on information in the EIR/EIS with the project team and provide comments.

After close of the public comment period and review of agency and public comments on the EIR/EIS, the Authority's Board of Directors, in conjunction with the FRA, will select a preferred alternative based on the analysis in the EIR/EIS and comments received. Identification of the preferred alternative is anticipated in 2012. Additional analysis of the preferred alternative will be conducted and a Final EIR/EIS published. The Final EIR/EIS will respond to comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS and specify mitigation measures for project impacts. As with the Draft EIR/EIS, a Notice of Availability will be published in the *Federal Register*. The Authority will select the project to be built and prepare a Notice of Determination for the California State Clearinghouse pursuant to CEQA. With appropriate completion of the Final EIR/EIS, the FRA will issue a Record of Decision for the project, which will present the basis for the decision and summarize the mitigation measures that will be incorporated into the project. After the Record of Decision, project final design and construction can commence contingent on funding availability.

1.0 Introduction

This report summarizes the public scoping process for the Los Angeles to San Diego (LA-SD) via the Inland Empire Section of the California High-Speed Train (HST) project. This report includes a project description, explains the purpose of public scoping, describes the public scoping notification process, summarizes the 14 project public scoping meetings, summarizes the comments received from the public and agencies, and describes the next steps for the project.

1.1 Description of Project

Since 1992, extensive information has been gathered and a preliminary evaluation has been completed concerning the potential environmental effects associated with numerous HST corridor alternatives throughout California. From feasibility studies through conceptual design, a variety of technical studies have been undertaken to address the engineering, operational, financial, ridership, and environmental aspects of such a system. The findings of these studies resulted in the *California High-Speed Train Business Plan* prepared by the California High-Speed Rail Authority (November 2008). The Authority was established in 1996 and is authorized and directed by statute to undertake the planning and development of a proposed statewide HST network that is fully coordinated with other public transportation services. The 2008 Business Plan concluded that California would benefit substantially from HST transportation, and the Authority initiated further evaluation of an HST System connecting the San Francisco Bay Area, Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Diego. The proposed statewide HST System (Figure 1-1) consists of 800 miles of dedicated, fully grade-separated, state-of-the-art track with trains capable of speeds in excess of 220 miles per hour. In 2009, an updated Business Plan was prepared that updates HST project ridership, cost, and revenue information for the Phase 1 HST system defined as the corridor from San Francisco to Anaheim (Authority, December 2009). This 2009 Business Plan identifies the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section as a subsequent section to be constructed when funding has been identified.

In 2005, the Authority and Federal Rail Administration (FRA) completed the Statewide Program Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Proposed California High-Speed Train System, as the first phase of a tiered environmental review process. The Authority certified the Statewide Program EIR under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and approved the proposed HST System. FRA issued a Record of Decision on the Statewide Program EIR/EIS as required under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The Statewide Program EIR/EIS established the purpose and need for the HST System and compared the proposed HST System with a No Project/No Action Alternative and a Modal Alternative. In approving the Statewide Program EIR/EIS, the Authority and the FRA selected the HST Alternative, selected certain corridors/general alignments and general station locations for further study, and incorporated mitigation strategies with design practices. Further measures were specified to guide the development of the HST System during the site-specific project environmental review that would avoid and minimize potential adverse environmental impacts. In the Statewide Program EIR/EIS, the Authority and FRA selected the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR)/I-215/I-15 corridor for the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section of the HST (Figure 1-2).

The LA-SD HST Project EIR/EIS will tier from the Statewide Program EIR/EIS in accordance with Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations §1508.28) and CEQA guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations §15168[b]). Tiering is a staged approach to NEPA in which broad programs and issues are evaluated in initial (Tier 1) analyses, and site-specific proposals and impacts are evaluated in subsequent tier studies. Tiering ensures that the LA-SD HST Project EIR/EIS builds upon program analyses and decisions made with the Statewide Program EIR/EIS.

The LA-SD HST Project EIR/EIS will describe site-specific environmental impacts, identify specific mitigation measures to address those impacts, and incorporate measures with design features that would avoid and minimize potential adverse environmental impacts.



Proposed California HST System

Figure 1-1



Los Angeles to San Diego HST Project Area

Figure 1-2

The FRA and the Authority will assess the site characteristics, size, nature, and timing of proposed site-specific HST project sections to determine whether adverse impacts are potentially significant as defined by NEPA and CEQA, and whether adverse impacts can be avoided or mitigated. This document and other project EIR/EISs will identify and evaluate reasonable and feasible site-specific alignment alternatives, and evaluate the impacts from construction, operation, and maintenance of the HST System.

1.2 Project Alternatives

The LA-SD HST Project EIR/EIS will consider a No Action Alternative and an HST Alternative for the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section. These alternatives are briefly described below.

1.2.1 No Action Alternative

The No Project Alternative (No Project or No Build) represents the conditions in the corridor as it existed in 2009, and as it would exist based on programmed and funded improvements to the intercity transportation system and other reasonably foreseeable projects through 2035, taking into account the following sources of information: the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) for all modes of travel, airport plans, intercity passenger rail plans, and city and county plans.

1.2.2 HST Alternative

The Authority proposes to construct, operate, and maintain an electric-powered steel-wheel-on-steel-rail HST System, about 800 miles long, capable of operating at speeds in excess of 220 mph on mostly dedicated, fully grade-separated tracks, with state-of-the-art safety, signaling, communication and automated train control systems. In the Statewide Program EIR/EIS, the Authority and the FRA selected the Inland Empire alignment, which was divided into three segments: 1) Los Angeles to March Air Reserve Base (ARB); 2) March ARB to Mira Mesa; and 3) Mira Mesa to San Diego. Between LA Union Station and March ARB, the selected alignment generally follows the UPRR Riverside/Colton corridor. From March ARB to Mira Mesa, the selected I-215/I-15 alignment generally follows the I-215 and then the I-15 corridor to Mira Mesa. There are two alignment options along Carroll Canyon and Miramar Road that would directly serve downtown San Diego. Both the Carroll Canyon and Miramar Road alignment options are being considered for further evaluation. During public scoping, new alternative alignments were identified for further consideration by the Authority and FRA.

Preferred station locations selected by the Authority and FRA through the Statewide Program EIR/EIS scoping process and AA will be evaluated in the LA-SD HST Project EIR/EIS. As part of the Statewide Program EIR/EIS the following stations have been identified:

- East San Gabriel Valley Station in City of Industry
- Ontario Airport Connector Station
- Riverside County/East San Bernardino County Station near the University of California Riverside
- Temecula Valley Station in Murrieta at the I-15/I-215 interchange
- Escondido Station Area along the I-15
- Mid-San Diego County Station at University City
- San Diego Station-Downtown at the Santa Fe Depot

In addition, the following alternative station locations were identified for further evaluation:

- El Monte, West Covina, and Pomona (via the I-605, I-10, and Holt Avenue corridors)
- San Bernardino (via the SANBAG/MetroLink corridor)
- Riverside-UCR, Riverside-March ARB, and Murrieta (via the I-215 corridor)
- Corona and Escondido Transit Center (via the I-15 corridor)

- University Towne Center (via the University City corridor)
- San Diego International Airport at Lindbergh Field

1.3 Purpose of Public Scoping

Public scoping is an important element in the process of determining the focus and content of an EIR/EIS. Public scoping helps to identify the range of actions, alternatives, environmental effects, and mitigation measures to be analyzed in depth and helps eliminate from detailed study those issues that are not pertinent to the final decision on the proposed project. Public scoping is also an effective way to bring together and address the concerns of the public, affected agencies, and other interested parties. Significant issues may be identified through public and agency comments. The CEQ Regulations Section 1501.7 and CEQA Section 21083.9 describe public scoping as required by NEPA and CEQA.

Public scoping is not conducted to resolve differences concerning the merits of a project or to anticipate the ultimate decision on a proposal. Rather, public scoping helps ensure that a comprehensive and focused EIR/EIS will be prepared that informs the decision-making process.

The intent of the California High-Speed Train LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section project public scoping process is to:

- Inform public agencies and interested members of the public about the proposed project, including compliance with NEPA and CEQA requirements, and the FRA's and Authority's actions in relation to the project.
- Assist with identifying a range of alignments and station locations along the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section that may be considered in the EIR/EIS.
- Assist with identifying the range of concerns and project-related issues to be considered in the EIR/EIS.
- Assist with identifying mitigation measures, strategies, and approaches to mitigation that may be useful and explored further in the EIR/EIS.
- Develop an expanded mailing list of agencies and individuals interested in the future actions relative to the EIR/EIS.

The public scoping process and the input gathered during the public scoping period are documented herein for the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section Project-Level EIR/EIS.

1.4 Notification of EIR/EIS Scoping

Public scoping activities for the LA-SD HST Project EIR/EIS were conducted between September 17 and November 20, 2009 (public scoping period). The process was initiated by the issuance of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) (Appendix A) and the Notice of Intent (NOI) (Appendix B). The California State environmental review process began when the NOP was submitted to the State Clearinghouse on September 17, 2009. The federal process began with the publication of the NOI in the *Federal Register* on September 24, 2009. The NOP and NOI discuss the history of the California High-Speed Train System, the purpose of the Statewide System, the limits and potential alignments of the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section of the system, and potential environmental impacts of the project. They also provide contact names for additional information regarding the project and list the dates and locations of public scoping meetings being held for the project.

The proposed alignments and station locations are based on the Statewide Program EIR/EIS and on alternatives developed with input from regional planning agencies. Invitation letters, including the NOP

and NOI as attachments, were sent to potential Participating and Cooperating Agencies at the federal, state, and local level requesting that they provide written comments about the applicable permit and environmental review requirements of the agency, and the scope and content of the environmental information germane to the agency's responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. The dates of two agency-specific public scoping meetings, as well as the 12 public scoping meetings were included in the invitation letters.

Public scoping meetings were held between October 13 and November 3, 2009. Public notification for the public scoping meetings included (1) mailing a public scoping meeting announcement post card (Appendix C), (2) publication of display ads and legal notices in local newspapers (Table 1-1 and Appendix D), and (3) posting public scoping meeting dates and locations on the Authority's website in addition to links on local cities, agencies and elected officials websites, (4) announcements on local cable channels, (5) electronic notification to project stakeholder contact database, and (6) calendar notification and press releases to local newspapers. Approximately 84,000 property owners, residents, and business tenants immediately adjacent to the proposed alternative alignments and within 500 feet of stations within the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section received public scoping meeting announcement post cards (Appendix C). Table 1-1 lists the publications and dates for the display advertisements and legal notices as well as articles and editorials published prior to and during the public scoping process. Appendix E includes copies of articles and editorials.

Table 1-1
 Published Public Notifications within the LA-SD Section

Publication	Notice Date
LEGAL SECTION NOTICES	
San Gabriel Tribune	September 30, 2009
The Daily Bulletin	September 30, 2009
San Bernardino Sun	September 30, 2009
The Press Enterprise	September 30, 2009
North County Times	September 30, 2009
San Diego Union Tribune	September 30, 2009
La Opinión	September 30, 2009
DISPLAY AD NOTICES	
La Jolla Light	October 1, 2009
Rancho Bernardo News	October 1, 2009
North County Times	October 6, 2009
San Diego Union Tribune	October 6, 2009
The Press Enterprise	October 12, 2009
Downtown News	October 12, 2009
San Gabriel Tribune	October 13, 2009
The Daily Bulletin	October 13, 2009
San Bernardino Sun	October 13, 2009

Table 1-1
 Published Public Notifications within the LA-SD Section

Publication	Notice Date
La Opinion	October 14, 2009
Chinese Daily News	October 14, 2009
Rafu Shimpo	October 14, 2009
La Prensa	October 16, 2009

1.5 Public Scoping Process

Public scoping meetings for the LA-SD HST Project EIR/EIS were conducted between October 13 and November 3, 2009 (Table 1-2). Public scoping meetings with an open house format were conducted in 12 locations. Two additional public scoping meetings, tailored for resource agencies (but also open to the general public) with a presentation format, were held.

The 12 public scoping meetings were held between 3:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. to allow representatives from agencies and the public the opportunity to participate. These open house meetings were designed so that people could arrive at any time to obtain information and provide input. Project information was displayed via video, PowerPoint, and on large presentation boards throughout the meeting room, and project team members were available to respond to questions and record comments.

The two public scoping meetings tailored for resource agencies were conducted in a presentation format with a PowerPoint presentation of the project, followed by a question and answer session. These meetings were also open to and attended by members of the general public. All attendees received information about the project on a CD including project maps, the NOI and NOP, the Statewide HST Project Purpose and Need, and a copy of the Authority's Environmental Methodologies technical memo. All of these materials are also available online on the Authority's website.

Public scoping comment cards and handouts, located in Appendix F, were provided at each of the meetings for attendees to provide comments on the materials and information. The written scoping comments and questions collected at the meetings, submitted via mail or through the Authority's internet website, and the verbal comments recorded at the public scoping meetings through a court reporter are included in Appendix G through M. Comments are summarized in Section 3, Public Scoping Summary of Issues. Agency responses to the NOP and NOI are included in Appendix N and summarized in Section 3.4. The deadline for submitting scoping comments was November 20, 2009.

Members of the public; affected federal, state, and local agencies; interest groups; and other interested parties participated in the public scoping process by attending the meetings and/or providing written and verbal comments or recommendations concerning project alignment and station alternatives, potential environmental impacts to be analyzed in the EIR/EIS, and other project-related issues.

Table 1-2		
Public Scoping Meeting Locations within the LA-SD HST Project Area		
Date	City	Location/Address
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS		
San Diego County		
October 13	University City	Lawrence Family Jewish Community Center, 4126 Executive Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037
October 14	San Diego	Ramada Limited San Diego Airport, 1403 Rosecrans Street, San Diego, CA 92106
October 15	Escondido	Escondido Center for the Arts, 340 N. Escondido Blvd, Escondido CA 92025
Riverside County		
October 19	Murrieta	Murrieta Public Library, Eight Town Square, 24700 Adams Avenue, Murrieta, CA 92562
October 20	Corona	Corona Public Library, West Room, 650 S. Main Street, Corona, CA 92882
October 22	Riverside	Cesar Chavez Community Center, Bobby Bonds Park, 2060 University Avenue, Riverside, CA 92507
Los Angeles County		
October 21	Monterey Park	Shepherd of the Hills United Methodist Church, Wesley Fellowship Hall, 333 South Garfield Avenue, Monterey Park, CA 91754
October 26	West Covina	City of West Covina City Hall, Community Room, First Floor, 1444 West Garvey Avenue, West Covina, CA 91790
October 28	El Monte	El Monte Community Center Grace T. Black Auditorium, 3130 Tyler Avenue, El Monte, California 91731
October 29	Pomona	Pomona First Baptist Church, Room E-202, 586 N. Main Street, Pomona, California 91768
San Bernardino County		
November 2	Ontario	Ontario Airport Administrative Conference Rooms, 1923 E. Avion Street, Ontario, CA 91764
November 3	San Bernardino	Norman Feldheim Central Library, Kellogg Room, 555 West 6th Street, San Bernardino, CA 92410
RESOURCE AGENCY SCOPING MEETINGS		
October 15	Carlsbad	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 6010 Hidden Valley Road (Room 1), Carlsbad, CA 92011
October 22	Riverside	California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region 8, 3737 Main Street, Suite 500 (Highgrove Room), Riverside, CA 92501-3348

2.0 Public and Agency Involvement During Public Scoping

Throughout the public scoping period, the Authority and FRA encouraged public and agency input through a variety of activities. As noted, the Authority issued the NOP and the FRA published the NOI in the *Federal Register*, initiating the public scoping process.

2.1 Summary of Public Scoping Meetings

Public scoping meetings were open to both the general public and agencies. Attendance lists for the public scoping meetings are included in Appendix O. Copies of the materials provided at the public scoping meetings are included in Appendix F.

Approximately 812 people attended the public scoping meetings, approximately 1,243 comments were submitted by individuals and organizations, and 62 agencies provided comments. The public scoping meetings are summarized in sections 2.1.1 through 2.1.14.

Materials developed for use in the public scoping meetings included the following:

- Public scoping meeting announcement post card mailer (Appendix C)
- Public scoping period comment card (Appendix F)
- Copies of the Statewide HST Purpose and Need (Appendix F)
- Open House Station Guide (Appendix F)
- Information boards displayed on easels and power point presentations (Appendix P)

Public Scoping Meeting Format

Each meeting took place between 3 p.m. and 7 p.m. and was set up in the same format. The format consisted of an open house style meeting with five information stations including presentation boards set up on easels and attended by LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section HST project team members. Team members were assigned to stations based on their area of expertise in order to provide information and answers to questions through informal discussions. Spanish-speaking team members were available at each meeting to answer questions for participants who preferred to speak in Spanish. A court reporter was also available at each meeting so that participants could submit comments verbally. The meeting presentation boards (divided by station) can be found in Appendix P. The stations were set up in the following format.

Station 1: Sign-in/Comments

This station, located at the entrance to the meeting, functioned as the welcome table and sign-in area. The comment box where completed comment cards could be deposited was also at this station. Here, LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section HST project team outreach staff greeted participants and explained the meeting format and the procedure for submitting comments. Participants also filled out the sign-in sheet and received handouts including (1) a "Public Scoping Meeting Guide" explaining the meeting format, the station set-up, and the procedure for submitting comments; (2) a copy of the Statewide HST Purpose and Need; and (3) a comment card (in English or Spanish). The court reporter was located at a table set up near the Sign-in/Comments station, or at a table marked with a placard within the stations area.

Station 2: PowerPoint Loop

This station included a seating area where guests could sit and watch a 15-minute PowerPoint loop which included video clips of Governor Schwarzenegger discussing the HST project, a video showing high-speed trains around the world, slides describing the process and schedule for the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section HST project Alternatives Analysis and EIR/EIS, and visual simulations of selected areas along the potential alignments (Appendix P). The presentation was also available in Spanish on a laptop at each of the meetings.

Station 3: HST System Description

This station featured seven large presentation boards describing the Purpose and Need for the California HST System, as well as information and figures explaining general high-speed train design and operations features. Presentation boards depicted general information about high-speed trains, travel times for the California HST System, illustrations of typical over- and underpasses, typical sections along the HST alignment, and considerations for HST stations (Appendix P).

Station 4: Maps

At this station, participants could view and ask questions about the potential LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section HST project alignment corridors. Maps were presented for each county, as well as an overview of the LA-SD section and the statewide system.

Station 5: Project Overview and EIR/EIS Process

The final station included presentation boards depicting the overall schedule for the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section HST project as well as the process and schedule for the alternatives analysis and environmental process. This station also included information about areas of environmental analysis for the project and potential key environmental issues.

The comments provided during the public scoping meetings are summarized in Tables 3-1 through 3-7 and described briefly in the following sections.

2.1.1 University City, October 13, 2009

On October 13, 2009, the Authority held a public scoping meeting at the Lawrence Family Community Senior Center. Approximately 170 people signed in at the meeting, including representatives from Friends of Rose Canyon, Valencia Homeowner's Association (HOA), City of Poway, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, University of California, San Diego (UCSD) Community Planning, The Irvine Company, La Jolla County Day School, Marian Bear Natural Park, and League of Women Voters of San Diego. A total of 42 written comments were submitted during the public scoping meeting.

In general, comments pertained to the location of the alternative alignments and station locations. Several commenters requested that the I-15/Qualcomm alternative evaluated in the 2005 Statewide Program EIR/EIS be included in the alternatives analysis process for the Project EIR/EIS. Issues of concern include natural resource impacts to Rose Canyon and community impacts to University City.

Media coverage from Fox Channel 5, KSWB Channel 6, KNSD 7/39 (NBC), KFMB Channel 8 (CBS), KUSI Channel 9, and La Jolla Light were present at the public scoping meeting.

2.1.2 San Diego, October 14, 2009

On October 14, 2009, the Authority held a public scoping meeting at the Ramada Limited San Diego Airport. Approximately 60 people signed in at the meeting, including representatives from Warren Walker Middle School, Friends of Rose Canyon, South County Economic Development Council, San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 11, State of California Department of Transportation (DOT), San Diego County Regional Airport Authority, and Peninsula Community Planning Board. A total of five written comments were submitted during the public scoping meeting.

General comments were related to the location of the alignment and whether the I-15/Qualcomm alternative could be considered in the alternatives analysis process.

Media coverage was not present at the public scoping meeting.

2.1.3 Escondido, October 15, 2009

On October 15, 2009, the Authority held a public scoping meeting at the Escondido Center of the Arts. Approximately 90 people signed in at the meeting, including representatives from San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy, UCSD, City of Escondido, Escondido Chamber of Citizens, and Caltrans. Thirteen comments were submitted during the public scoping meeting.

General comments provided at the public scoping meeting included concern about community impacts along the I-15 corridor to the adjacent communities of Rancho Bernardo, Sabre Springs, and Mira Mesa.

Media coverage from North County Times was present.

2.1.4 Carlsbad, October 15, 2009

On October 15, 2009, the Authority held a regulatory agency scoping meeting at the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Approximately 15 people attended the meeting, including representatives from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Regional Water Quality Control Board, (RWQCB), Caltrans District 11, County of San Diego Air Pollution District, San Diego County Regional Airport Authority City of San Diego, and Friends of Rose Canyon. Two written comments were submitted at the scoping meeting.

Comments provided included a request to include an alternative alignment to the Rose Canyon route that would connect to the I-5 corridor. A comment was made that a land use evaluation should be conducted that considers the implication of SB 375, compatibility with adopted land use plans including the adopted master plan for San Diego International Airport, and to evaluate project consistency with the Destination Lindbergh Plan.

Media coverage was not present at the scoping meeting.

2.1.5 Murrieta, October 19, 2009

On October 19, 2009, the Authority held a public scoping meeting at the Murrieta Public Library. Approximately 95 local citizens signed in at the meeting. No representatives from public or private agencies attended. A total of 11 comments were submitted during the public scoping meeting.

General comments provided at the public scoping meeting included support for the overall project, preference for the I-15 alignment, questions regarding funding availability to complete this section of the HST System, and making sure that the project provides intermodal connectivity with regional transportation projects.

Media coverage from Press-Enterprise, The Californian, and KVCR Radio were present.



Murrieta Public Scoping Meeting, October 19, 2009

2.1.6 Corona, October 20, 2009

On October 20, 2009, the Authority held a public scoping meeting at the Corona Public Library.



Corona Public Scoping Meeting, October 20, 2009

Approximately 45 people signed in at the meeting, including representatives from City of Corona, Corona Chamber of Commerce, and Corona-Norco Unified School District. A total of nine written comments were received at the meeting.

General comments included requests for additional project-specific information to determine property and community impacts, preference for the I-15 alignment, and several comments regarding station location preferences.

Media coverage from Press-Enterprise was present.

2.1.7 Monterey Park, October 21, 2009

On October 21, 2009, the Authority held a public scoping meeting at the Shepherd of the Hills United Methodist Church. Approximately 50 people signed in at the meeting, including representatives from City of South Pasadena; Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; Congresswoman Lucille Roybal-Allard, 34th District California; Laborers' International Union; County of Los Angeles; City of Los Angeles, Councilmember Greg Smith; Assemblymember Mike Eng, 49th District; Caltrans District 7; and the Japanese Chamber of Commerce. A total of three written comments were received at the meeting.

General comments from the public included concerns with SR 60 and its constrained right-of-way, preference for an I-10 alignment alternative, use of Mission Boulevard instead of Holt Avenue, and concern about the MetroLink Corridor due to right-of-way constraints.

Media coverage from KABC-TV Channel 7 (ABC Affiliate) and LA Weekly were present.

2.1.8 Riverside, October 22, 2009

On October 22, 2009, the Authority held a public scoping meeting at the Cesar Chavez Community Center. Approximately 53 people signed in at the meeting, including representatives from Riverside Neighborhood Partnership; University of California (UC) Riverside, City of Riverside; and Supervisor Bob Buster, First District of Riverside County. A total of seven written comments were received at the public scoping meeting.

General comments were made regarding preference for either the I-15 or I-215 alignment, concerns about disparate community impacts along the I-215 alignment, and natural resource impacts to open space areas along I-15 and I-215. Comments were also made about providing HST intermodal connectivity with local transportation plans.

Media coverage was not present at the public scoping meeting.



2.1.9 Riverside, October 22, 2009

On October 22, 2009, a regulatory agency scoping meeting was held at the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region 8, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Twelve people signed in at the meeting, including representatives from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, USFWS, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), State of California Public Utilities Commission, and the State Department of Conservation. No written comments were provided at the public scoping meeting.

Regulatory staff requested additional information on the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the FRA/Authority and the USACE, and on bridge construction in proximity to drainages and natural channels. General comments included concerns with development and growth-inducement potential, tunneling, and groundwater impacts.

Media coverage was not present at the scoping meeting.



Riverside Public Scoping Meeting, October 22, 2009

2.1.10 West Covina, October 26, 2009

On October 26, 2009, the Authority held a public scoping meeting at the City of West Covina City Hall. Approximately 27 people signed in at the meeting, including representatives from City of West Covina; City of La Puente; Laborers' International Union; City of Covina; and Supervisor Don Knabe, Fourth District, County of Los Angeles. A total of two written comments were received at the meeting.

General comments included concerns with property acquisition, dislocation/relocation, availability of funding, and the constrained nature of the MetroLink alignment.

Media coverage was not present at the public scoping meeting.



West Covina Public Scoping Meeting, October 26, 2009

2.1.11 El Monte, October 28, 2009

On October 28, 2009, the Authority held a public scoping meeting at the El Monte Community Center Grace T. Black Auditorium. Approximately 37 local citizens signed in at the meeting in addition to representatives from the City of Montebello, City of Pico Rivera, City of El Monte, City of Monterey Park, County of Los Angeles, and California Department of Transportation. A total of three written comments were provided at the public scoping meeting.

General comments included concern with property impacts along SR 60 and I-605 corridor, HST crossing at the San Gabriel River and potential waterway impacts, and preference for a station location at the El Monte transit center.

Media coverage was not present at the public scoping meeting.

2.1.12 Pomona, October 29, 2009

On October 29, 2009, the Authority held a public scoping meeting at the Pomona First Baptist Church. Approximately 24 people signed in at the meeting, including representatives from City of Pomona, Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA), Laborers' International Union, Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority, City of Upland, and Monte Vista Water District. A total of 3 written comments were provided at the public scoping meeting.

Media coverage was not present at the public scoping meeting.



*Pomona Public Scoping Meeting,
October 29, 2009*

2.1.13 Ontario, November 2, 2009

On November 2, 2009, the Authority held a public scoping meeting at the Ontario Airport Administrative Conference Room. Approximately 49 people signed in at the meeting, including representatives from City of Ontario; Councilmember Alan D. Wapner, City of Ontario; Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA); Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro); Riverside Transit Agency (RTA); Joe Baca, Congress District 43 of California; County of San Bernardino Board of Supervisors, Fourth District Supervisor Gary Ovitt; City of Rancho Cucamonga; Western Municipal Water District; USACE, Los Angeles

District; City of Claremont; Caltrans District 7; and San Bernardino Association of Governments (SANBAG). A total of three written comments were provided at the meeting.

General comments focused on the need for a station in the City of San Bernardino, compatibility with local transportation projects, and how the selection decision will be made to choose between I-15 and I-215.

Media coverage from the Inland Valley Daily Bulletin and The Sun were present at the public scoping meeting.

2.1.14 San Bernardino, November 3, 2009

On November 3, 2009, the Authority held a public scoping meeting at the Norman Feldheim Central Library Kellogg Room. Approximately 83 people signed in at the meeting, including representatives from State of California Department of Water Resources; Joe Baca, Congress District 43 of California; Omnitrans; Caltrans District 8; City of Fontana; City of Highland; DOT District 8; Assemblymember Wilmer Amina Carter, 62nd District; County of San Bernardino Economic Development Agency; County of San Bernardino Board of Supervisors, Supervisor Neil Derry, Third District; County of San Bernardino; Riverside County Transportation Commission; California State Senator Bob Dutton, 31st District; San Bernardino Community College District; City of Loma Linda; SANBAG; City of San Bernardino; and Southern California Edison (SCE). A total of 10 written comments were provided at the public scoping meeting.

General comments included a request for data exchange with the State Water Resources Board to avoid impacts to the state water aqueduct, strong desire to have a station at City of San Bernardino, strong support for the I-215 alignment, requests to provide intermodal connectivity with the proposed Multi-Modal Transit Facility in downtown San Bernardino, and support of HST as a catalyst to revitalize economic growth of the area.

Media coverage was not present at the public scoping meeting.



San Bernardino Public Scoping Meeting, November 3, 2009

2.2 Summary of Outreach Activities

The public scoping period officially began September 17, 2009, with the receipt of the NOP at the State Clearinghouse. However, outreach to stakeholders in the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section HST project corridor began earlier. Implementing stakeholder outreach early in the planning process improved awareness of the project so that, as the Authority began the public scoping period, the stakeholders could be better prepared to offer pertinent comments. Activities included outreach to business and community groups, early agency coordination, and elected official briefings. Outreach activities are listed in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1
Summary of Outreach Activities

Date	Organization/Individual	Purpose
Thursday, September 17, 2009	Assemblymember Ed Hernandez (and other staff)	Briefing update
Friday, September 18, 2009	State Senator Gil Cedillo (and Arturo Chavez, District Director)	First time presentation
Friday, September 18, 2009	State Senator Denise Ducheny (and staff)	Briefing update
Wednesday, September 23, 2009	San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments - Transportation Forum (including LA County Supervisors Antonovich, Knabe and Molina)	15-minute briefing
Thursday, September 24, 2009	So Cal Inland Corridor Group(ICG) Meeting	Present public scoping materials
Thursday, October 1, 2009	Congressmember Mary Bono Mack Staff (Will Burger, District Director, and Karen Brown, Assistant Director)	Briefing prior to public scoping
Friday, October 2, 2009	The Nature Conservancy	Impacts to southwestern Riverside County and northern San Diego County.
Tuesday, October 6, 2009	City of El Monte - City Council	Briefing
Tuesday, October 6, 2009	City of West Covina - City Council	Briefing
Wednesday, October 7, 2009	District Director Marisela Cervantes and Assemblyman Charles Calderon	Briefing prior to public scoping
Wednesday, October 7, 2009	Michael Delgado, Executive Analyst, San Bernardino County Board of Supervisor Gary Ovitt	Briefing prior to public scoping
Thursday, October 8, 2009	Assemblymember Wilmer Amina Carter and District Director Juan Lopez	Briefing prior to public scoping
Friday, October 9, 2009	Senator Gloria Negrete McLeod and Marti Rodriguez, District Director	Briefing prior to public scoping
Friday, October 9, 2009	Megan McLaughlin (Transportation Deputy) and Steve Johnson (District Director) - Staff of Assemblyman Anthony Adams	Briefing prior to public scoping
Monday, October 12, 2009	Joint briefing with HST and Eastside/Metro Staff	Briefing prior to public scoping
Monday, October 12, 2009	Caltrans District 11 Staff - Chris Schmidt, Lou Melendes, Chi Vargas, Sam Amen	Briefing prior to public scoping
Tuesday, October 13, 2009	Staff of Assemblymember Bill Emmerson - Field Representatives Brittany Reher and Gina Grace	Briefing prior to public scoping
Wednesday, October 14, 2009	Assemblyman Kevin deLeon and District Director Steve Veres	Briefing prior to public scoping
Wednesday, October 14, 2009	So Cal ICG Meeting	Ongoing coordination meeting
Friday, October 16, 2009	SANDAG Transportation Committee	Briefing prior to public scoping
Friday, October 16, 2009	Staff of Congressman Joe Baca - Transportation Deputy Mike Trujillo and District Director Sam Garcia	Briefing prior to public scoping

Table 2-1
Summary of Outreach Activities

Date	Organization/Individual	Purpose
Tuesday, October 20, 2009	Assemblymember John Perez Staff - Elected Office Attendees: Richard Ryan, District Director Miguel Martinez, Transportation Betsy Cardenas, Field Representative Lizzette Henderson, Case Manager	Briefing prior to public scoping
Wednesday, October 21, 2009	Staff of Assembly Member Norma Torres - Senior Field Representative Manuel Saucedo and Field Representatives Vicky McLeod and Jennifer Nesslar	Briefing prior to public scoping
Friday, October 23, 2009	Senator Dennis Hollingsworth - Staff Briefing - Elected Office Attendees: Tom Rogers, District Director Donna Thompson, Field Representative	Briefing before public scoping
Friday, October 23, 2009	Councilmember Sherri Lightner	Follow up briefing - post public scoping
Wednesday, November 4, 2009	Staff from Sen. Mark Wyland and Assemblyman Martin Garrick: Patricia Forsio, Deputy Chief of Staff, office of Senator Wyland; Caroline Massey, office of Senator Wyland Sherry Hodges, District Director, office of Assemblyman Garrick; Marie Joyce, Senior Field Representative, Office of Assemblyman Garrick	Meeting with state legislative staff to follow up on public scoping and issues related to I-15/Rancho Bernardo
Thursday, November 5, 2009	CT District 11 - Chris Schmidt and Sam Amen with Al Cox; David L Nagy; Eric Bassell; Gregory Parks; Jacob Armstrong; Kelly Finn;	Follow up meeting to public scoping meetings.
Thursday, November 5, 2009	SCAG Transportation Committee Presentation	Update of environmental review, alternatives analysis and outreach
Monday, November 9, 2009	SR-60 Coalition (South El Monte, El Monte, Rosemead, Monterey Park, Montebello, City of Industry)	Debriefing
Monday, November 9, 2009	Del Mar City Council Meeting	HST Overview
Tuesday, November 10, 2009	Metro Eastside Coordination Meeting - Rebrief - SR60 & Engineering Next Steps	Ongoing coordination meeting
Tuesday, November 10, 2009	University Community Planning Group - San Diego	High points of what was raised during public scoping, specifically the San Diego/University City meetings
Thursday, November 12, 2009	Caltrans External Advisory Liaison (CEAL) committee meeting	Meeting with Caltrans CEAL committee requested by Chris Schmidt
Thursday, November 12, 2009	Inland Valley Development Agency (IVDA) / San Bernardino International Airport -Authority Staff Briefing with Mike Burrows and Alex Estrada	Follow up briefing

Table 2-1
Summary of Outreach Activities

Date	Organization/Individual	Purpose
Thursday, November 12, 2009	Rose Creek Watershed Alliance Meeting (P)	Rose Creek Watershed Alliance meeting requested by Debbie Knight. Public scoping follow up meeting to discuss issues related to Rose Canyon.
Monday, November 16, 2009	So Cal ICG Meeting	Ongoing coordination meeting
Wednesday, November 18, 2009	San Gabriel Valley City Manager's Group	Briefing
Wednesday, November 18, 2009	Inland Empire Caucus	Presentation
Thursday, November 19, 2009	San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments - Transportation Committee	Presentation

3.0 Public Scoping Summary of Issues

The goals of project public scoping include identification of the range of alternatives and environmental effects that will require analysis in the EIR/EIS. The LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section HST project public scoping process identified issues with proposed alignments and stations, suggestions for new or modified alignments and stations, and areas of potential concern related to the proposed HST System. The following is a summary of the comments received during the public scoping process. Comments were submitted in the following ways:

- Verbally to court reporters at public scoping meetings
- Comment forms submitted at public scoping meetings
- Mailed comment forms
- Mailed personal comment letters
- Mailed Agency letters
- E-mails

Approximately, 1,243 comments from agencies, organizations and individuals were received, of which at least 80 were verbal public scoping comments. Several individuals submitted two or more comments. Tables 3-1 through Table 3-7 summarize comments submitted and are divided by county for organizational purposes. Comments are reproduced in Appendices G through M and should be referred to for the complete content.

In general, the comments received addressed the following topics:

- The location of stations
- The location of the HST alignment
- The benefits of HST, including air quality, congestion relief, and economic development
- Connections to local transit
- General support for the project
- Fast tracking the project
- Noise and vibration impacts
- Questions about cost and financing of the system
- Economic growth issues
- Benefits/impacts on local businesses
- Employment opportunities
- Ridership estimates
- Property acquisition
- Displacement of people
- Potential devaluation of property
- Parks and recreation
- Open space
- Funding for the proposed project
- Visual impacts
- Water quality and runoff
- Parking availability
- Integration of HST with existing and planned regional and local transportation/transit efforts
- Impacts to plant and animal species, including associated habitats
- Impacts to wildlife corridor movement
- Geology, including faults and earthquakes
- Safety/Hazards
- Conflict with location of utility corridors
- Land use compatibility

- Agriculture
- Cultural and historic resources

3.1 Scoping Summary of Alternative Alignments and Stations

This section summarizes comments pertaining to possible alternative alignment and station development received during the public scoping process for the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section of the proposed HST project. This discussion will guide the development of alternative options to be evaluated as part of the alternatives analysis process for the project.

3.1.1 Los Angeles County

Stations

Local groups indicated concern about impacts in the vicinity of LA Union Station and how information on each of the different HST sections (i.e. LA-Anaheim Section and LA-Palmdale) which converge at this location is being disseminated to the community.

There were comments in support of stations in El Monte, Cal Poly Pomona, and downtown Pomona. One commenter felt that there should be more stations between LA Union Station and Ontario Airport.

Some comments suggested a connection to Los Angeles International (LAX) Airport.

Alignments

Comments from individuals varied with respect to alignments in Los Angeles County. Some people were against having the HST alignment follow the MetroLink, or if this alignment were chosen, that quiet zones should be considered where residences are nearby. Some commenters opposed an alignment along SR 60, but one preferred the SR 60 to the UPRR option. Various commenters identified the I-10 route as a route that could potentially alleviate traffic.

3.1.2 San Bernardino County

Stations

Commenters noted that the project should maximize the opportunity to connect the HST with the Multi-Modal Transit Facility development proposed in the downtown San Bernardino area. Several commenters were in favor of locating an HST station in this area to provide intermodal connectivity with the region's planned transportation projects.

Alignments

Several comments were received about the need to extend the HST through the San Bernardino area, given it is the largest growing county in the region. The project would support the economic revitalization of eastern San Bernardino and also serve existing and future populations in areas such as Redlands, Highlands, and San Bernardino. San Bernardino provides a logical linkage to areas such as Palm Springs and the Coachella Valley and would serve as a connecting hub for future extension of the HST System to areas further east, including Arizona.

Commenters also voiced frustration with existing congestion on local freeways and roadways and recognize the HST System as a solution to traffic congestion, especially since many people travel from San Bernardino to reach major job centers such as Los Angeles. Other commenters noted the importance

of providing air/rail connectivity between the HST and Ontario Airport, San Bernardino Airport, and March ARB.

The San Bernardino International Airport Authority (SBIAA) and the Inland Valley Development Agency (IVDA) expressed support to extend the HST alignment through the Inland Empire to maximize the economic development opportunities in this region of California. The State Water Resources Board expressed concern about potential infrastructure impacts to their existing facilities in relation to the proposed HST alternative alignments that would extend across the state aqueduct in the I-215 area. They would like to work closely with the Authority during the alternatives analysis process and share information to avoid impacts.

3.1.3 Riverside County

Stations

Preferred station locations mentioned in comments included Riverside, Corona, and Murrieta.

One commenter requested that a station in Corona be located near the Naval Warfare Center. Another thought that the station should be located closer to the central portion of the city.

One commenter opposed a station at UC Riverside because of poor transit connections, insufficient parking, and community opposition to a previously proposed transit station, preferring a station at the proposed Multi-Modal Transit Facility in downtown Riverside.

Alignments

Twelve comments from individuals were in favor of an HST alignment along the I-215 and nine were in favor of an alignment along the I-15. The Corona Chamber of Commerce also submitted 643 form letters signed by different individuals in favor of the I-15 alignment.

The majority of comments in favor of the I-215 alignment point out that major population centers (San Bernardino and Riverside) would be excluded if the HST follows the I-15. Comments in favor of the I-15 alignment cite benefits to local businesses and residents, and state that I-15 is a major corridor for movement of goods and people from Orange County.

3.1.4 San Diego County

Stations

Generally, the comments suggested the HST stations be located in areas with larger populations, support connections to existing and proposed transit systems and projects (i.e., trolley, buses, freeways, bicycle lanes), and areas identified as existing or planned smart growth. Other comments indicated the HST stations should support and promote regional Multi-Modal Transit Facility connections. Comments on the HST stations also included a range of recommendations from fewer stops in order to meet expected travel times to more stations to facilitate HST to function more like the trolley system.

The proposed station locations in Escondido, University Towne Centre (UTC)/University City, and San Diego received comments both in support and opposition. Comments supporting station locations also included the following suggestions and preferences:

- Lindbergh Field - specifically the Intermodal Transit Center
- City of Escondido - specifically the Escondido Transit Center

- UTC - parking would be utilized and service businesses as well as connecting with the Mid Coast Corridor project
- University City - if this option is not proposed, then a trolley extension to UTC and an NCTD Coaster station at Nobel Drive is suggested

Comments opposing station locations included the following concerns:

- UTC – currently the area is too congested and lacks ridership; SANDAG recommends removing this station option from further consideration in the project EIR/EIS.
- Lindbergh Field – some comments question HST service connection with the airport and noted this seems to conflict and compete against other modes of transportation rather than provide a transit option

A variety of HST station options was also suggested; however, the majority of the comments supported a station at Qualcomm Stadium. These alternative station options included the following:

- Qualcomm Stadium - utilize existing parking and connect with the trolley system
- Mira Mesa Boulevard - integrate it with a planned transit center at I-15 and Hillary at Miramar College to support public transportation to a populated area and provide access to existing freeway and major roads
- Miramar instead of Qualcomm Stadium before terminus in downtown San Diego
- Miramar area – also received suggestion to extend the trolley system to service UTC/UCSD area
- Shared NCTD Coaster station in Sorrento Valley
- Near I-5 or I-805 to prevent traffic impacts
- Locate a station at City of Solana Beach
- Westfield North County in the City of Escondido
- Extend the route from Santa Fe Depot downtown San Diego to 32nd Street Naval Base and connect with I-15 making stops at all communities north to the City of Escondido
- Santa Fe Depot downtown San Diego to connect with other modes of transportation
- Kinder Morgan site
- City of National City and to connect with trolley to I-5
- City of Chula Vista
- Rodriguez International Airport in Tijuana, Baja California, Mexico

Though there was much support for a station at Qualcomm Stadium, there was a comment opposing a station in the Mission Valley area/Qualcomm Stadium. This comment also stated the HST connections should include major urban corridors such as downtown San Diego and UTC.

Alignments

The majority of comments associated with the alignment were specifically focused on the segment through Rose Canyon, with many commenters opposed to tunneling underneath Rose Canyon. The comments from the residents surrounding Rose Canyon typically proposed the route to continue along I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium in order to avoid the canyon and associated open space park. A large number of comments supported and suggested the alignment to follow I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. This alignment would allow for a connection with the existing trolley system and provides access to parking. One comment suggested enhancing trolley service to support access to the HST System and expanding the public transit network system.

Although there was a strong majority of comments opposing the route through Rose Canyon, there were some comments in support of the route through Rose Canyon and University City with stations in either the UTC area or University City.

A number of other alignment options were suggested to avoid Rose Canyon and/or extend the HST service to connect with existing and planned transit efforts and support access to other areas of San Diego County, mainly south and east San Diego County. These suggested options include the following:

- Utilize existing freeway corridors such as I-15, I-5, SR 163, and I-8 to reach downtown San Diego.
- Utilize the existing rail corridor along the coast.
- Connect from I-15 to I-5 via Miramar Road.
- Connect from I-15 to I-5 via SR 56 or the neighborhood of 4S Ranch.
- Continue along I-15 to SR 94 into downtown San Diego.
- Extend the route to reach Kearny Mesa.
- Extend the route from Qualcomm Stadium or Lindbergh Field to the border to provide service to south San Diego County; another option would be provide shuttle service from the high-speed rail terminus to the border.
- Extend the route from Santa Fe Depot downtown San Diego to 32nd Street Naval Base and connect with I-15 making stops at all communities north to Escondido.
- Plan the alignment along I-15 with a terminus at Rodriguez International Airport in Tijuana, Baja California, Mexico.
- Extend the alignment from San Diego to Chula Vista.
- Plan the alignment along I-15 to National City and connect with the trolley to I-5.

Despite some opposition to tunneling, a variety of tunneling options were also suggested and included the following:

- Tunnel under Rose Canyon and/or University City and connect with I-5 above ground.
- Tunnel under Carroll Canyon directly to Lindbergh Field.
- Tunnel under MCAS Miramar.
- Tunnel under I-5 and La Jolla Village Drive north to the existing Coaster station in Sorrento Valley and then along SR 56 to connect with I-15.
- Tunnel from Qualcomm Stadium under Balboa Park to downtown San Diego.
- Tunnel from Temecula to Escondido.
- Tunnel under the community of Rainbow.
- Divert from I-15 from Temecula through Rainbow and reconnect with the Stewart Canyon area.
- Start from the west side of I-15 just south of SR 79/Temecula with the tunnel transitioning to the east side of the corridor just north of the intersection of Old Highway 395 and 5th Street, following the corridor to the intersection of Old Highway 395 and Reche Road before the tunnel would pass back under I-15 with the south end of the tunnel on the hillside west of I-15, elevate alignment over San Luis Rey River, and continue in tunnel south of the river and west of Old Highway 395.

While the majority of the comments expressed opposition to the route through Rose Canyon and suggested an alternative alignment along I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium, there were a number of comments received that strongly opposed the route along I-15 starting in Escondido south through the communities of Sabre Springs and Rancho Peñasquitos, particularly in the communities of Rancho Bernardo.

Comments received also included opposition to other alignment options, which include the following:

- Executive Drive or Regents Road in the UTC/University City area due to proximity to schools
- Centre City Parkway in the City of Escondido
- Through any canyon and/or watershed as well as open space parks (i.e., Marian Bear Park, Rose Creek, Los Peñasquitos Canyon, Carroll Canyon, Lake Hodges, San Pasqual Valley, Battle Mountain, Green Valley Creek, San Luis Rey River, San Diego River)
- Unincorporated communities of Rainbow and Bonsall in northern San Diego County

3.2 Environmental Concerns

The following discussion summarizes public comments received pertaining to environmental concerns for the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section of the proposed HST project. The list below includes all environmental issues mentioned.

- Visual impacts: project in general, stations, elevated track, glare, night lighting
- Air quality: if project not implemented; HST's potential emissions, dust, vehicle emissions
- Environmental justice impacts on communities
- Community cohesion
- Fiscal impacts
- Construction impacts (tunneling)
- Safety/Hazards
- Global warming (if HST is not implemented)
- Growth inducement
- Electromagnetic field impacts on humans and animals
- Noise and vibration impacts
- Transportation/Circulation impacts: crossings, blocked roads, blocked intersections, congestion if HST is not implemented
- Impacts to parks and recreation
- Impacts to open space
- Impacts on the value of housing/property
- Water quality and runoff
- Parking
- Impacts to plant and animal species, including associated habitats
- Listed species and habitat impacts
- Impacts to wildlife corridor movement
- Geology, including faults and earthquakes, mineral resources
- Conflict with location of utility corridors
- Land use
- Agriculture
- Cultural and historic resources

3.2.1 Los Angeles County

Concern was expressed by a local Native American Tribe regarding cultural impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains. It was requested that a Native American monitor be present during ground-disturbing activities to avoid or minimize impacts.

Several commenters were concerned about the possibility of losing property due to eminent domain or that property value would decrease if the HST alignment were placed near their home.

Noise was cited as a concern by some, and placing the HST underground near residential areas was suggested as a possible solution.

3.2.2 San Bernardino County

Commenters were concerned about the potential land use displacement impacts, noise impacts to surrounding residential uses, and land use compatibility with local planning projects. A few commenters acknowledged the air quality and energy benefits that would occur with the project.

3.2.3 Riverside County

One comment indicated that the route through Riverside along the I-215/SR 60 would be less environmentally damaging than that along Watkins Drive because Watkins Drive crosses through an MSHCP criteria cell. The commenter also noted that a route on the west side of the freeway would have less impact due to the presence of a riparian corridor on the east side.

A few commenters were concerned about property take, or about impacts to adjacent properties such as senior citizen communities along the I-215. Concern was also expressed about construction impacts.

Some commenters expressed concern about the energy source for trains, preferring alternative "green" energy sources.

One comment inquired about accommodating passengers with bicycles, and asked how bicycle corridors might be improved in the vicinity of stations.

A few commenters voiced concern about earthquakes and fault lines.

A few commenters were concerned about noise and vibration impacts.

3.2.4 San Diego County

The majority of comments expressed support for the HST project and believed the project will help to reduce traffic congestion and air pollution. General project concerns that were raised included right-of-way acquisition and easements; decrease property values and take; noise and vibration; biological resources; parks and recreation; visual impacts associated with the elevated track, catenary poles, and light and glare; overall quality of life; adequate and available parking associated with the HST stations; support of existing and planned intermodal connections; and the relationship with existing general and community plans, including military activity and regional goals. Many comments requested the HST design efforts be coordinated directly with regional and local planning efforts to ensure consistency and compatibility as well as proper integration into General Plans and Community Plans for the various jurisdictions along the proposed alignment. Such jurisdictions ranged from cities, County of San Diego, MCAS Miramar, Port of San Diego, and Caltrans. Several comments also requested HST design details are made available. The consistency of the project with SB 375 and long-range goals regarding greenhouse gas emissions was noted. In addition, concerns regarding historic preservation in Old Town were identified.

Environmental issues associated with the alignment through Rose Canyon included concerns with the decrease in property values, increase in noise and vibration, and changes in traffic circulation. Impacts to biological resources were frequently identified by comments related to Rose Canyon, specifically animal and plant species, habitat, wetlands and riparian areas, open space preservation and consistency with the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), and dividing and creating fragmentation within the canyon for wildlife corridor movement. Additional environmental issues included compatibility with surrounding land uses, geology and faults/earthquakes, decrease or loss of various recreational uses,

security issues with the introduction of fencing, decrease in water quality, geology (faults and earthquakes), and visual impacts.

Comments associated with the alignment along I-15 starting in the City of Escondido through the communities of Sabre Springs and Rancho Peñasquitos strongly expressed concern over the lack of available space to support a high-speed rail alignment, property take, decrease in property values, increase in noise and vibration impacts, and the degradation of community character and neighborhoods along this corridor. Additional concerns included visual impacts due to an elevated track, particularly over Lake Hodges/San Pasqual Valley and the hillsides west of I-15 in the neighborhood of 4S Ranch. Encroachment to various open space areas and canyons (i.e., Los Peñasquitos Canyon, Green Valley Creek, Battle Mountain) were also identified as issues. Comments also questioned the project cost and feasibility for construction and operation and if the project objectives will be achieved, meet anticipated ridership demands, and/or promote projected ridership.

Concerns raised by comments for the northern portion of San Diego County in the unincorporated communities of Rainbow and Bonsall include water quality, compatibility with community plans and land use (agricultural and rural environment), decrease in property values, seismic and hydraulic constraints (particularly with a high water table), impacts to mineral resources, and impacts to utilities (i.e., aqueducts, natural gas, and power transmission lines).

3.3 Technical/Engineering Concerns

The following section summarizes public comments received pertaining to technical/engineering concerns for the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section of the proposed HST project.

3.3.1 Project-wide

Several commenters recommended expedited review and completion of design and planning studies. Others commented on economic feasibility of project construction. A few commenters suggested revisiting the coastal corridor alternative evaluated in the 2005 Program EIR/EIS.

UPRR noted various technical issues, including right-of-way constraints and projected traffic growth that limit use of the rail corridor for other uses. UPRR also cited the requirement to obtain authority from the federal Surface Transportation Board in order to abandon or discontinue freight services over main or branch lines of a railroad and stated that any attempt to interfere with operations or appropriate by eminent domain will force a de facto abandonment of freight service in violation of federal law. UPRR further stated it has no interest in freight consolidation. UPRR also stated that grade-separated crossings must be provided for freight, that freight on any HST trackage should not be contemplated, and freight must comply with all FRA regulations. Finally, UPRR believes that it is not possible or practical to devise mitigation to permit shared use of any of its track.

3.3.2 Los Angeles County

One commenter was concerned about connecting the alignment to LA Union Station since the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section and the LA-Anaheim Section of the HST will need to connect, along with a planned Metro regional connector. One person questioned whether the rails would be held down by screws or railroad ties and spikes, and cautioned that spikes could move up and out of the wood due to vibration. Another was concerned that the speed of the trains would cause safety issues.

3.3.3 San Bernardino County

One commenter requested information on ticket pricing and its affordability by workers. Another commenter inquired about the economic benefits to local business. One commenter noted that aerial

trench and tunnel options need to be balanced with property acquisition costs and total miles of route. Several commenters requested cost information. One commenter requested that the HST System use electricity drawn from local sources and not via corporations and the HST System should use renewable wind power or solar energy. Linkages to areas further east such as Las Vegas were also noted as a benefit of providing HST in the San Bernardino area.

3.3.4 Riverside County

Concern was expressed about interruption of existing rail service during project construction, and one commenter recommended coordination with local existing rail.

Commenters were interested in ensuring adequate parking at stations, and concerned that local transit facilities are not currently equipped to support the project.

3.3.5 San Diego County

General project concerns included right-of-way and easement acquisition and property take. Many comments requested project design details and analysis to support and justify the HST project. Some commenters expressing support for the project concept and goals also believed the project will help to promote economic growth. Comments received also requested the timing and schedule for project completion. The cost and funding for HST project construction, maintenance, and operation were questioned. These questions include specific explanations regarding the feasibility and demand for the project as well as calculating the cost per ridership and as compared to other modes of transportation. Many comments requested the identification of funding sources for the HST. Some comments suggested the funding and efforts be redirected to improve and expand existing infrastructure (i.e., freeways, HOV lanes, buses, trolley). One comment requested the cost breakdown and comparison of seat-per-mile versus flying in order to support project justification.

A variety of comments and questions were received related to the design and operation of the HST project. These comments and questions include the following:

- What is the curve radius, rate, and distance for the alignment when decelerating and accelerating into and out of a station?
- Additional information requested on the availability of parking associated with the proposed stations.
- Where will the trains be stored?
- Will the trains operate at night?
- What is the energy/power source for the trains and emergency energy storage? Will the voltage interfere with other electronic equipment?
- Additional detail requested regarding the technology proposed for the HST project and if mag-lev technology would be an option.

A few questions were raised regarding the maintenance facility and primarily pertained to the location(s) and the associated activities. Commenters requested detailed information on the size of the maintenance facility and building structures, and the types of activities related with maintenance, storage, and repair of trains to be conducted at the maintenance facility.

As previously noted, there is an overall support to have the HST project connect with existing and proposed transit systems and projects (i.e., trolley, buses, freeways, bicycle lanes) and more densely populated communities, especially areas identified as existing or planned transit oriented development (TOD) in support of smart growth planning objectives. Comments received also requested the

coordination with other existing and proposed transit service schedules to support the operation of intermodal transit services.

There were a number of concerns received that were focused on project-specific design features. Comments associated with the alignment along I-15 starting in the City of Escondido through the communities of Sabre Springs and Rancho Peñasquitos emphasized the conflict of the proposed HST alignment with on-going work along I-15 as well as associated HOV lanes and freeway widening efforts. A few of the commenters voiced concerns regarding vibration impacts on sensitive equipment at businesses in areas like UCSD and Sorrento Valley. General concern was raised regarding the safety of the trains, including pedestrian safety, as well as military security issues and interference/conflict with military operations. Commenters raised questions on the feasibility, safety, ventilation, and stability of tunnels in the area of Rose Canyon and communities of Rainbow and Bonsall. One comment requested an underpass or pedestrian bridge over the tracks at the start and end of the alignment in Rose Canyon to provide public access to the trails. Another comment suggested using Rose Canyon as an option for project mitigation.

3.4 Agency Responses to NOP/NOI

Agency representatives attended the public scoping meetings and numerous letters in response to the NOP/NOI were received. The following section summarizes the 62 comments received from agencies in response to the NOP/NOI and/or provided at one of the public scoping meetings. This section is subdivided into federal, state, regional, and local agencies, with local agencies categorized by those within the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section. Agency comments are reproduced in Appendices G through M and should be referred to for the complete content of the letter.

3.4.1 Federal

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

The USACE provided comments regarding the permitting requisites as outlined in the 404 Clean Water Act and indicated that the project may be subject to Section 408. The USACE concurred on the alternative most likely to yield the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA). Several alternatives to be considered for the project would require approval by the USACE. The USACE suggests that the project be constructed within or adjacent to existing transportation corridors where there are lower occurrences of potential sensitive biological and aquatic resources. The "No Action" alternative, and alternatives that avoid or minimize fill in waters of the U.S. must be carefully analyzed. Impacts resulting from the build alternatives must be compared to the No Action Alternative to understand the overall intensity and magnitude of impacts. The USACE suggests that the State Route 56 and Interstate 8 corridor be analyzed as alternative routes.

U.S. Bureau of Land Management

The BLM identified potential right-of-way issues within federal lands. Impacts to public lands and special designations should be analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS.

U.S. Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Coast Guard

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security noted that the HST needs to include the Coast Guard Bridge Office from the City of Los Angeles to the City of San Diego via the Inland Empire for all bridge related issues over existing or proposed navigable waters of the United States.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recommended FRA and the Authority follow through with mitigation commitments from the Statewide Programmatic EIR/EIS and attached the former list to their comment letter. EPA also provided recommendations for continued interagency and community coordination and recommendations, information sources, and guidance for various analyses such as:

- The relationship between this project and other transportation projects.
- Land use and transportation linkages, including integration of HST System with the existing MetroLink system, modifications to the existing rail network and rail crossings required for compatibility. The Draft EIR/EIS should also provide clarification how the previous proposal for the LA-San Diego - San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) corridor improvements relate to this project.
- Analysis of impacts on water resources, biological resources and wildlife (including wildlife movement impacts), noise and vibration (to residents and wildlife), energy resources, air quality (including greenhouse gases), environmental justice communities, and invasive species.
- Cumulative impacts
- Growth inducement
- Tunneling impacts

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

The USFWS had specific concerns about the potential for growth inducement, tunneling, and associated groundwater impacts. They expressed interest in working closely with the Authority early in the planning process to address issues and guide the process to minimize environmental impacts.

U.S. Marine Corps

The U.S. Marine Corps commented on the proximity of the alternative alignments to the MCAS Miramar facilities and identified potential issues of concern related to the Miramar Air Installation Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Area of Influence for land use planning purposes and FAA airspace surfaces. They are concerned about direct affects to routine military operations and fixed and rotary-wing aircraft entering to and from the installation. The Marine Corps noted the northern alternative alignments along Miramar Road and their proximity to military housing as well as sensitive natural habitats near Eastgate Mall. Of importance to the Marine Corps is the avoidance of impacts associated with any of the alternatives that may limit the Marine Corps' ability to perform mission-essential training and readiness requirements to meet national security objectives. The Marine Corps suggested close coordination with the Authority during preparation of the Draft EIS. Another area of concern is the potential alignment alternative along the I-15/Qualcomm corridor and acquisition of federal lands for construction. Such measures would require a formal written request from the Authority to the Department of Defense (DOD) to officially determine the viability of such a request.

3.4.2 State

California Department of Fish and Game

The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) commented on the various studies that will be required as part of the Draft EIR including completion of rare plant and rare natural communities surveys; assessment of sensitive fish, wildlife reptile and amphibian species; and completion of focused, species-specific surveys conducted at the appropriate time of year. The CDFG outlined the required procedures to address direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that may adversely affect biological

resources. The CDFG noted that, because the CDFG will use the EIR/EIS to issue findings, the document should summarize the technical data, maps, plans, diagrams, and similar information to permit full assessment of all significant impacts.

The CDFG informed the Authority that an incidental take permit is required for projects that could result in a "take" of species listed as threatened or endangered by the state. The CDFG also has regulatory authority for activities in streams and lakes that could adversely affect fish or wildlife and notes that a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement will likely be necessary for the project.

The CDFG opposes the elimination of watercourse (including concrete channels) and/or the canalization of natural and manmade drainages or conversion to subsurface drainages. All wetlands and watercourses must be retained with setbacks to preserve the riparian and aquatic habitat values. They recommend a minimum natural buffer of 500 feet from the outside edge of the riparian zone on each side of drainages.

Given the magnitude of this type of linear project that expands various diverse and biologically rich habitats, the CDFG strongly recommends a discussion of the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section HST project and its relation with the goals and objectives in existing and draft Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP) efforts. A separate and thorough discussion should be provided in the Draft EIR/EIS that addresses local multiple species habitat conservation planning efforts (e.g., City of San Diego's Multispecies Conservation Subarea Plan and County of San Diego's Draft North County MSCP) and effects on conservation strategies outlined within existing or draft NCCP/HCPs. Federal and State Incidental Take Permits (ITPs) for endangered/threatened species have been issued to local jurisdictions within San Diego County based upon plan conservation levels and conserved habitat configurations. The CDFG comments that major alterations to these ITPs may have to be modified and may affect a much broader area than just the footprint of the HST projects.

Finally, the CDFG provided guidance and information sources regarding analysis of impacts on species and habitat and encouraged close coordination with the CDFG regarding species surveys.

California Department of Conservation (Oil/Gas/Geothermal)

The Department of Conservation expressed concern about potential impacts to active, idle, plugged, and abandoned oil wells that exist throughout the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section. All potentially affected wells will need to be mapped, documented, and analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS. Coordination and permitting efforts will be required if the HST results in direct impacts to such facilities.

California Department of Transportation, District 7

Caltrans District 7 extended its support to the Authority with regards to environmental and engineering issues that occur within the state right-of-way. Caltrans may be identified as a Cooperating Agency, as FHWA's delegated NEPA agency, and directly involved in the environmental document and permitting process.

California Department of Transportation (joint letter on behalf of Districts 7, 8, and 11)

Caltrans accepts participation as a responsible agency pursuant to CEQA and as a cooperating agency pursuant to FHWA's delegated NEPA agency status. Caltrans would like to participate in all aspects of the environmental document and approval process including developing a refined purpose and need, providing input during alternative selection, and offering expertise on impact avoidance, minimization, and mitigation efforts.

Caltrans is interested in any impacts resulting from the proposed project on the physical, human, and natural environment and would like to evaluate measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate any adverse impacts. Of particular concern is increased traffic to and from proposed train stations, which may have a

significant impact on the state highway system. The agency noted that future grade separations may also have operational impacts on the state highway system and recommended that these be analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS.

Caltrans commented on the scope of analysis for traffic, siting of station locations in relation to local planning efforts, visual impacts, noise impacts, and stormwater requirements. Caltrans also noted that all work performed within their right-of-way requires review and approval by the department.

California Department of Water Resources

The Department of Water Resources is concerned about potential infrastructure impacts to the state water project in the southern leg of I-215. Close coordination with the Department is requested.

California State Lands Commission

The CA State Lands Commission (CSLC) commented that impacts to sovereign or school lands for project buildout would require a lease from the CSLC. They requested a thorough review of greenhouse gas emissions and consistency with the California Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32). Detailed mapping and information was requested upon availability.

California Transportation Commission

General comments were provided by the CTC regarding its role to allocate funds for design, right-of-way or construction activities, new public road connection, and route adoptions following the environmental review process.

CA Senator Christine Kehoe, 39th District

Senator Kehoe recommends no more than two stations should be included in San Diego County, including Lindbergh Field (future Intermodal Transportation Center) and at Escondido Transit Center. She supports analysis along I-5 and I-15 corridors and recommends that the public's benefit be kept in mind regarding intercity rail. She supports extension of the HST System to the U.S.-Mexico border and linking transportation improvements with smart growth land uses.

State of California Coastal Commission

The Coastal Commission indicates that the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section may be subject to a coastal development permit and/or federal certifications. The proposed alignments in the San Diego section traverse through the coastal zone boundary and may impact sensitive resources including wetlands and coastal sage scrub. The Commission also recommends reviewing and addressing impacts to ridership, operation, and phased implementation in the portion of the alignment that traverses through the LOSSAN corridor, which lies within the Coastal Zone.

State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation

The California Department of Parks and Recreation had concerns with potential impacts to Old Town San Diego State Historic Park associated with the HST operational activities and associated visual, historic, noise and vibration, air pressure and quality, traffic delays, public access, and parking impacts. The department expressed concern with potential downstream impacts between Carroll Canyon and Los Peñasquitos Lagoon within Torrey Pines State Natural Reserve (sediment and urban runoff).

State of California Public Utilities Commission

The State Public Utilities Commission is concerned about the HST crossing along existing freight and passenger lines in downtown San Diego. The Commission expressed concern that the HST will affect quiet zones in downtown San Diego; that the extension of the alternative alignment to downtown San Diego would potentially disrupt the nature of the Ash Street crossing and possibly other nearby crossings within the quiet zone. They also recommend consolidation and grade separation of all existing at-grade crossings along the adopted alignment. Elevated tracks or lowering of tracks at major urban center are recommended to avoid pedestrian safety issues. The Commission requests additional meetings to review detailed plans and placement of electrical lines.

State Water Resources Board

State Water Resources Board commented on potential impacts to water quality and beneficial uses during construction and operations of the project. No net loss of impacts should occur. Comments were provided regarding avoidance and minimization of impacts to riparian and wetland vegetation, drainage channels, and intermittent and perennial stream banks. The Board recommends incorporation of low-impact development design techniques. Hydrological effects of the project associated with changes to existing flow volume, channel location/size, or rate of discharge should be thoroughly analyzed in the DEIR/DEIS.

Regional Water Quality Control Board

The RWQCB expressed concerns about the potential hydrological effects of the project and potential groundwater impacts if dewatering is necessary for construction and operation of trenched or tunneled segments in the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section. The project is subject to comply with waste discharge requirements set by the RWQCB. The RWQCB recommends that the DEIS/DEIR include an anti-degradation study for the project so it would not degrade U.S. and state waters.

3.4.3 Regional

San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

The governing board of the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments unanimously voted to "support in concept" the California HST Project, including the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section, to be routed through and include at least one station in the San Gabriel Valley.

Southern California Association of Governments

SCAG has determined that the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section HST project is regionally significant; therefore, the RTP and Compass Growth Visioning (CGV) would be applicable to the project and those policies would need to be reviewed for consistency. SCAG encourages that their List of Mitigation Measures be reviewed for guidance in mitigating any potentially negative regional impacts associated with the project.

Additionally, SCAG commented that all major transportation investments in the region must be incorporated and integrated into SCAG's RTP in order to pursue federal funds and seek project-level NEPA clearance. The LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section is not in the current RTP. New projects can be incorporated into the RTP either through an amendment or a regular update which occurs every four years. SCAG also requests that the project is coordinated with planned goods movement projects and programs as defined in the 2008 RTP and Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan.

San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG)

SANBAG acknowledged their support for the Authority's project. They expressed support for two station locations: Ontario Airport, and the Rialto and "E" Transit Center in the City of San Bernardino. The Ontario Airport would provide a connection with international airports planned for expansion. A potential station location at Ontario Airport would offer potential for high ridership due to its central location including areas to the east in San Bernardino Valley. This location allows growth in air traffic, commercial and residential development around the airport, together with easy access to two major freeways. Rialto and "E" Transit Center provide convergence of several transportation modes including the SBX BRT, MetroLink, Redlands light rail, and connections with the San Bernardino International Airport (SBIA).

Western Municipal Water District

Western Municipal Water District requested correspondence concerning the proposed route of the HST once the decision is made. The HST alternative alignments via the I-15 or the I-215 would extend the Water District's jurisdiction.

Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District

The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District owns and operates various drainage facilities located along proposed routes and will likely be required to issue encroachment permits. They indicated that the project needs to comply with National Flood Insurance Program regulations and local floodplain management ordinances. Each incorporated city along the route is also responsible for compliance. They expressed concern about watersheds and watercourses being crossed by the proposed project. They commented that the project needs to comply with Western Riverside MSHCP and NPDDS Stormwater Permitting.

San Diego Association of Governments

SANDAG indicated that a station at the proposed Lindbergh Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) must be included in the process and the HST should directly serve the downtown San Diego area. They recommend that fewer stops be included for the section of the HST between LA and San Diego with no more than four stops during express service and recommend the elimination of a University City station and inclusion of the station locations in Escondido and at the Lindbergh ITC. SANDAG supports the efforts to plan, design, and construct HST along this corridor. SANDAG acknowledges that the Escondido Transit Center (ETC) is the preferred Escondido station. The City of Escondido should be involved in the corridor process. All station locations should provide regional multimodal connections and be located at or near existing or planned smart growth areas. They would like the project to consider the SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor and work closely for both services to share the same general corridor between Old Town Transit Center and University City, including potential tunnels option in the University City area. In addition, consideration for ongoing and future planning and project development along the LOSSAN corridor for commuter and intercity rail services is important and SANDAG would like to continue work with the Authority to pursue the possible future extension to the International Border. Lastly, they suggest continuing to work collaboratively on the feasibility to serve commuters along the I-15 corridor.

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority

The San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) commented that, as the Airport Land Use Commission for San Diego County, SDCRAA must review projects within the Airport Influence Area to determine consistency with the applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, and the Project EIR should evaluate land use compatibility with respect to the plan. Destination Lindbergh, a multi-agency planning effort that evaluated off-airport alternatives for ground transportation connecting with the airport, incorporated a high-speed rail station, and should be referenced in evaluating high-speed rail station locations. The SDCRAA noted that the Project EIR/EIS should also include analyses of circulation and

traffic impacts on city streets serving the airport, and describe how demand for vehicle parking will be accommodated. Any potential opportunities to improve transit connectivity to and through and high-speed rail stations are encouraged.

Air Pollution Control District (APCD) of San Diego

APCD commented on several issues to be considered for study: increased pedestrian and bike trips outside of stations and safety issues such as increases present; traffic issues including traffic diversion from airports, and from local roads and highways; net air quality benefits; parking alternatives including pricing; increased transit services and associated air quality impacts; potential increased land development near stations and associated air quality impacts/benefits.

The APCD is interested in the timeframe for air quality analysis since there are immediate and induced impacts, in addition to impacts within 10, 15, and 20 years. The APCD feels that this project provides an opportunity for the state to demonstrate best practices for local roads and urban design. They applaud the plan having urban design guidelines and would like to review and comment on the guidelines. The APCD would like to see funding provided to the local governments to implement traffic calming, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit design within a certain vicinity of the station. There will be traffic safety issues, not only in the vicinity of the station but further away from the station. There would be traffic diversion from airports and net air quality benefits. The APCD conjectured that there will be some relieving of development in the region due to development relocating to the station area – what will be the net impacts? Parking for the project would require land or building upwards and planning should ask: how far away can you build parking and still allow them to serve the station in a way that is attractive for passengers for downtown San Diego? Where and how will parking alternatives be managed? What is the pricing for parking? Free parking is not a good idea for this facility. Any new transit services are induced as a result of parking. The net air quality impacts should include new transit services.

3.4.4 Los Angeles County Local Agencies

City of Alhambra

City of Alhambra acknowledged their support for the concept of high-speed rail and the program and alternative alignment currently being considered. If alignment options change, for example if an alignment were altered to run from LA Union Station along the I-10 passing through California State University at Los Angeles, the City would want to review and provide additional comments.

City of Claremont

City of Claremont noted that they are strongly opposed to the use of the Metro/MetroLink railroad right-of-way between El Monte and the Ontario Airport because it goes through the City of Claremont and Claremont's historic downtown Village and would result in severe environmental impacts on the community. The City feels there is insufficient right-of-way due to planned Gold Line tracks being added adjacent to MetroLink, which already requires acquisition of property. In addition, maintaining Claremont's historic depot as the hub for transit operations imposes restraints on pedestrian access to the platform such that grade separation may not be feasible for pedestrian crossing across the tracks.

The City also commented on another concern for the community character and connectivity that the City has developed, which is based on historic preservation, providing a pedestrian experience, and creating livability. A high-speed train through the center of Claremont would act as a physical barrier, separating parts of the city, and because of the nature of the local residences (one-story homes on small properties) there is no way to provide a buffer for noise and vibration. Grade separating a high-speed train from local roads would not be feasible because necessary gradients and clearances for approaches could not be provided.

City of Covina

The City of Covina opposes the use of the MetroLink San Bernardino right-of-way as a potential HST corridor, due to the impact an elevated structure adjacent to residential neighborhoods would have on the community. The City of Covina supports an HST alignment that would use the I-10 corridor and make a San Gabriel Valley stop at the City of El Monte Bus Terminal, because the El Monte Bus Terminal is the busiest bus terminal west of Chicago and is scheduled to be rebuilt, making it the most logical location for intermodal connections in the San Gabriel Valley.

City of La Verne

The City of La Verne requested that evaluation of the project in the Project Draft EIR/EIS address all relevant matters, including, but not limited to: coordination with the proposed nearby Gold Line light rail; aesthetics; potential disruption to existing land uses, including housing and commercial/industrial uses; noise; necessary grade separations; possible loss of mature trees; and potential traffic impacts.

City of Pomona

The City Council of the City of Pomona unanimously voted to adopt a resolution identifying Pomona's preference for the alignment of the Inland Empire Section of the HST project and asserting the City's desire for the placement of an HST station within the City's limits.

City of South El Monte

The City of South El Monte supports the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section of the HST via the I-10 with a major transportation hub in the City of El Monte. The City of El Monte states that the creation of the rail along the I-10 would significantly reduce the highly congested I-10 by providing a major east-to-west alternative. A station in El Monte would provide a needed regional transportation hub in San Gabriel Valley. The connectivity, Los Angeles via the San Gabriel Valley to Ontario onto San Diego, would alleviate substantial congestion and increase connectivity to the region.

City of West Covina

The City of West Covina supports the alternative alignment along the San Bernardino Freeway (I-10) with a HST rail station in West Covina. They recommend consideration of the HST rail station at the Westfield West Covina Shopping Center. The city is a member of a Joint Powers Authority named the Southern California High-Speed Transport Authority, along with the cities of Los Angeles and Ontario, which seeks to develop and implement high-speed rail service that is integrated with other high-speed railways.

County of Los Angeles, Department of Parks and Recreation - Planning and Development Agency

The County of Los Angeles, Department of Parks and Recreation expressed concern with impacts to county trails (proposed Los Angeles River trail extension, Rio Hondo River trail, San Gabriel River trail, San Jose Creek trail, and Schabarum trail) and parks (Saybrook park, Parque de Los Sueños, and Amigo Park). The County feels that the Proposed Los Angeles River Trail would most safely cross under the HST rail line, and that this would also support a wildlife corridor. In addition, the County is concerned with noise and air quality impacts to recreational users, and indicates that mitigation measures would need to be developed to reduce these impacts. The County also states that the project needs to avoid heavily used recreation areas, parks, open space, and wildlife corridors.

County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works

County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works recommends the project address the impact of discharging into the Los Angeles County Flood Control District's (LACFCD) drainage system, including any increase in the volume discharged and introduction of pollutants. The Project EIR/EIS should also detail any impacts the project would have on LACFCD properties. Since the project site is located within potentially liquefiable areas, geotechnical reports should be included in the Draft EIR/EIS as necessary. The department commented that permits from Public Works' Construction Division will be required for all works impacting County roads or the LACFCD. They noted that the following Public Works road construction projects may be impacted by the HST project: Nogales Street at Railroad Street; Nogales Street (LA Subdivision) Grade Separation - ACE Projects; Fullerton Road Grade Separation Project; therefore, the lead agency must coordinate with Public Works to ensure that the design and construction of the HST do not conflict with the planned road construction projects.

Los Angeles County - Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)

The Los Angeles County Metro supports the concept of the high-speed rail. They asked that an adequate number of potential horizontal alignments to be studied, specifically an I-10 alignment originating from Union Station in downtown Los Angeles and running east toward San Bernardino County. There is a concern that the brevity of the proposed schedule for the Alternatives Analysis and Draft EIR/EIS may not be adequate to allow necessary analysis and for local agencies to interface with their city officials and community. Metro requested that station location considerations should be made with detailed analysis of local transit linkages and capacities, and the analysis should be consistent with goals of AB 32 and SB375, focusing in measures that would reduce vehicle miles traveled and vehicle trips. Metro also feels that the Authority should support and assist in funding improvements in the LOSSAN corridor.

Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning

The Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning has no specific comments at this time. However, they are generally concerned with the project's potential to result in significant impacts related to noise, visual, traffic, and community division.

Los Angeles World Airports

Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) is encouraged that the build alternatives include an HST station at LA/Ontario International Airport (ONT). LAWA commented that the EIR/EIS should discuss and evaluate the demand relationship between air passenger traffic at ONT and passengers using the HST. The analysis should include alternative methods of connecting passengers between the station and the airport terminals, and should discuss parking demand at the ONT and other proposed HST stations. The EIR/EIS must address coordination with the proposed Gold Line Light Rail extension to ONT. They request a review of synergy between the HST and a potential shuttle bus service between ONT and the City of Anaheim. Other issues which LAWA believes should be analyzed in the EIR/EIS are: ground access impacts at ONT; technical review of impact the HST technology could have on air traffic control; investigation to ensure compliance with Federal Aviation Administration height restrictions and clear zone restrictions; review of land use/zoning restrictions; noise impacts in combination with airport generated noise contours; quantified analysis of the environmental benefits of diverting air passengers to rail, including air quality benefits.

3.4.5 San Bernardino County Local Agencies

San Bernardino International Airport Authority

The San Bernardino International Airport Authority (SBIAA) supports the route through the Inland Empire, particularly through San Bernardino, to maximize economic development. In addition, they

support a station in San Bernardino. The SBIAA recommends the HST alignment through the Inland Empire to maximize the economic development opportunities in the region of California. They agree with the comments in the City of San Bernardino's letter, particularly with the comment pertaining to Airport Service to provide efficient air-rail-bus connectivity and that the alignment should connect through San Bernardino's Multi-Modal Transit Facility. SCAG's RTP forecasts increases in annual passenger at the San Bernardino International Airport (SBD) as well as ONT airports, and believes that the HST alignment should provide needed access to airports in the Southern California region.

City of Ontario

The City of Ontario would welcome a future meeting with project staff to discuss the Ontario airport station site planning. The City of Ontario believes that the Ontario Airport stop is a must and the project is strongly supported by the City.

Loma Linda University and Medical Center

Loma Linda University and Medical Center supports high-speed rail and is interested in its ability to serve the faculty, staff, students, patients, and visitors of their university and facilities. They support a station to connect the campus directly with the Multi-Modal Transit Facility in downtown San Bernardino and fully agree with the comment letter from the City of San Bernardino, which supports the project, and inclusion of San Bernardino in the route and station design options.

California State University, San Bernardino

California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) is interested in ensuring that the HST alignment through the Inland Empire maximizes the ability of thousands of students, faculty, staff, and visitors to access CSUSB by means of mass transit. In addition, they support the development of an SBX rapid Transit Bus line that will connect CSUSB campus directly with the San Bernardino Multi-Modal Transit Facility.

City of Highland

The City of Highland is in favor of the HST project and believes it will provide a viable and valuable transportation option for citizens of California and the City of Highland. The City supports an alignment that will extend high-speed rail through to a stop in the City of San Bernardino, which will provide improved access to the high-speed train for east San Bernardino Valley and encourage higher utilization of the trains.

City of San Bernardino

The City of San Bernardino is interested in ensuring that the alignment through the Inland Empire Section optimizes the purposes and objectives for the HST. The population of the San Bernardino area is among the largest in Southern California and the nation, and has experienced a high growth rate. The City of San Bernardino strongly believes that to maximize the HST project objectives adopted by the Authority, the Inland Empire Section of the HST requires a route alignment that includes an HST station in downtown San Bernardino.

The following are features of the San Bernardino area that would optimize the adopted objectives for the HST if an Inland Empire Section alignment with a station in downtown San Bernardino were selected: provide congestion relief for several over-utilized interstate highways and commercial airports (I-10, I-210, I-215, San Bernardino International Airport); the City of San Bernardino is identified as a key sustainable growth area; there is no other location in the Inland Empire that has or will have the transit connectivity of downtown San Bernardino; The City has been moving aggressively to create the plans and development incentives that will bring an urbanized future for its downtown city center; an alignment

through the downtown Multi-Modal Transit Facility could be largely accomplished using existing railroad rights-of-way and flood control right-of-way; The Multi-Modal Transit Facility is already in preliminary design and engineering; therefore, adding an HST station would add only an incremental cost; San Bernardino is located at the convergence of two potential interstate HST routes (to Las Vegas, Nevada and to Phoenix, Arizona), and is an ideal site for an intersection of the routes.

City of Fontana

The City of Fontana would prefer the HST alignment shown along the Metrolink Corridor to be located adjacent to the I-10 freeway corridor. This alignment would have less of an impact to residents and businesses than an alignment adjacent to the MetroLink. A high-speed rail line along the MetroLink Corridor would serve to negatively impact a predominately residential area and create a division in the City, so the City does not support the alternate alignment along the MetroLink Corridor.

City of Loma Linda

The City of Loma Linda strongly supports the San Bernardino alignment. Advantages of the San Bernardino alignment include location of an HST station with an intermodal mass transit center which would provide Omnitrans regular bus service, bus rapid transit service, and MetroLink commuter train service to allow access to the system by most people in the region. The station's close proximity to the San Bernardino International Airport opens another market for ridership. The I-215 and the I-10 freeway intersect close to the proposed HST station location.

City of Redlands

The City of Redlands is very interested in ensuring the CAHST alignment through the Inland Empire. They have worked closely with the City of San Bernardino and SANBAG to develop a light rail system that directly connects the University of Redlands, downtown Redlands, and the ESRI campus directly to the Multi-Modal Transit Center in downtown San Bernardino. They agree with the comments and analysis in the City of San Bernardino's letter to the CAHST, and the conclusion that it would be difficult to imagine how the adopted objectives for the CAHST could be optimized for the Inland Empire Section of the CAHST unless the alignment connects through the Multi-Modal Transit Center.

3.4.6 Riverside Local Agencies

City of Corona, Public Works Department

The City of Corona recently adopted a resolution supporting the overall implementation of the statewide HST system including the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section, and welcomes the consideration of alignment and station options within the city. They have no specific concerns at this time regarding scope of environmental analysis. However, they are concerned with the division points in the section analysis. March Air Reserve Base (ARB) and Mira Mesa create difficulties in the analysis and comparison of alternatives along the I-15 and I-215 corridors. They suggest that the subsection breaks at Ontario Airport and Temecula to better account for the alignment and station options currently under consideration.

City of Moreno Valley

The City of Moreno Valley is in favor of the project. The alignment must include the I-215 corridor because it will provide access to the major population centers of the Inland Empire - including Riverside, Moreno Valley, and San Bernardino. The I-15 corridor benefits only the city of Corona and ignores the majority of the population in the Inland region. The preferred location for a station in Riverside should be along the I-215 at March ARB. This location could be integrated into the new MetroLink station under development at this location. The I-215 route makes the most business sense.

City of Riverside, Community Development Department

The City of Riverside supports the HST project and strongly desires a station within the City along the I-215 alignment in the vicinity of UC Riverside. Based on the City's expected population and economic growth, the City is well-positioned to support the development of the HST system and placement of a station within the City. The environmental document should appropriately address all potential impacts on established neighborhoods within the bounds of the project area including but not limited to: quality of life issues, social justice issues, noise impacts, and potential displacements or relocations as they may relate to the I-215 alignment and the three proposed corridor portions through the City of Riverside.

Riverside County Transportation Commission

RCTC feels that it is too early for the Commission to take a position on a single alignment or a station location, but will continue to play an active role in the process of developing alternatives.

3.4.7 San Diego Local Agencies

County of San Diego

Overall, the County of San Diego is supportive of the HST project goals and objectives and favors routes along interstate corridors to minimize impacts to communities, property owners, natural habitats/corridors. Tunneling option would require geotechnical analysis. The County is concerned with faults; topographical constraints; vibration; groundwater; traffic; and disposal of mined material from the rock formations at locations of tunneling, which may produce high quality aggregate materials to be potentially used in the construction of the project and help defray cost. The County notes that the proposed alignment does not completely align with existing state highway facility of I-15 and will likely cross into unincorporated areas of northern San Diego County; therefore, any County roads that will be closed, realigned, or impacted by route or any other component of the project will need to be identified. Comments included the need to identify all details of project (i.e., alignment, tracks, right-of-way, stations, and other associated facilities and infrastructure). The project should note the proposed route will not preclude the construction of any planned County Circulation (Mobility) Element roads and will accommodate all planned County Circulation Element roads. Permits are required for any work within County right-of-way. The project should also consider the County's Transportation Impact Fee program as mitigation for any cumulative impacts to County facilities. The County has guidelines to determine the significance of environmental impacts in unincorporated areas of San Diego County and associated mitigation options. In addition, San Diego County currently is completing a North County MSCP map and plan under the NCCP. These guidelines and applicable data should be considered and utilized for the project.

City of San Diego, City Planning and Community Investment Department

The City of San Diego City Planning and Community Investment Department supports the efforts to plan, design, and construct the HST and believes that the station alternative at the Lindbergh ITC should be included. The stations should provide regional multimodal connections and consider vehicle parking demands, traffic impacts, and land use impacts. They would like the HST project to consider light rail transit along SANDAG's Mid-Coast Corridor and ensure services to share the same general corridor between Old Town Transit Center and University City, and to consider tunnel alignment options in University City area and/or use of the I-5 right-of-way, rather than Rose Canyon between I-805 and I-5. If a potential station exists at University City, it should be located in proximity to the planned Multi-Modal Transit Facility served by the Mid-Coast light rail transit extension and regional and local transit service. Impacts to view corridors identified in the relevant City community plans and local coastal program should be included. The City requests consideration for the following: grade alternatives along downtown to Old Town Transit Center corridor; potential impacts to City right-of-ways and public and private property; impacts to underground and above ground utilities; coordination and consistency with the

North Bay Redevelopment Project Area (portions of the corridor from downtown to the Old Town Transit Center and the Mid-Coast Corridor are within the North Bay Redevelopment Project Area) administered by the Redevelopment Agency of City of San Diego; improvements along the LOSSAN corridor; proposed extension to International Border; and alignment along the I-15 corridor.

City of San Diego, Planning and Land Use Department

The City of San Diego Planning and Land Use Department noted there is an option of looking at a route through University City that could potentially avoid using the Rose Canyon right-of-way and connect with I-5. The City of San Diego also requested an evaluation of the different alignments both at-and-below-grade and aerial structures to minimize visual impacts. SB 375 will need to be considered and addressed regarding the project and the work that local jurisdictions in the County of San Diego are working with SANDAG regarding the long-range assumptions being made for 2050 to avoid the commute out of the region (i.e., evaluate how to house future population for 2050). Project efforts would be coordinated with applicable jurisdictions to identify if current plans are in place or the appropriate land use assumptions to use as well as how this will be addressed in the environmental document. Parking at HST stations has been identified as a prominent issue for the City of San Diego, particularly in the University City area and downtown San Diego. Alternate transportation means using transit and other measures to reduce the parking demand and number of trips to the facilities would also need to be evaluated.

City of San Diego, Councilmembers Sherri Lightner (First District) and Donna Frye (Sixth District)

Councilmembers Sherri Lightner (First District) and Donna Frye (Sixth District) support bringing HST to San Diego. The HST will benefit the region by adding jobs, stimulating the economy, decreasing the demand for auto travel, and reducing overall carbon emissions. Consideration of an alignment alternative along the I-15 to a station at Qualcomm Stadium is suggested. This alignment would be cheaper to build, provide faster service to the region, and will attract more intercity passengers by 2020 than the two proposed alignments along the I-15 to the I-5 corridor according to data from the Final Program EIR/EIS for the proposed California HST System. This alignment will have lower potential impacts to aesthetic, visual, archaeological, and cultural resources. A stop at Qualcomm Stadium is centrally located in San Diego and provides opportunities for smart growth and redevelopment. This route would not preclude a final stop at the Lindbergh Field or downtown San Diego. An evaluation for an extension of the HST corridor to the international border with a station at Rodriguez International Airport is an opportunity to provide redevelopment and economic growth for Otay Mesa, San Ysidro, and the South Bay area. Meaningful public participation in the early stages of the project will provide opportunities for community involvement.

San Diego Unified School District Trustee, District A

The San Diego Unified School District Trustee is concerned with the proposed route in Rose Canyon regarding proximity to schools, fencing, and the open space park. They requested consideration of a route to follow an existing freeway corridor to avoid the Rose Canyon/park area.

Mira Mesa Community Planning Group

The Mira Mesa Community Planning Group is an officially recognized community planning group in the City of San Diego. Quarterly presentations on project status or at major milestones and an explanation on how the HST project would safely work and operate have been requested. In addition, the Mira Mesa Community Planning Group has also requested one viable alignment alternative to be provided that does not traverse through Mira Mesa in the alternatives analysis. Any alternative traversing through Mira Mesa would need to be evaluated for all impacts, especially noise and vibration in and across the canyons affecting surrounding residents. Each alternative should evaluate ridership levels generated. A description

of the station locations and an explanation regarding how the stations would be incorporated into the HST project and how it affects the preferred alternative selection should be included. The Mira Mesa Transit Center is planned at I-15 and Hillary, and should be incorporated into the alignment along I-15.

Old Town San Diego Community Planning Group

The Old Town San Diego Community Planning Group has requested the protection of Old Town's historic resources, including Koa'aay and San Diego Presidio, Presidio Park, Old Town San Diego State Historic Park, and San Diego River and wetlands; improvements for west vehicular circulation from Rosecrans Street to Hotel Circle without impacting Old Town Historic District; and improvements for south vehicular circulation from Pacific Coast Highway to Morena Boulevard without impacting the Old Town District. In addition, the Old Town San Diego Community Planning Group is concerned with visual and noise impacts and suggested trains be at grade to reduce these impacts. Railroad grade separation for vehicles and pedestrians should be provided without impacting Old Town Historic District. Direct access from PCH to I-8 was also requested. Project coordination should include SANDAG, Caltrans, and other appropriate agencies as well as private property. It is assumed the construction costs of these proposed features and requests will be less than the cost to carry trains over I-8.

Rainbow Community Planning Group

The Rainbow Community Planning Group has noted the proposed tunnel through the community of Rainbow would be expensive, result in considerable right-of-way constraints, and is incompatible with existing development. The Rainbow Community Planning Group believes the best alignment through the community of Rainbow is along the I-15 freeway. This route would have the least impacts on human and natural habitats in the Rainbow area. The proposed alignment from the City of Temecula would divert from the I-15 and tunnel through Rainbow and reconnect with the Stewart Canyon area. The proposed tunnel alignment will have high projected costs and the tunnel would result in right-of-way constraints, making the alignment alternative impractical. This alignment would not be compatible with existing development, would have seismic and hydrologic constraints, would impact the natural environment and agricultural land. It would also impact aquatic and riparian forest resources and threatened and endangered species. The water table is high in the Rainbow area. Changes to the water table would impact endangered and threatened species. Changes to Rainbow Creek, ground settling, loss of drinking and irrigation water, and would place a pressure for high density housing in Rainbow that is not compatible with the community plan. The project would impact property value in Rainbow if the route diverts from the I-15 corridor. The route will have potential impacts on existing aqueducts, natural gas facility, and high power transmission lines in Rainbow.

The following alignment was suggested: on or under I-15 through Rainbow and enter a tunnel on the west side of I-15 just south of SR 79/Temecula Parkway in Temecula with the tunnel transitioning to the east side of the corridor just north of Old Highway 395 and 5th Street intersection and continue to follow the corridor until the intersection of Old Highway 395 and Reche Road and then the tunnel would pass back under I-15 with the south end of the tunnel on the side of a hill on the west side of I-15 (in order to avoid highly sensitive habitat areas identified as preapproved take and preserve areas) and elevate route over San Luis Rey River and enter another tunnel south of river west of Old Highway 395 (due to the grade along I-15).

Rancho Bernardo Community Planning Board

The Rancho Bernardo Community Planning Board is an officially recognized community planning group in the City of San Diego and believes that the project route along I-15 would divide the community of Rancho Bernardo. The concerns identified include the following: incompatibility with surrounding land use and loss of property and community character, which includes Rancho Bernardo, San Pasqual, Rancho Peñasquitos, Carmel Mountain, Sabre Springs, Mira Mesa, and Scripps Ranch due to take and close

proximity to project route; construction and operation impacts to existing transportation facilities and traffic circulation along I-15; air quality; noise and vibration; geology and soils (especially landslides); water quality in watersheds; surrounding natural open space areas (i.e., Lake Hodges/San Pasqual Valley, Los Peñasquitos Canyon, Green Valley Creek, Battle Mountain); visual quality/aesthetics (particularly the hillsides of 4S Ranch and the area between Lake Hodges and Los Peñasquitos Canyon); and overall degradation of community character and cohesiveness with Sabre Springs, Rancho Bernardo, Rancho Peñasquitos, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Mira Mesa, and Scripps Ranch. The Rancho Bernardo Community Planning Board requested a formal opportunity to provide additional public scoping comments once 15 percent design is available and suggested the alternatives be evaluated at equal detail, and evaluation of construction options and cumulative impacts be included. All the communities mentioned have similar concerns as outlined.

Sabre Springs Planning Group

The Sabre Springs Planning Group is an officially recognized community planning group in the City of San Diego. The project route along I-15 would traverse through the western portion of the community. The concerns identified include the following: incompatibility with surrounding land use; loss of property due to take; impacts to existing transportation facilities and traffic circulation; air quality; noise and vibration; geology and soils (especially landslides); water quality in watersheds; surrounding natural open space areas (i.e., Lake Hodges/San Pasqual Valley, Los Peñasquitos Canyon, Green Valley Creek); visual quality/aesthetics (particularly through Lake Hodges and Los Peñasquitos Canyon, SR 56 and Poway Road); and overall degradation of community character and cohesiveness with Sabre Springs, Rancho Bernardo, Rancho Peñasquitos, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Mira Mesa, and Scripps Ranch. The Sabre Springs Planning Group requested a formal opportunity to provide additional public scoping comments once 15 percent design is available. All the communities mentioned have similar concerns as outlined.

The Sabre Springs Planning group recommends that the alternatives, including a coastal alignment, are to be evaluated at equal detail and construction options (particularly regarding sensitive noise receptors and visual impacts to the community character) are also to be analyzed. Minimizing the need for condemnation of private lands by incorporating the alignment into the existing ROW should also be considered and integrated into the project.

The group recommends that the project description be sufficient in detail to allow impacted communities and decisionmakers to grasp magnitude of impacts that could result from the project. The discussion of existing conditions should provide adequate information about the project setting and community character.

The residents of Sabre Springs have endured years of construction on the I-15 corridor. The ongoing construction impacts air quality, noise, traffic congestion, and replacement of green vegetation with concrete. Construction of a new HST rail line will result in similar impacts. In addition the HST project would impact existing transportation facilities, specifically the portion of the I-15 corridor extending from SR 78 in the City of Escondido to SR 163 in the City of San Diego that is currently being upgraded. The HST project should describe how these new transportation facilities would be impacted by rail line construction. An evaluation regarding how the construction and operation of the project could impact the Trans Net funded facilities should also be included. Factors such as height, design, color, visibility, and placement of proposed structures and its impact on aesthetics and community character should be considered. Requirements for night lighting should also be addressed. The anticipated noise impacts to sensitive receptors, such as schools, homes, and businesses, along the proposed alignment should be identified and described, particularly in areas where the HST would be elevated. Potential impacts of existing soil problems along the proposed alignment should be addressed and the potential impacts of increased vibration in areas with soil problems should be evaluated.

University Community Planning Group

The University Community Planning Group requested an analysis of the I-15 alignment from University City to Mission Valley to the Qualcomm Transit Center as a preferred alternative. A trolley station and a connection to downtown San Diego exists at this alignment and will serve a large population in eastern San Diego County with the potential to connect with Mexico and Rodriguez International Airport. The University Community Planning Group requested the HST project avoid Rose Canyon. Rose Canyon is an open space park on MSCP land supporting wildlife corridors, endangered plant and animal life, habitat, and wetlands. A study and analysis should be conducted regarding impacts to biological resources associated with grading, shading, displacement of habitat and wetland impacts. The geology of the Rose Canyon area should be conducted and include the analysis regarding impacts to soils and geology associated with the Rose Canyon Fault, San Andreas fault, and other minor faults in the area; the potential for an earthquake; the potential damage related to a tunnel or abovegrade designs. In addition, impacts to noise and vibration, hazardous materials, screening, and visual/aesthetics should be identified and evaluated. Impacts to surrounding residences also need to be identified.

University Community Planning Group also requested a detailed project description be included and also address if an underground station is being proposed and the associated size, number of tracks, venting for air circulation, and related safety and precautions. Tunnels should not impact University City. Feasibility, cost, construction impacts, soil stability, and terminus points for the tunnel should be discussed. Parking requirements and design at UTC station should be identified. The University Community Planning Group requested a parking study to analyze need for parking and detailed mitigation for increased traffic that may occur with the project. Any associated storage and maintenance facilities proposed in the University City community area needs to be identified and discussed in detail to include the number of trains stored, maintained, and repaired. The University Community Planning Group also raised the question if the General Plan needs to be updated.

3.5 Summary Comment Tables

Tables 3-1 through Table 3-7 summarize comments submitted and are divided by county for organizational purposes. Within each table the comments are organized by type of commenter (agency, organization, or individuals) and are listed alphabetically.

Table 3-1 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Los Angeles County		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
STATE AGENCIES		
California Department of Transportation, District 7; Deputy District Director - Division of Environmental Planning Ron Kosinski	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accepting invitation to become a Participating Agency. Want to provide any engineering or environmental assistance within State right-of-way, including proposed alignments and alternatives adjacent to or intersecting with Caltrans Highway System. Caltrans may be identified as a Cooperating Agency due to being FHWA's delegated NEPA agency and direct involvement in the environmental document and permitting process. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use
REGIONAL AGENCIES		
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, President Thomas King	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The governing board unanimously voted to "support in concept" the HST project, including the Los Angeles to San Diego Segment, to be routed through and include at least one station in the San Gabriel Valley. 	
LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES		
City of Alhambra, City Attorney Rachel H. Richman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support concept of high-speed rail and alignment options. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
City of Claremont, Community Development Director Anthony Witt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route segment through City of Claremont and its historic downtown village. Challenges with maintaining Claremont's historic depot as the hub for transit operations in Claremont and integrate it with the City's historic downtown. The right-of-way in this segment does not accommodate project. Claremont already has two tracks to serve Metrolink and two more will be added for the Gold Line and additional right-of-way for these additional tracks has been challenging. Support keeping at-grade crossing for pedestrians to access tracks. No option for tunnel or elevator system for multiple platforms. Concern with overall physical constraints for proposed project. Route location through Claremont will create a physical barrier/division to the city and sever connectivity and impact neighborhood viability, community design, and historic preservation of the built environment. Concern with noise and vibration, congestion and circulation patterns, scale and character of neighborhoods, and pedestrian safety. Underpass and overpass crossings at intersections are not feasible. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality; Section 3.16 Cultural Resources; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

Table 3-1 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Los Angeles County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose use of alignment that follows the Metro/Metrolink railroad ROW between El Monte and Ontario Airport. This alignment goes through City of Claremont and Claremont's historic downtown village. The ROW along this alignment in Claremont is insufficient to accommodate the HST. Currently two railroad tracks serve Metrolink, and two more tracks are to be added for the Gold Line adjacent to the Metrolink tracks. The Gold Line Authority must purchase additional land from the property owners along the alignment to accommodate the Gold Line, which will limit future economic development opportunities in the City's small downtown core. The purchase of even more land from adjacent property owners would impact existing development and will have greater economic impacts on the community. Another challenge has been to maintain Claremont's historic depot as the hub for transit operations in Claremont. Currently an on-grade pedestrian crossing is the only way access can be provided to two Metrolink tracks from the narrow platform at Claremont's historic depot. Claremont has strongly supported keeping the on-grade crossing for access to the tracks and to provide intermodal connections when the Gold Line tracks are added. There is no reasonable way to tunnel or install an elevator system to provide access to the three narrow platform given the limited ROW. Beside the physical constraints, the use of the Metrolink alignment for the HST would have serious adverse impacts on the character and social environment of the City. Interconnectivity between neighborhoods, community design, and historic preservation are especially important in Claremont. A HST through the center of Claremont would act as a physical barrier, separating parts of the city. It would reduce livability for quiet residential neighborhoods that abut the Metrolink tracks. East and west of the depot are Indian Hill Boulevard and College Avenue, that have at-grade railroad crossings connecting south Village area to the city's historic core. These two streets function as a major north-south transportation corridor. College Avenue provides pedestrian access point for Metrolink and future Gold Line. Congestion and pedestrian safety at these intersections are serious concerns for the community. The addition of an HST system would greatly increase safety and congestion concerns. Underpass or overpass crossings at these intersections are not feasible because necessary gradients and clearances for approaches could not be provided, pedestrian and vehicular access to businesses would be eliminated to a large part of the downtown area, substantial changes would be required to circulation patterns in downtown village, and the scale and character of the village and nearby residential neighborhoods would be severely impacted. The City would have congestion and pedestrian safety concerns at the other at-grade railroad rail crossings on Claremont Boulevard and Cambridge Avenue. Please involve the City of Claremont in the process as you are preparing the analysis on the Metrolink 	



Table 3-1 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Los Angeles County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	alignment.	
City of Covina, City Manager Darryl Parrish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An elevated structure adjacent to residential neighborhoods would significantly impact communities. Therefore, oppose use of the Metrolink San Bernardino right-of-way as a potential HST corridor. Support an HST alignment that would use the I-10 corridor and would make a San Gabriel Valley stop at the City of El Monte Bus Terminal. El Monte Bus Terminal is already the busiest bus terminal west of Chicago, making this terminal the most logical location for intermodal connections in the San Gabriel Valley. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
City of La Verne, Community Development Director Hal G. Fredericksen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noted potential route in the City of La Verne and requested involvement and noticing as participating agency. Concerned with coordination with proposed nearby Gold Line light rail, aesthetics, consistency with surrounding land uses, noise, necessary grade separations, loss of mature trees, and traffic. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
City of Pomona Mayor Elliott Rotham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The City Council of the City of Pomona unanimously voted to adopt a resolution identifying Pomona's preference for the alignment of the Inland Empire Section of the HST project and asserting the City's desire for the placement of an HST station within the City's limits. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
City of Pomona, Senior Civil Engineer David L. Nelson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ City of Pomona is completing a position letter and should transmit by November 24, 2009. 	
City of South El Monte, Chair and Councilmember Joseph Gonzales	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The connectivity, Los Angeles via the San Gabriel Valley to Ontario onto San Diego, would alleviate substantial congestion and increase connectivity to the region. The City of South El Monte is pleased to support the HST from LA to San Diego via Interstate 10 with a major transportation hub in the City of El Monte. The creation of the rail along the I-10 would significantly reduce the highly congested I-10 by providing a major east-to-west alternative. A station in El Monte would provide a needed regional transportation hub in San Gabriel Valley. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives

Table 3-1 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Los Angeles County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
City of West Covina, Office of the Mayor Roger Hernandez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports the alternative alignment along the San Bernardino Freeway (I-10) with a possible rail station in West Covina. Seeks consideration of the rail station at the Westfield West Covina Shopping Center. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
County of Los Angeles, Department of Parks and Recreation - Planning and Development Agency Jui Ing Chein	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned with impacts to county trails (proposed Los Angeles River trail extension, Rio Hondo River trail, San Gabriel River trail, San Jose Creek trail, and Schabarum trail). Safest method is to have trail cross under rail to also support wildlife corridor. Concerned with impacts to parks (Saybrook park, Parque de Los Sueños, and Amigo Park). Concerned with associated noise and air quality impacts to recreational users. Project should avoid recreational areas, parks, open space, and wildlife corridors. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Gail Farber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The project should address impact of discharges from the project into the Los Angeles County Flood Control District's (LACFCD) drainage system including any increase in the volume discharged and introduction of pollutants. Detail any impacts the project would have on LACFCD properties including any proposed easements or connections to the system. Hazards - Geotechnical/Soils/Geology: The site is located within potential liquefiable area. Geotechnical reports are necessary. Services-Road/Flood Maintenance: Permits from Public Works' Construction Division will be required for all works impacting County roads or the LACFCD. Other Programs Development: The following Public Works road construction projects may be impacted by the HST project: Nogales Street at Railroad Street; Noteles Street (LA Subdivision) Grade Separation - ACE Projects; Fullerton Road Grade Separation Project. 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.17 Cumulative Impacts; Chapter 7.0 Public and Agency Participation
County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Shari Afshari	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pleased to accept invitation to participate on the Los Angeles to San Diego via the Inland Empire project. 	Chapter 7.0 Public Participation

Table 3-1 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Los Angeles County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
<p>County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works; Assistant Deputy Director Land Development Division Dennis Hunter Lindsay Sagorski Jeremy Wan Maryam Adhami Phil Doudar Toan Duong</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concurs an EIR/EIS is required. Project analysis needs to address: impacts related to discharges into the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD) drainage system, increase in volume discharged, and the introduction of pollutants with the discharge; how discharges from project site will meet all applicable receiving water body and water quality standards; impacts to LACFCD properties including easements or connections to the system. Geotechnical reports to be included as the project is located within liquefiable areas. Permits from Public Works' Construction Division will be required for all work affecting County roads or LACFCD. Submit construction plans/documents for any proposed construction affecting County roads or flood control facilities to Public Works for review and approval prior to construction. Coordinate with County regarding their planned projects. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use</p>
<p>Los Angeles County - Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Arthur T. Leahy Alex Clifford</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports concepts of the high-speed rail. Concerns: adequate number of potential horizontal alignments to be studied, scheduling adequate analysis for all parties to interface and coordinate on alternatives, station location considerations should be made with detail analysis of local transit linkages and capabilities (does not support vehicles as primary mode of access to high-speed rail stations), project is consistent with goals of AB 32 and SB375, reduction in trip miles, project costs, and improve service along LOSSAN corridor. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations; Chapter 7.0 Public and Agency Participation</p>
<p>Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning Paul McCarthy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific comments at this time. Concerned with the project's potential to create significant impacts to noise, visual, traffic, and community division. 	<p>Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice. Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality</p>
<p>Los Angeles World Airports Michael Feldman</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LAWA is interested in the success of the proposed project. The EIR/EIS should discuss and evaluate the relationship between air passenger traffic at Ontario International Airport (ONT) and passengers using the HST. Discuss alternative methods of connecting passengers between the station and the airport terminus. The document should discuss parking demand at the ONT and other proposed HST stations. Address coordination with the proposed Gold Line Light Rail extension to ONT. Review of synergy between the HST and a potential shuttle bus service between ONT and the City of Anaheim. Other issues that require investigation: An account of the ground access impacts at ONT; technical review of impact the HST technology could have on air traffic control; investigation to ensure compliance with Federal Aviation Administration height restrictions and clear zone restrictions; 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.4 Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use</p>

Table 3-1 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Los Angeles County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	review of land use/zoning restrictions; Noise impacts in combination with airport generated noise contours; Quantified analysis of the environmental benefits of diverting air passengers to rail, including air quality benefits.	
ORGANIZATIONS, ASSOCIATIONS, & BUSINESSES		
Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians, Executive Director Andy Salas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Gabrieleño Mission Indians are tribal members who are direct descendants from the Gabrieleño villages throughout LA County basin. Concerned with the traditional tribal territory of the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians. Project runs through and surrounds highly sensitive cultural areas. Concerned with the identification, protection, and proper disposition of cultural resources and proper handling. Requests direct involvement with the project and that the Native American monitor be present during any excavation or ground disturbances. Position is there would be significant cultural impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains, therefore recommend their Native American monitor be present during any excavation or ground disturbances. 	Section 3.16 Cultural Resources; Section 7.0 Public and Agency Involvement
Japanese Chamber of Commerce Masao Okamoto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about what is going to happen around LA Union Station. Metro is pursuing a regional connector, a harbor subdivision. The LA-Anaheim Section of the HST will be connected after San Diego merges into its alignment. The community should be presented with one consolidated information during public scoping and alternatives studies. One entity may repeat a community's concerns while another may neglect their concerns. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Little Tokyo Business Association, President Wilson Liu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Since LA Union Station is in close proximity to the Little Tokyo community and the impacts of the HST are potentially high, the Little Tokyo community should have a separate public scoping meeting. Little Tokyo is currently actively involved in planning stages of the MTA Regional Connector Transit Corridor project and its impact on the community. Request a public scoping meeting scheduled in the Little Tokyo community. 	Chapter 7.0 Public and Agency Involvement
INDIVIDUAL		
Kristine Alessandrini	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The HST route is directly next to my house. The 60 freeway is next to my house. Very concerned that home will be taken by eminent domain and that the value of house will decrease. 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use

Table 3-1 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Los Angeles County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
David Avila	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that the trains will be travelling by homes. Currently the Metrolink blows the horn at 5 a.m. and it is very loud. Would like to see Metrolink and the project have quiet zones. Also concerned with speed of the train because kids walk along the tracks. Prefer the Metrolink line from El Monte to the Covina station. Hope they do not use this line as the other two lines seem more appropriate because there is more space. Underground would be very expensive and aboveground would decrease home values. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Frisbee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of the project. Cities are a reasonable distance apart - use the train to connect them. It will save environmental damage and it will be faster. Would like a stop in El Monte. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands
Sharon Gardner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Against having the HST on the Metrolink line because homes would be taken out along the Metro line. Don't want to lose my home. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Susie Heath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider getting it to connect to LAX. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Kristi Kercheval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like a stop at Cal Poly Pomona or downtown Pomona and preferably an underground rail. They have enough noise already. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration
Bill Marsh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On the San Gabriel Valley segment, they should look at the relationship to the alignment in the Gold Line extension; any alignment is not going to siphon off ridership from the Gold Line. 	Section 3.1 Transportation
Elsa and Rosa Moreno	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Live near the 71 highway and the 10 freeway. What is going to happen if they relocate residences and how will the project impact them? Am happy that Pomona will benefit from the project and provide jobs. Want to know more about the relocation property acquisition process once a decision is made about the alignment. Request to be informed of any new developments that affect us directly. Concerned about how this will impact my home and community. 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Marisa Pina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What criteria is used to base a decision on where the primary or alternative routes will be? If the decision of route or terminal is chosen will it make residences move? How much in advance will the residential families be informed? What will the monetary compensation be based on? If residences are replaced and forced to move will the housing authority give aide to those who need it? Interested in the environmental impact because live next to a wildlife center, the Audubon, in South El Monte. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives. Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.6 Biological Resources; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice

Table 3-1 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Los Angeles County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Betty "Granny" Raab	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of project. Would like to see a north-south route from Glendora or San Dimas 57 to tie into Orange County/Anaheim to provide relief on freeways. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Michael G. Saitz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't want properties along the 60 freeway to be taken by eminent domain or impaired in any way that would create a negative economic impact. 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Jesse Salcedo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enjoy South El Monte Senior Center. Take HST System as far away from the proposed 60/605 freeway and our home. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Paul Schuber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prefer the 60 route rather than the Union Pacific route because it does not impact as many residents. Like the I-10 route east because it would allow a station on the I-10, which would alleviate traffic on the I-10. Like the I-15 route versus the I-215 route for development of the new areas in Riverside County. The I-215 goes far out and provides many turns that would slow down the railroad and would be placed in areas that are not economically favorable. Like the Escondido transit center option rather than the Escondido Station. It provides intermodal transportation connections. Like the Miramar Road rather than the Carroll Canyon option because it does not impact the environment. Like the University City option station versus the University City station because it would be closer to the University. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands
Edward Sewell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At first was against the project because of the five billion dollars. In favor of it because it will pay off over a few years. However, do not raise taxes. This should not be taxpayer funded. How are they holding the rails together. Are they using screws to hold the rails down or railroad ties and spikes? Railroad spikes move up and out of the wood due to vibration. 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Mark Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Live near the 71 highway and the 10 freeway where they are proposing the project. One stop between Union Station and Ontario Airport does not make any sense. There are two major interchanges between Ontario and Union Station. Those interchanges are the 57, 210, and 10 freeways. Then you have the 71 freeway that can also feed into it. On the 10 freeway, the 605 and 10 interchange. The reason why they need stops at these areas is because there are several people that traverse the freeways. For instance, on the 10 and 605 freeway interchange, commuters drive down from Duarte, Pasadena, Monrovia, and all the cities in the foothills. People from Whittier and areas south can come up. People in the immediate area or Baldwin Park, West Covina, and Rosemead to the west can all come in. In other words, this would be a perfect feeder. Out near Pomona the project can serve the eastern end of the San Gabriel Valley. If a station or stop were placed at Cal Poly Pomona or the 57 and 210 interchange, people would come down from San Dimas, La Verne, Glendora, Claremont, Montclair, Diamond Bar, and Walnut. From the east, perhaps some commuters from Montclair and Chino would come down. If the project 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation

Table 3-1 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Los Angeles County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	used the new Union Pacific tracks, those would be the best interchanges. Set up stations in that vicinity and it would be easy access for the different freeways feeding into it. Having one stop between Los Angeles Union Station and Ontario does not make any sense because this area is large and there is a large population.	
Ken Sterling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It makes more sense to make the route on the I-215 to go through San Bernardino for two reasons: 1) it provides more Inland Empire access for those in San Bernardino and 2) it eventually goes through Las Vegas and Phoenix. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives

Table 3-2 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Bernardino County		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
FEDERAL AGENCY		
Congressman Joe Baca Mike Trujillo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a San Bernardino option as a possible route. The proposed route goes from the Ontario Airport to Colton rail yard and then south. Why not have the route in San Bernardino, the city proper? 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
STATE AGENCIES		
California Department of Water Resources, Engineering Division Richard Sanchez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the NOP, it is difficult to determine if Program Level 215 route impacts the southern leg of California's leg of California's State Water Project. Any proposed encroachments on California's State Water Project will require approval by the CA Department of Water Resources. It is important to keep DWR engaged and informed as the project moves forward. 	Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources
REGIONAL AGENCIES		
Inland Empire Transportation Coalition Larry Sharp	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support route through the Inland Empire, particularly through San Bernardino. Support a station in San Bernardino. Included a copy of the letter from the City of San Bernardino supporting the project and the route and station in their city. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), President Paul Eaton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for the HST project. Both the Ontario Airport and the Rialto and "E" Transit Center in the City of San Bernardino offer benefits as two potential stations. The Ontario Airport will provide a connection with international airports that is planned to be expanded. Will offer potential for high ridership with central location to east San Bernardino Valley. Growth in air traffic, commercial and residential development around the airport, together with easy access to two major freeways. Rialto and "E" Transit Center provide convergence of several transportation modes including the SBX BRT, Metrolink, Redlands light rail, and connections with the SBIA. San Bernardino Metrolink line has highest ridership. Demonstrates potential for high ridership on HSTs with a station at the Ontario Airport and in City of San Bernardino. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) Paul M. Alderman, P.E. Mitch Eaton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support high-speed rail. Station locations at Ontario Airport and the Rialto and "E" Transit Center in the City of San Bernardino offer beneficial multimodal connections. San Bernardino Metrolink route has highest ridership, thus supporting need for high-speed rail. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives

Table 3-2 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Bernardino County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES		
California State University, San Bernardino Albert K. Karnig	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interested in alignment through Inland Empire to maximize the population at CSUSB. Supports bus line to connect CSUSB with Multi Modal Transit Facility downtown San Bernardino. Supports station at the San Bernardino Multi Modal Transit Facility. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
City of Fontana Kevin Ryan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City of Fontana would prefer the alignment shown to run adjacent to the I-10 freeway corridor. This alignment would have less of an impact to residents and businesses than an alignment adjacent to the Metrolink. High-speed rail line along the Metrolink Corridor would serve to negatively impact predominately residential area and create a division in the City. City does not support the alternate alignment along the Metrolink Corridor. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
City of Highland Mayor Penny Lilburn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of the project and believe it will provide a viable and valuable transportation option. Support an alignment that will extend high-speed rail through to a stop in the City of San Bernardino which will provide improved access to the high-speed train for east San Bernardino Valley and encourage higher utilization of the trains. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
City of Highland Bruce Meikle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the HST in the City of San Bernardino. Residents in the city of San Bernardino and in the surrounding Highland, Loma Linda, Redlands, Yucaipa, etc. need convenient access to the HST without having to get into the car and drive the already congested freeways to stations in Ontario or Riverside. One of the reasons the City of San Bernardino exists is because of its convenient geographic location at the crossroads of the Cajon and San Gorgonio Passes. The Cajon Pass provides access for residents of the desert cities of La Quinta, Palm Desert, Palm Springs, Rancho Mirage, etc. These residents need easy access to the HST without driving further to Ontario or Riverside. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
City of Loma Linda, City Manager T. Jarb Thaipejr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presented the proposed HST alternative alignments to the Loma Linda City Council and received unanimous support for the San Bernardino alignment. Strongly supports the San Bernardino alignment. The San Bernardino train station located within an intermodal mass transit hub is needed in the region. Omnitrans regular bus service, bus rapid transit service, and Metrolink commuter train service at this hub will allow access to the system by most people in the region. The station's close proximity to the San Bernardino International Airport opens another market for ridership. The I-215 and the 10 freeway intersect close to the proposed station location. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
City of Ontario Thomas Danna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would welcome a future meeting with project staff to discuss the Ontario airport station site planning. The Ontario Airport stop is a must and is strongly supported by the city of Ontario. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
City of Redlands Jon Harrison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City of Redlands is one of Southern California's historic communities with a well-educated, affluent, and increasing youthful population. The City of Redlands is very interested in ensuring the CAHST alignment through the Inland Empire, maximizing the ability of the 281,760 residents in the Redlands Market Area. This includes the University of Redlands and 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives;

Table 3-2 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Bernardino County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	<p>ESRI to have ready access to the CAHST for intercity travel in California. The City of Redlands has worked closely with the City of San Bernardino and SANBAG to develop a light rail system that directly connects the University of Redlands, downtown Redlands, and the ESRI campus directly to the Multi-Modal Transit Center in downtown San Bernardino. Over \$75 million in local funding from voter approved Measure I has been set-aside for construction of the \$240 million project, and operations are expected to commence in 2016. We agree with the comments and analysis in the City of San Bernardino's letter to the CAHST, and the conclusion that it would be difficult to imagine how the adopted objectives for the CAHST could be optimized for the Inland Empire Section of the CAHST unless the alignment connects through the Multi-Modal Transit Center.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The City of Redlands and its partners, like the University of Redlands and ESRI, are eager to participate in the ongoing analysis of the alignment and station alternatives for the Inland Empire Section of the CAHST. 	
<p>City of San Bernardino, Office of the Mayor Patrick J. Morris, Mayor Patrick Morris</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ City of San Bernardino is interested in ensuring the alignment through the Inland Empire Section optimizes the purposes and objectives for the HST. The San Bernardino-Riverside area has experienced over four times the growth rate of other areas in Southern California. The Inland Empire section of the project requires a route that includes a station in downtown San Bernardino. The following are adopted objectives for the HST and how an Inland Empire section alignment with station in downtown San Bernardino optimizes the objectives: 1) "Provide intercity travel capacity to supplement critically over-utilized interstate highways and commercial airports." Downtown San Bernardino lies at the intersection of three highways: I-10, I-210, and I-215; also lies at the intersection of two transportation passages into and out of Southern California. Locating a station in downtown San Bernardino provides the ability of intrastate and interstate highway traffic to quickly access the HST and remove traffic from the interstate highways. The station would relieve congestion for over-utilized commercial airports such as the San Bernardino International Airport (SBIA). If the downtown San Bernardino station fails to be included in the project, the state will lose a critical opportunity to connect the HST System to a passenger airport with significant existing and future capacity that can relieve congestion at other Southern California airports that are operating at or close to their design limits or legal restrictions, including LAX, San Diego - Lindbergh Field Airport, Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airports, John Wayne Airport, and Long Beach Airport. 2) "Meet future intercity travel demand that will be unmet by present transportation systems and increase capacity for intercity mobility." Design the HST around areas of future growth. It is critical for the HST to maximize its objective of meeting future intercity travel demand and aligning through the Inland Empire to include a station in downtown San Bernardino. Leaving this major urban growth center unconnected to the HST System would be inconsistent with SCAG's Compass Blueprint for the region. 3) "Maximize intermodal transportation opportunities by 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations</p>

Table 3-2 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Bernardino County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	<p>locating stations to connect with local transit, airports, and highways." To meet HST purpose, it is incumbent that an HST station be located in downtown San Bernardino. A recent SCAG study found that downtown San Bernardino had a transit connectivity index 350% higher than most other regions in SCAG because of its transit assets and physical configuration (SCAG Region: Compass Blueprint Case Study - Downtown San Bernardino, March 2008, p. 14). Downtown San Bernardino will be developed as a major regional Multi-Modal Transit Facility hub for the Inland Empire. The location is near existing state, county, and city government centers. Various transit systems will be interconnected through Multi-Modal Transit Facility in downtown San Bernardino. 4) "Provide a sustainable reduction in travel time between major urban centers increase the efficiency of the intercity transportation system." Downtown San Bernardino is one of key locations that has the capacity to accommodate significant new sustainable growth. Local, regional, state, and interstate transit connectivity is one of the critical ingredients that make this location ideal for accommodating growth. City of San Bernardino has been moving aggressively to create the plans and development incentives that embrace the urbanized future for its downtown city center. The mass transit systems will connect downtown San Bernardino with other major regional employment and activity centers in San Bernardino Valley. 5) "Preserve environmental quality and protect California's sensitive environmental resources by reducing emissions and vehicle kilometers/vehicle miles traveled for intercity trips." The HST alignment and station locations should complement and be consistent with the locations identified in the Compass Blueprint that can accommodate growth. For Inland Empire, one of the crucial sustainable growth areas is downtown San Bernardino, as identified in the Compass Blueprint. 6) "Maximize the use of existing transportation corridors and rights-of-way, to the extent feasible." HST alignment through downtown San Bernardino is consistent with this objective. 7) "Develop a practical and economically viable transportation system that can be implemented in phases by 2020, which would generate revenues in excess of operations and maintenance costs." Connecting to the HST to the Multi-Modal Transit Facility in downtown San Bernardino fulfills this objective. A distinct advantage of a station in downtown San Bernardino is that the HST can make the only 90 degree turn in the Los Angeles to San Diego Section while traveling at minimal speed as the train approaches or departs the station. A station in downtown San Bernardino will add ridership and revenue to the HST System. The National Rail Plan identifies preliminary routes for an HST rail network. The first route is to Las Vegas through the Cajon Pass, and the second is to Phoenix through the San Gorgonio Pass. San Bernardino is located at the convergence of these two mountain passes, and is the ideal site for the intersection of interstate high-speed rail routes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports route connection to San Bernardino and has population and projected growth to support project and meet its objectives and goals. Supports station downtown San Bernardino due to location to existing transportation corridors, population forecasts and related travel 	



Table 3-2 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Bernardino County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	<p>demands, critical junction for the region. Consistent with intermodal transportation opportunities, specifically for various systems (SBX Bus Rapid Transit Service, Metrolink Commuter Rail Service, local light rail, local bus and commuter bus service, airport, interstate Amtrak Rail service, and high-speed tram service to southern CA mountain resorts) and is aligned with SCAG Compass Blueprint and the downtown Core Vision and Action Plan as well as Multi-Modal Transit Facility. High-speed rail is consistent with the future growth of San Bernardino and region, ridership, and transportation options.</p>	
<p>Loma Linda University and Medical Center Dr. Richard Hart</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Loma Linda University and Medical Center supports high-speed rail and is interested in its ability to service the faculty, staff, students, patients, and visitors of their university and facilities. Supports a station to connect the campus directly with the Multi-Modal Transit Facility in downtown San Bernardino. Fully agrees and supports the comment letter from the City of San Bernardino in support of the project to include San Bernardino in the route and station design option. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use</p>
<p>San Bernardino International Airport Authority Michael Burrows</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support route through the Inland Empire, particularly through San Bernardino, to maximize economic development. Supports a station in San Bernardino. Included a copy of the letter from the City of San Bernardino supporting the project and the route and station in their city. ▪ The San Bernardino International Airport Authority (SBIAA) and the Inland Valley Development Agency (IVDA) are interested in ensuring the HST alignment through the Inland Empire to maximize the economic development opportunities in the region of California. Agree with the comments in the City of San Bernardino's letter, particularly to the comment pertaining to Airport Service to provide efficient air-rail-bus connectivity and the conclusion that it would be difficult to adopt objectives for the HST could be optimized for the Inland Empire unless the alignment connects through San Bernardino's Multi-Modal Transit Facility. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice</p>
<p>San Bernardino International Airport, Aviation Director William Ingraham</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The San Bernardino International Airport Authority (SBIAA) and the Inland Valley Development Agency (IVDA) are interested in ensuring the HST alignment through the Inland Empire to maximize the economic development opportunities in the region of California. Agree with the comments in the City of San Bernardino's letter, particularly to the comment pertaining to Airport Service to provide efficient air-rail-bus connectivity and the conclusion that it would be difficult to adopt objectives for the HST could be optimized for the Inland Empire unless the alignment connects through San Bernardino's Multi-Modal Transit Facility. 	<p>Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice</p>

Table 3-2 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Bernardino County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
ORGANIZATIONS, ASSOCIATIONS, & BUSINESSES		
Inland Action, Inc. Carol Beswick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inland Action (non-profit, non-partisan corporation of public citizens) supports route through the Inland Empire, particularly through San Bernardino, to maximize economic development. Supports a station in San Bernardino. Included a copy of the letter from the City of San Bernardino supporting the project and the route and station in their city. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Inland Empire Economic Partnership William Carney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inland Action (private, non-profit regional economic development organization) supports route through the Inland Empire, particularly through San Bernardino, to maximize economic development. Supports a station in San Bernardino. Included a copy of the letter from the City of San Bernardino supporting the project and the route and station in their city. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
INDIVIDUAL		
Cheryl Anaya	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support high-speed rail and believe it is a much needed infrastructure. Believe project will be an economic boost for the San Bernardino area. Tracks must extend east to the City of San Bernardino. Please add the alternative TWG alignment. Route 2 is a must. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Jose Castillo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Want to know how the project will benefit the local businesses and how they can become part of the project. Would like to get in on the early stages and receive information for requirements on local business benefits. 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Joel Cerna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Start as soon as possible on the construction of the project to provide services needed. 1) This will make travel faster, easier, and less expensive. 2) Will compete in business around the state, it will make it better for workers and businesses to stay. 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Brett Clavio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bring the HST to San Bernardino. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Robert Duncan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1) Which track would be the designated track - Union Pacific or Santa Fe? 2) Have property that is about 150 yards from the Union Pacific tracks. There are no sound walls proposed. 3) If the HST uses the Union Pacific track, will our property be devalued? 	Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

Table 3-2 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Bernardino County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Public Affairs Coordinator - Apartment Association Greater Inland Empire Khalilah Durias	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like to get notes and handouts from the public scoping meeting, specifically from Ontario meeting. 	
Sam Garcia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ San Bernardino is the largest county in the nation. It has the most population, a developing transportation module, and a large need. San Bernardino must be a destination not an option. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Wilson & Company Allen Grabinski	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Travel time and expense are the two keys to a successful project. Minimize miles that are aerial, trench or tunnel and balance that with property acquisition costs and total miles of the route. Interested to see the cost estimate of the project. 	Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
James Hammer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. It's vital to the economy and believe it will be a great asset to the community. It will help revitalize the communities and neighboring communities. The tough decision is deciding how best to serve the goal of the program for the project and taking in consideration local communities' interest, and weighing the two. 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
J.K. Jetton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commute times in the Inland Empire have worsened even with improvements or upgrades to local freeways. We are too dependent on gasoline vehicles and need a reliable, efficient, electric system. This project would help future growth in areas along the 10 freeway. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives;
Eunice and David Jiang	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like to have a station in San Bernardino because there are several people working in the Los Angeles area. Commuters must drive a long distance and an HST would be convenient. There is a large population in Redlands, Highlands, and San Bernardino. If there is a station in downtown San Bernardino, it would be better for the city. Commuters spend a lot of time in traffic so we would save time and money. This area is a low-income area. This area needs help and it needs more people and businesses to move in. The project would help this area economically. It will help develop the whole city, developers do not develop here because of transportation. There is a lot of land here. We need the project - there is too much traffic on the freeways. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use
Matthew Kennedy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like to see the HST built as soon as possible. Prefers a stop at the Ontario Airport and wants fewer small stops and more major stops like at the Ontario Airport. Prefers an aerial alignment on Holt or Mission Avenue and Milliken Avenue. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Matt Korner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support route to service San Bernardino and would coincide with Vision Action Plan for downtown San Bernardino (including a multi-modal transit center), help to stimulate economy/businesses, reduce traffic congestion, improve air quality. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental

Table 3-2 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Bernardino County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use
Sun Valley Equities Scott Lisk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No comment. 	
Salvador and Elizabeth Lopez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1) Lead agency needs smart growth in place. 2) Cooperating agency need to keep good public records. 3) HST needs 24/7/365 complaint center for residents and businesses to call in. 4) Have restrictions from horn blowing as a noise limit, idling in one place, and hours of operation after 10 p.m. 5) Prefer a station in San Bernardino, Fontana at the Speedway AAA Auto Club and Ontario Airport, Convention Center. 6) Have a buy-out opportunity for residents that live close to the train track. 7) Independent agency for EIR public scoping to help in issue for the welfare of the public, seniors, and animals. 8) Make jobs available for citizens that live in San Bernardino city. 9) Use the stations to inform citizens and educate about green energy and health. 10) Lead agency needs to assess problems now before the impacts are too great and it will be costly in the future to mitigate. 	Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 7.0 Public and Agency Involvement
Leroy J. Martinez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It would be cost effective for the HST to go through San Bernardino because it provides economic growth. There is Cal State San Bernardino, the San Manuel Casino, the City of San Bernardino, and the Fontana Speedway that provide year round strategic revenues. There is also the San Bernardino Airport, which could impact traffic to and from airports of San Bernardino and Ontario. Construction costs would also be reduced because San Bernardino has access to the 10 and 210 freeways as well as the 215 interchange of the 15 freeway. There could also be an option to the proposed Las Vegas HST system, which is under consideration. In case of breakdowns, accessibility to hotels and existing 215, the 210, and the 10 freeways are assured. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Roberts Inc. Robert Mata	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No comment. 	
Richard Ortiz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed Ontario route would be beneficial if it came from Ontario instead of following the 10 freeway. The route should run parallel to the 10 freeway to the San Bernardino Airport before connecting to other airports. If it connected to other airports, people would have more options of coming into this area, not just by Ontario, but also through flying into San Bernardino and connecting into the March Airfield. You are connecting three airports and allowing visitors to have more flexibility and not forcing them to go to Ontario. Right now there is nothing at the San Bernardino downtown area. Most people go home after 5 p.m. from downtown San Bernardino. There is another alternative that goes from Ontario, down the 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice

Table 3-2 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Bernardino County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	<p>15 freeway all the way to Escondido. The area is fairly new, there is a lake out there, and it is busy. It would benefit to take the first route to the San Bernardino Airport, rather than routing it at the junction of the 15 freeway.</p>	
Alfred Palazzo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like the entire nation to have access to HST. It would do so much for the Inland Empire for San Bernardino to be the designated stop after the Ontario Airport. The Inland Empire would then be accessible to commuters going to Coachella Valley, and Palm Springs. In the wintertime, San Bernardino attracts visitors to the mountains and resorts. The HST would allow visitors to travel to San Bernardino. Building a tram to get from San Bernardino to the mountain resort would do a lot for the community. It would not be a burden for people to drive from Riverside to San Bernardino. The HST would help the revitalization of San Bernardino, and it seems to be the logical connection to other regions. Do not favor the corridor from the airport through Corona on the 15 freeway could be the best way to route the HST. The route would eliminate the eastern part of the Inland in San Bernardino and Riverside counties. One more stop beyond Ontario to the east is essential. It will serve a vast area and it would culminate in an economic boom for the entire area around San Bernardino and Riverside. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use</p>
Gerard Reminiskey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the route to Riverside or San Bernardino. The I-15 alignment would bypass a large population of potential users in the Riverside and San Bernardino metropolitan area. There's a growing population in the East Valley area. There should be a stop in San Bernardino, thus reducing traffic on the I-215 between San Bernardino and Riverside. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation</p>
Leah Rinehart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Live directly south of the Metro railroad tracks. The tracks pass several homes and streets. The cost of the new tracks is not feasible for homeowners along these tracks. Progress and improvements for traffic problems in Southern California are needed but the consideration for homeowners is imperative. Please take residential homeowners into serious consideration and do not put the HST along this corridor. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice</p>
Gary Saenz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assuming that the HST would one day connect to the eastern part of the nation, preparations should be made to connect the HST to the eastern portions. Maintain avenues of travel specifically to the corridor that travel through San Bernardino, through the Cajon Pass and through the San Gorgonio pass. The Cajon Pass and the San Gorgonio Pass have been used to traverse through most of Southern California to eastern portions of the U.S. The HST should pass through San Bernardino, Cajon, up through Las Vegas and beyond to areas of the midwest, specifically Chicago, or through the San Gorgonio Pass, both pass through San Bernardino. Designing an HST that completely bypasses San Bernardino ignores the future growth in Southern California. The area north of San Bernardino, or Victorville to Barstow, will be saturated with homes, businesses, and industries of all kinds. Expects to see this similar saturation in San Bernardino and Palm Springs. Often heard that the Inland Empire is the fastest growing area in the United States. Believes that after the recession, the Inland Empire will continue being the fastest growing metropolitan area in the country. To ignore and bypass 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice</p>



Table 3-2 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Bernardino County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	<p>the fastest growing area in the country for an HST is short-sighted and we will have lost a great opportunity. Should include a stop in San Bernardino. Would be further contributing to the congestion of areas east and south of San Bernardino if the stop is excluded. That congestion would have an environmental impact to air and noise pollution. There is a lot of open space north and east of San Bernardino that will see a tremendous amount of growth in the next 50 to 100 years. Being far-sighted and recognizing the need to bring the rail system to San Bernardino now would be very efficient, economical, and a well thought out plan.</p>	
John and Denise Scudder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like to see the HST use electricity drawn from local sources and not corporations. The local draw on electricity is for renewable wind power, solar, or solar draw. Feed the small income corporations. Make sure environmental impacts were assessed properly for the wildlife in the area. Hopefully if the track went to San Bernardino, it would become an easy link to Las Vegas. It would also be an easy link for HST to go across the country. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.5 Public Utilities and Energy; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands</p>
Unidentified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Affordability is not mentioned. Will the HST be priced for the average person or is it solely for the professional worker? Can this be made affordable for everyone? 	<p>Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations</p>
Daryl L. Vollrath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who will have rail right -of-way and future HST services? How much land will be required to service the project? More public scoping meetings are important and help residents become familiar with HST services. In the future, meetings should be at the city of Ontario and an easier to find location. 	<p>Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use</p>
Omnitran Wendy Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The HST must offer connections to other modes of transportation such as local rail, bus, etc. The HST should not have too many stop because it will slow down service. Are there any safety screenings (i.e. TSA at airports)? The project must move forward as an option rather than continuing to favor travel by car or plane. 	<p>Section 3.10 Safety; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations</p>
QUASI-PUBLIC		
Inland Empire Transportation Coalition Larry Sharp	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports route through the Inland Empire, particularly through San Bernardino. Supports a station in San Bernardino. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives</p>

Table 3-3 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Riverside County		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
STATE AGENCIES		
California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region Mark G. Adelson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RWQCB provides review of the following routes: between Anaheim (ARTIC Station) and Los Angeles (Union Station) and 2) Between San Diego, Riverside, Ontario, and/or San Bernardino, and Los Angeles. Please consider the following comments: Where groundwater dewatering is necessary for construction and operation of trenched or tunneled segments in Orange, Riverside, or San Bernardino Counties, hydrologic investigations must determine groundwater quality. The DEIS/DEIR should discuss local results. If unacceptable high levels of pollutants (petroleum hydrocarbons, volatile organic compounds, metals, etc.) are present in the groundwater, treatment is necessary to comply with waste discharge requirements set by the Regional Board. The DEIS/DEIR should include an anti-degradation study for the project to ensure it will not degrade U.S. and state waters. 	Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources
Senator, 39th District Christine Kehoe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support project, but no more than two stations in San Diego County, specifically Lindbergh Field as part of the Intermodal Transportation Center and the Escondido Transit Center. Supports analysis for both I-5 and I-15 corridors. Recommend public's intent be kept in mind to enhance intercity rail, support opportunities to develop a commuter market along I-15, potential extension to the border, and linking transportation improvements with smart growth land uses. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use
REGIONAL AGENCIES		
Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District Mark Willis David Garcia Edward Quinonez Albert Martinez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Owns and operates various drainage facilities located along proposed routes and will likely be required to issue encroachment permits. Would be a responsible agency. Project to comply with National Flood Insurance Program regulations and local floodplain management ordinances and each incorporated city along route is also responsible for compliance. Concerned with watersheds and watercourses being crossed by the proposed project. Project to comply with Western Riverside MSHCP and NPDES Stormwater Permitting. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources
Western Municipal Water District, Principal Engineer Keith Owens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like to receive correspondence concerning the defined proposed route of the HST. The HST via the I-15 or the I-215 will route through Western's general district. 	

Table 3-3 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Riverside County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES		
City of Corona, Public Works Department, Public Works Director Kip Field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The City of Corona recently adopted a resolution supporting the overall implementation of the statewide HST System including the Los Angeles to San Diego via the Inland Empire segment. No specific concerns at this time regarding scope of environmental analysis. However, concerned with the division points. March Air Reserve Base (ARB) and Mira Mesa create difficulties in the analysis and comparison of alternatives along the I-15 and I-215 corridors. Suggest segment breaks at Ontario and Temecula to better account for the alignment and station options currently under consideration. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
City of Corona Paul Tecson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. Glad that California is in the forefront of possibly building the first high-speed rail project in the U.S. For the rail station stop, the 15 route to San Diego is the ideal stop instead of Riverside. This route is more direct than looping around the 215. Second, the population growth forecast is projected along the 15 freeway corridor. Third, the planned station for Corona is ideal and there is easy access fronting the 15 freeway off the Cajales Interchange in an area that is already developing mixed-use residential, commercial, and office use. Lastly, this station location is situation on a planned east-west freeway corridor called Mid-County Parkways. The last compelling reason to build in Corona is because it makes the most practical sense in terms of use and cost. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
City of Moreno Valley, Economic Development Director Barry Foster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. The alignment must include the I-215 corridor because it will provide access to the major population centers of the Inland Empire - including Riverside, Moreno Valley, and San Bernardino. The I-15 corridor benefits only the city of Corona and ignores the majority of the population in the Inland region. Prefers a station in Riverside along the I-215 at March ARB. This location could be integrated into the new Metrolink station under development at this location. The I-215 route makes the most business sense. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
City of Riverside, Community Development Department Planning Division Ken Gutierrez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two alignments are under consideration in the vicinity of the City of Riverside - the I-215 alignment and the I-15 alignment. City staff has offered the following for your consideration. City Council expressed strong desire for a station within the City along the I-215 alignment in the vicinity of UC Riverside. Combined with the city's expected population and economic growth, the City is well-positioned to support the development of the HST System and placement of a station within the City. Address and discuss all potential impacts on established neighborhoods within the bounds of the project area including but not limited to: quality of life issues, social justice issues, noise impacts, and potential displacements or relocations as they may related to the I-215 alignment and the three proposed corridor portions through the City of Riverside. Public involvement are integral components of the public scoping process. [City Council Memorandum attached, July 14, 2009]. Committee recommends endorsing the HST I-215 alignment; have the Authority's study recommended corridor options; and support RCTC's HST Ad Hoc Committee for a regional perspective on the rail project. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 7.0 Public and Agency Involvement

Table 3-3 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Riverside County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
City of Riverside, Community Development Department Moises A. Lopez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ City of Riverside voted in support of high-speed rail and formally endorses I-215 alignment in the vicinity of UC Riverside with a station in the city. Concerned with impacts associated with established neighborhoods, social justice/displacement/relocation, quality of life, noise, and the physical and natural environment. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land
Riverside County Transportation Commission, Executive Director Anne Mayer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommend formally accepting the Authority as a participating agency as part of the EIR/EIS process for the LA to SD via the Inland Empire HST project. Too early for the Commission to take a position on a single alignment or a station location. 	Chapter 7.0 Public and Agency Participation
ORGANIZATIONS, ASSOCIATIONS, & BUSINESSES		
Corona Chamber of Commerce 643 form letters were submitted. These individuals are listed in Appendix A.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports CA HST System; Supports alternative route along I-15 with a proposed station in the City of Corona; proposed alternative would be beneficial to business and residential communities; need for alternative transportation needed due to increased traffic flow of goods and movement of people from Orange County through Corona to neighboring cities. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics Communities, and Environmental Justice
Friends of Riverside's Hills Len Nunney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1) The route following the 215/60 past UC Riverside has the least environmental impact compared to the route following Watkin Drive. The area around Watkins Drive is included as a criteria cell in the western Riverside MSHCP and includes a wildlife area. The wildlife area connects to Box Springs Mountain to the UC Riverside natural open space and to Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park. 2) A potential mitigation measure we have been evaluating is the construction of a living bridge across the 215/60 freeway linking the UC Riverside open space area to Quail Run Park. 3) The 215/60 freeway section of UC Riverside and Central Avenue contains a major riparian area to the east of the freeway. A route on the west side of the freeway would have a lower impact. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands

Table 3-3 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Riverside County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
McAnally Enterprises, LLC Mark D. Jacobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 70 percent of imports are delivered by rail. Receive from the BNSF five days a week, spotting 15 to 20 covered hopper cars per week. This is critical to my business. Concerned about the interruption of existing rail service during construction of the project. Was told that the HST would not interfere with any freight movement at the public scoping meeting. 	Section 3.1 Transportation
NI Associates Neo Ibrahim	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of the original Program Alignment. Follow Route 60 from Ontario Airport to the Riverside Station. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Riverside Bicycle Club Hugh Thornton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of the project. How will bicyclists be accommodated as passengers? Will there be onboard storage for bicycles? How soon would local governments start planning improvements to bicycle corridors in neighborhood stations? How many crossings will be closed when the routes are planned? 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
T.E.C. Inc. Stephen Klein	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be more opportunity for manufacturing trains and engines in America. The project should be more green by using alternative electric instead of purchasing from Southern California Edison. There should be a direct route not heading east. The route should head north and south. Make the train tickets affordable. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.5 Public Utilities and Energy; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
INDIVIDUAL		
Kent Appel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with the ongoing construction associated with a large project. Live in the target area for the Murrieta station and concerned with the taking of people's property. Concerned with noise problems and cost overruns. Funds have been approved for the project but what about costs not anticipated? Opposed to the project. Do we need it and can we afford it? What is the need and cost for this project? How far will it go? Will property be seized due to eminent domain? 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Louise Appel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose the trains running through or near my property. There are condominiums located about half a mile east of the 15 freeway and the train station was also approximately 1 mile away from the condos. There are empty fields near the property and I'm concerned about noise issues and not being able to sleep at night. It is a bad time to spend money on a train. Lived here for ten years and several neighbors have moved out and several houses are bankrupt, owned by the bank, and foreclosed. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice

Table 3-3 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Riverside County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Charles Benson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Infrastructure investment like this project is the key to the future of California. This project will create construction jobs and a quality of life that will revive future development. 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice.
John E. Brown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The alternative "TWG Alignment" bypassing San Bernardino and Riverside Counties needs to be carefully analyzed. What are the consequences of cutting off commuters to Los Angeles and Orange Counties from access to an HST station? Bypassing I-215 will cut off downtown San Bernardino and Riverside and deny HST access to Cal State Universities (San Bernardino) and UC Riverside. Commuters from Moreno Valley, Perris, Hemet, San Jacinto, the Coachella Valley, Riverside, and San Bernardino will continue to clog the following freeways: 91, 10, 60, and 215. The airport at the former March Air Reserve Base will not have HST access. Main rail and publicly owned rights-of-way exist along most of the 215 corridor. The land acquisition costs should be cheaper. The narrow width of Temecula Canyon and the existing water courses (Lee Lake, Temecula Creek, San Jacinto River, Lake Elsinore) will make the I-15 corridor very difficult to construct. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Richard Bull	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. 	
Robert Carlson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Where is the route between Escondido and Temecula? 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Sylvia Chavez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Naval Warfare Center is a large employer in Norco or Corona. More than 1,000 employees commute from San Diego, Hemet, Riverside, Aliso Viejo, Temecula, and Apple Valley. Should have alignment close to the base so that they can take advantage of the high-speed rail System. Norco is also a rural community with horse ranch homes. A Norco society buys land to keep it open and free of commercial or residential buildings. Please work with communities for deciding the best placement for a stop. Naval Surface Warfare Center's address is 2300 5th Street, Norco, CA 92880. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Charles H. Cram	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of an alignment that follows I-215. Believe project is more cost effective than freeways, land acquisition, and construction costs as well as less fuel costs per passenger mile than cars or airplanes. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Steve Enna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Limit the stations or will have to build a Metrolink. The purpose of the high-speed train is to have limited access so that it could go faster. Prefer the I-215 freeway alternative. It is easier to construct, the land is not impacted, and there is open space. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use
DeLaine Enos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prefer the Riverside County area transportation route to follow the 15 freeway through Corona. This area is more crowded on the freeways and faster growing in population than the city of Riverside. The junction at the 15 and 91 freeways is a bottleneck for traffic into Orange County and LA County. Alternative transportation is needed. The 215 from Riverside heading south is not so heavily travelled. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice

Table 3-3 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Riverside County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Stanley Fader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is an overdependence on local communities to provide transportation to and from proposed rail stations. Local transit facilities are substandard and could not support the proposed project. Are there plans to fund transit between HST and the local communities? Do the communities end up with huge parking garages at each station? 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Garry Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The U.S. is facing bad economic times and to consider the project is amiss. Prefer the rails placed on either side of the freeways. The reason for this is that the value of land is high and to use areas for the project would not be wise financially. 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use
UCR Regional Center Lakisha Hankins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interesting qualities regarding the project such as use of less gas and being on time without any traffic. The project would also provide more jobs. 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
George Hepker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. The project is necessary given the population in California. This project will provide jobs and help solve pollution and highway congestion problems. People will prefer the train over driving. By using existing transportation corridors, the project has properly been placed to minimize negative ecological concerns. The project has made accessibility excellent. 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Mayo Rosie Hernandez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The regular train passes behind our housing complex and noise from the main crossing is fairly loud. What would be done to reduce noise impact if the rail were to pass near UCR? What projected plans are there to link the rail to the San Diego Redline? High-speed rail will make Riverside a City of modern proportions that will attract businesses but need to keep in mind that Riverside should not lose its feel of home and increased crime due to progress. 	Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.10 Safety and Security Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Jean V. Hixenbaugh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is a large senior community that lives in Antelope and Oasis in Menifee and Palmea. Commenter's home is close to Antelope and is concerned if the project goes along the I-215 and will impact the community. ▪ Live in a retirement community close to the 215 freeway. Several senior homes are located along the 215 freeway that runs through Sun City and Menifee. The noise and dust created during construction of the project would be detrimental to the community. Consider the alternate route along the 15 freeway, which would have less of an impact among the residents. Loma Linda hospital is also located along the 215 freeway on the Menifee/Murrieta border. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice

Table 3-3 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Riverside County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Robert L. Horner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Make routes direct and do not go through developed cities. The project should serve San Francisco, San Jose, LA, and SD. There should be two stops in San Joaquin Valley, Los Angeles, and Inland Empire where you can use Metrolink connections. There should also be stops near the Ontario Airport baggage area, Murrieta, Escondido, North San Diego, Lindbergh Field. Skip downtown Fresno, Merced, San Diego, Bakersfield, Corona, San Bernardino, and Riverside. Build stations where you can get there by air, commuter rail, and light rail. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation
Joseph Horvath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I-15 Alignment concerns - grade differential from Corona to Murrieta and close proximity to the Elsinore Fault. I-215 Alignment comment - need the connection to March ARB and grade is more uniform from the March ARB to Murrieta. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils
Ned Ibrahim	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I was Assistant Public Works Director for City of Corona. Prefer the I-10/215 alignment that runs through east Riverside. This route seems to serve the most concentration of population, commerce, and future growth for western Riverside County. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Dennis W. Kidd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. It should go through San Bernardino, Riverside, and Moreno Valley. It should not go through Corona and the Temescal Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Ira Krauss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allow high-speed rail to stop at the City of Riverside. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Annette Larsonclose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Live very close to the I-15 in South Corona. Concerned about the environmental impact, noise, and vibrations caused by this rail. Where would the station be if it were in Corona? When will the project begin and is this a done deal? 	Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration
Camille Mahant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ HST linking San Diego, Murrieta, Riverside, and Los Angeles is an excellent idea. Even though it will be expensive to build and maintain it, the long-term benefits will be worth it. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need
Keller Williams Realty Anita McMillan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prefer having the project go through Corona along the 15 freeway. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Russ Napier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordination with local rail is necessary. The Los Angeles-Las Vegas route should be studied. Why not lead with it? 	Section 3.1 Transportation
Justin Nelson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support high-speed rail and rail transit in the Inland Empire/Riverside area. Oppose route through Corona via I-15 due to poor regional connections and low ridership. Should Corona emerge as the preferred alternative, a station should be adjacent to the north Main-Corona rail station and transit center. Opposes a station near the Dos Lagos developments rather than the Magnolia/6th Street corridor as it would make possible transit connections worse. Corona's bus system does not operate on Sundays. Support route through Riverside along I-215 since it is a natural regional location with a strong ridership due to the eastern hub of Metrolink, bus lines, Amtrak, and a large population, business core, and student population. Oppose a station at UC Riverside because access to this area is by a single hourly bus line, poor road access, little space for parking, and the proposed station for the Metrolink Perris Valley Line at this site was 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

Table 3-3 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Riverside County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	<p>faced with substantial neighborhood opposition and was modified to include no parking. However City of Riverside and RTA are negotiating to put a new Multi-Modal Transit Facility adjacent to the current Metrolink/Amtrak station downtown, RCTC is currently working to widen SR 91 through downtown Riverside. A station at the Multi-Modal Transit Facility would access the downtown area and connect existing transit to service out to San Bernardino and other areas in Riverside County with space for parking, potentially rejoin the I-215 right-of-way via 14th Street or other similar east-west roads.</p>	
Richard Ornelas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1) Suggest another way to bring water through the high-speed train and siphon off water from the delta 24 hours a day. When the HST travels down to San Diego, it will bring the water down with it through pipes. The pipes can siphon off the pressure on the HST. 2) The HST will take 70 percent of the traffic off the freeway. The funding to build new freeways will not be necessary because freeway traffic will decrease. The funding for freeways can be used to build the HST. 3) The HST will cut the environmental budget in half. 4) With the saving on water, traffic, and the environment, the money can offset the deficit. The HST will be the cheapest, quickest, and easiest transportation. 	<p>Section 3.5 Public Utilities and Energy; Section 5.0 Project Costs and Operations</p>
Jim Perry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. The project appears to be safe and clean to the environment. Prefer to have a station located in the City of Riverside. This station would provide a location in the largest city within the county. Riverside is centrally located within the region and is easy to access. It will benefit the entire region and county. It would bring jobs to thousands of citizens. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics</p>
Stephan Prior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like to see the project move forward. The project would provide benefits for many people, giving them more choices and freedom. 	
Curt Pry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I'm from England and am used to riding trains. Would like to see this project completed in a couple of years rather than a couple of decades. 	
Kiwanis of Temecula Kenneth Ray	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1) Will the right-of-way be primarily through the center of existing freeways? If not, a state-wide policy is needed to preserve potential rights-of-way. There should be prohibitions to prevent local agencies from permitting permanent structures across routes. 2) Who will build or operate the stations? A joint authority of the cities of Murrieta and Temecula would be the quickest way to bring a new Murrieta station to the community. 3) Double the parking that is currently planned. The stations will be commuter hubs and adequate parking is critical to persuade drivers to abandon their vehicles and take the train. 	<p>Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations</p>
Christine G. Rodriguez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project and believe it will enable small business owners on fixed incomes. Believe project is an environmentally-friendly transportation option. 	<p>Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice</p>

Table 3-3 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Riverside County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Barbara Rugg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Live 1 mile east of the I-15 freeway. Not interested in selling or having a train path run through my home. 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Judy Salazar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prefer the route along the 215 freeway corridor. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Kaila Saunders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The HST should offer an annual or yearly pass. 	Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Mark Scarlata	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ People will use the trains. Several people commute from here to Orange County or Los Angeles for work. People would use it more for commuting purposes than for transportation from Los Angeles to San Francisco. Should build it from the Southern California regional standpoint first, then the San Francisco to Sacramento route. The trains should meet somewhere in the San Joaquin Valley. If it is affordable, then more people will use it for commuter purposes. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation
Manuel Sousa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No comment. 	
Bobby Spiegel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prefer the alignment up the 15 freeway rather than along the 215 freeway. The construction cost would be lower. Both alignments would create jobs. However, the 15 freeway alignment would be a shorter distance to build. Prefer having the trains locally. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
CIONO Turner C. Stancil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. 	
Susan Stonestreet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Inland Empire suffers from a severe lack of jobs. A high-speed rail will allow access to good jobs located in other areas. An area that is heavily industrialized is Irvine and the non-direct route will not alter the current 1.5 to 2 hour commute. Would like to see this project implemented within a faster timeframe. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Henry Tang	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support construction of HST. Will pay even if train fares high for the significant time savings. Is there any information on Metrolink commuter service improvements that may result from high-speed rail project infrastructure improvements? 	Section 3.1 Transportation
Ahee Ubry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about safety and if the HST is earthquake proof. How will the HST keep people and wildlife away from the tracks? How is the HST powered - solar electricity or conventional electricity? How long do the trains last? What is the annual maintenance cost? What is the cost for a train ticket compared to airfare? 	Section 3.5 Public Utilities and Energy; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Hunter Engineering Ramon Ventura	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor and support the project especially the portion that runs through the I-15 northbound. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives

Table 3-3 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Riverside County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Phillip Villa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. Should focus on persistent lobbying effects and focus on job creation, environmental sustainability, and other ideas that benefit the community. This project will have the political and public support necessary to acquire the required funding. This is a green public project that would be a sign of progression for California and the rest of the nation. 	Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Katherine Zook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The demographics of Moreno Valley will not support the project as much as Corona. Go through Corona rather than Moreno Valley. There should be a connection as the train runs north and makes a bend into Riverside/San Bernardino area. There should be a connector so people could go from San Diego to Las Vegas. There should be a connection from San Diego with one stop at Riverside/San Bernardino station. Riders can go north and make a change to go to Vegas. How are the trains being powered? Where will the train get its electricity? Are we bringing in electricity from another state so that it appears we are not polluting? 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation Section 3.5 Public Utilities and Energy

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
FEDERAL AGENCIES		
United States Marine Corps Colonel Frank A. Richie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the expansion of mass transit and will continue to participate in the planning process for the region. The proposed alignments occur within the Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar Air Installation Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Area of Influence for land use planning purposes and beneath Federal Aviation Administration airspace surfaces associated with MCAS Miramar. Any alignment alternatives in close proximity to MCAS Miramar would be directly affected by routine military operations and aircraft from this installation. Of particular concern are the proposed alignment alternatives north of the base boundary that follow and/or intersect Miramar Road. These alignments are adjacent to and/or are close to military housing units and sensitive natural habitats in the vicinity of Eastgate Mall. The EIR should evaluate impacts to these resources as well as quality of life for military family members. Any disruption to federal infrastructure and services would also need to be identified, prevented, or mitigations implemented. Evaluate impacts associated with any alternatives that may limit the Marine Corp's ability to perform mission essential training and readiness requirements to meet national security objectives. The EIR should study noise, operational, and safety issues associated with the Miramar Road alternative. This alternative would be in close proximity to the primary departure and arrival corridors, Field Carrier Landing Practice, Touch and Go and Ground Controlled Approach Flight patterns for Miramar operations, and would be subject to potential noise levels ranging from 65 to 80 decibels CNEL. There is no effective mitigation for exterior noise from over-flight and the cumulative impacts of both the rail corridor traffic and transiting military aircraft should be examined further. It should be determined if electronic emissions would cause interference with air or land-based military operations. Any proposed tunneling along Miramar Road would require examination by the Department of Navy to determine if disruption of critical infrastructure (ex. fuel and natural gas lines) would negatively impact mission operations and create security concerns at MCAS Miramar and/or other Marine Corps and Navy facilities in San Diego County. Portions of the proposed alignments are within the Accident Potential Zone (APZ). The Marine Corps would need to examine aspects of the HST to make an informed determination if the proposed project would be a compatible land use in the area. Of particular concern is the analysis of the I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium and the proposed acquisition of federal land. This would require that the DOD receive a formal written request from the Authority to determine the viability of the request and potential impacts to military operations at MCAS Miramar and the San Diego region. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.4 Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference; Section 3.5 Public Utilities and Energy; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.10 Safety and Security Section 3.11 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
<p>United States Marine Corps, Marine Corps Air Station Miramar; Colonel, U.S. Marine Corps, Commanding Officer Frank A. Richie Laura Thornton Juan Lias</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of high-speed rail. Noted that alignments within close proximity to MCAS Miramar would occur within AICUZ Areas of Influence, routine military operations, and fixed and rotary-wing aircraft flight patterns regarding land use planning, military family housing, and sensitive natural habitats. Need to identify any disruption to federal infrastructure and services with associated prevention or mitigation measures. EIR to evaluate impacts associated any alternatives that may limit the Marine Corp's ability to perform mission essential training and readiness requirements regarding national security objectives. EIR to examine noise, operational, safety issues, electronic emissions/interference, utilities/infrastructure, and cumulative impacts. Security concerns and land use compatibility. Consider other pending and potential transportation actions. Concerned with potential acquisition of federal land. Letter included an attachment with previous statements provided to SANDAG High-Speed Rail Task Force dated May 13, 1999 and is summarized below.. ▪ Any effort to use Marine Corps' land for the HST that would limit or impact the Marine Corps ability to perform its mission would not be approved. The impacts could take the form of electronic interference to flight operations, interference with any of the airfield approach or safety surfaces required for airfield operations, encroachment on base boundaries that would impact family housing, quality of life, environmentally sensitive areas, or surface traffic patterns. Approval could not occur until the HSRA completes the Consolidated Land and Airspace Management Planning process with the MCAS Miramar staff. Routes along the I-15 that would encroach on and impact sensitive environmental areas including very high quality vernal pools and habitat for the California gnatcatcher. Coordinate with the Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan. MCAS Miramar has a critical shortage of military family housing. The HST must consider and avoid environmental impact to military family housing, particularly noise impacts and blocking access of ingress and egress. The EIS must address transportation actions that may impact MCAS Miramar, including the proposed I-805 expansion and commuter rail service and lines. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.4 Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference; Section 3.5 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations</p>
STATE AGENCIES		
<p>California Coastal Commission, District Manager Deborah Lee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Place us on your mailing list for the EIR/EIR and other notices. Portions of the project may need coastal development permits and/or federal certifications from the Commission. Sensitive resources in the potential project area could include the San Diego River, wetlands, and areas of coastal sage scrub. Public access and visual resources will also need to be protected within the corridor. The majority for these impacts would be located within the Coastal Zone of San Diego County. In your review, it would be important to analyze and discuss the impacts the proposed project may have on the ridership, operations, and phased implementation of projects in the LOSSAN corridor, due to the fact that a large component of the LOSSAN corridor within San Diego County is located within the Coastal Zone. 	<p>Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources</p>

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
<p>California Department of Transportation, Planning Division Deputy District Director Bill Figge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Letter is a coordinated effort with Caltrans Districts 7, 8, and 11. Concern with impacts to state highway system and right-of-way. Would like coordination with planned future projects and related land use plans for project and alternatives (attachment has preliminary list for all 3 districts). Concerned with impacts associated with traffic and circulation, communities, visual, airport compatibility, noise, and stormwater. Statewide coordinator: Jess Avila and District 11: Chris Schmidt. ▪ Consider currently planned and future transportation projects along state highway facilities during all phases of project development. The planned HST stations would result in traffic circulation reconfiguration and a traffic volume increase accessing the HST station. The impacts to the state highway systems should be included in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS). The TIS must include the proposed project's near-term and long-term impacts to state facilities and include mitigation measures. Study the regionally significant arterial system segments and intersections, including state highways where the project will add over 100 peak hour trips, or the Caltrans maximum limit. State highways that are already experiencing noticeable delays should be analyzed in the scope of the traffic study for projects that add 50 to 100 (per TIS) peak hour trips. A focused analysis may be required for project trips assigned to a state highway facility that is experiencing significant delay, such as where traffic queues exceed ramp storage capacities. A focused analysis may be necessary if there is an increased risk of potential traffic accident. The TIS must include the proposed project's near-term and long-term impacts to state facilities and include mitigation measures. Study the regionally significant arterial system segments and intersections, including state highways where the project will add over 100 peak hour trips, or the Caltrans maximum limit. State highways that are already experiencing noticeable delays should be analyzed in the scope of the traffic study for projects that add 50 to 100 (per TIS) peak hour trips. A focused analysis may be required for project trips assigned to a state highway facility that is experiencing significant delay, such as where traffic queues exceed ramp storage capacities. A focused analysis may be necessary if there is an increased risk of potential traffic accident. Freeway entrance and exits should be analyzed. Additional protocols are specified in the letter. Proposed HST stations should provide regional multi-modal connectivity and should be located at or near existing or planned smart growth areas. The TIS must include the proposed station impact analysis on state and local transportation facilities. Visual impact studies of the stations are required. The HST alignment and stations may have a direct impact on existing public-use airports. The transportation opportunities afforded to traveling public and potential change in demand for airport facilities should be assessed. A traffic control plan (TCP) or construction traffic impact study is required by Caltrans. A transportation management plan (TMP) must identify potential traffic delays and keep the delays to Caltrans maximum. Address noise impacts caused by changes in the alignment of a Caltrans roadway by following Caltrans' Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol. Satisfy stormwater requirements. Any work performed within Caltrans R/W requires review and approval by Caltrans. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality</p>



Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
California Natural Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Regional Manager, South Coast Region Edmund Pert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An assessment of flora and fauna within and adjacent to the project is recommended. The following are recommended: assessment of rare plants and natural communities; assessment of sensitive fish, wildlife, reptile, and amphibian species. rare, threatened, and endangered species should meet CEQA Guidelines; the Department's Biogeographic Data Branch should be contacted to obtain current information on reported sensitive species and habitats. 2) A thorough discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to negatively impact biological resources should be discussed. 3) A range of alternatives should be analyzed. The alternatives should avoid or minimize impacts to biological resources including wetlands/ riparian habitats, alluvial scrub, coastal sage scrub, Joshua tree woodlands, etc. 4) A California Endangered Species Act (CESA) permit is required if project has potential to result in "take" of species of plants or animals listed under CESA. 5) The Department opposes the elimination of watercourses and/or the canalization of natural and manmade drainages or conversion to subsurface drains. All wetlands and watercourses, must be retained and provided with setbacks to preserve riparian and aquatic habitat and wildlife populations. 6) Project specific comments should be addressed in the Draft EIR and consistency with existing and draft regional conservation plans is required. 	Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources
California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Executive Officer John H. Robertus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of the project is likely to result in potential impacts to water quality, wetland, and riparian resources. 	Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources
Senator, 39th District Christine Kehoe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support project, but no more than two stations in San Diego County, specifically Lindbergh Field as part of the Intermodal Transportation Center and the Escondido Transit Center. Support analysis for both I-5 and I-15 corridors. Recommend public's intent be kept in mind to enhance intercity rail, support opportunities to develop a commuter market along I-15, potential extension to the border, and linking transportation improvements with smart growth land uses. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use
State of California - The Resource Agency, Department of Parks and Recreation Ronilee Clark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues with potential impacts to Old Town San Diego State Historic Park and Torrey Pines State Natural Reserve, and the design of appropriate minimization, avoidance, or mitigation measures. Old Town already supports several major transportation facilities - high-speed rail seems appropriate, but the concerns are operational activities, aesthetics, historic and interpretive resources, noise and vibration, air pressure and quality, traffic delays, public access, and parking. Route crosses Carroll Canyon which is a tributary to Los Peñasquitos lagoon within Torrey Pines State Natural Reserve - concerns are with sediment and urban runoff upstream. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality



Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
<p>State of California Public Utilities Commission, Utilities Engineer Rosa Munoz</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The design criteria of the proposed project must comply with Commission General Orders (GO's) listed in this letter. The HST alignment from LA to SD via Inland Empire will run along rights of way for several railroads and transit systems. The Amtrak and Metrolink also operate passenger trains along portions of this route. The portion of the alignment that will run along existing freight and passenger lines in downtown San Diego is one area of concern. The HST will impact the proposed downtown San Diego quiet zone. Ash Street is part of the proposed San Diego quiet zone and the addition of the HST station will add pedestrian traffic and alter the characteristics of the Ash Street crossing and possibly other nearby crossings that are part of the quiet zone. HST Alternative: 1) HST proposes an electric powered steel-wheel-on-steel-rail system on mostly dedicated grade separated tracks. Recommend consolidation and grade separation of all existing at-grade crossings along adopted alignment in the HST project. 2) Recommend that the HST project operate on an entirely dedicated fully grade-separated track. 3) Consideration should be given to grade-separated structures involving trenching the HST track. 4) As construction of roadway grade separation structures is likely to involve changes to public infrastructure and private property, local entities must be allowed to amend their general plans and incorporate the HST into existing footprints to allow for future ROW preservation. 5) Most cities along the proposed corridor have built their downtowns around the tracks. This leads to high amount of pedestrians around the tracks. Tracks at current elevation would likely result in trespassing issues. Elevating or lowering the tracks would mitigate this concern. Fencing or barriers should be a requirement. 6) Requests a detailed proposal of the LA to SD HST project. 7) Discussions regarding the placement of electrical lines for the project must be held with Commission staff. 	<p>Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibrations; Section 3.10 Safety and Security</p>
REGIONAL AGENCIES		
<p>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority Ted Anasis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Amendments to a general plan or specific plan, zoning ordinance, or building code are subject to review by the Airport Land Use Compatibility (ALUCP). Destination Lindbergh is a multi-agency planning effort that evaluated off-airport alternatives for ground transportation to connect with San Diego International Airport. Destination Lindbergh should be referenced in evaluating the HST station locations. The HST should include analysis of circulation and traffic impacts. As vehicle parking is constrained at and surrounding San Diego International Airport, any potential uses that increase demand for vehicle and parking use should be analyzed and described how they will be served. Opportunities to improve transit connectivity to and through any HST stations are encouraged. 	<p>Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use</p>

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
SANDAG, Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A station at the proposed Lindbergh Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) must be included in the process and HSTs should directly serve this downtown San Diego area. Recommend that fewer stops be included for the section of the HST between LA and San Diego with no more than four stops during express service. Recommend elimination of a University City station and inclusion of the station locations in Escondido and at the Lindbergh ITC. Supports the efforts to plan, design, and construct HST along this corridor. The Escondido Transit Center (ETC) is the preferred Escondido station. The City of Escondido should be involved in the corridor process. All station locations should provide regional multimodal connections and be located at or near existing or planned smart growth areas. Consider the SANDAG Mid-Coast Corridor and work closely to ensure both services share the same general corridor between Old Town Transit Center and University City, including potential tunnels option in the University City area. Consider ongoing and future planning and project development along the LOSSAN corridor for commuter and intercity rail services. Would like to continue work with the CHSRA to pursue the possible future extension to the International Border. Suggests working on the feasibility to serve commuters along the I-15 corridor. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Chapter 7.0 Public and Agency Participation
LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES		
City of Chula Vista, Development Services Department; Advance Planning Manager Ed Batchelder Dave Kaplan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accepting invitation to become a Participating Agency. Primary City of Chula Vista contact is Dave Kaplan, Transportation Engineer. 	
City of Escondido Planning Jay Petrek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment. 	
City of San Diego, City Planning & Community Investment Director William Anderson Tait Galloway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support high-speed rail. Station at Lindbergh Intermodal Transportation Center should be included. All station locations evaluated should provide regional multimodal connections and consider parking demands and traffic and land use impacts. Consider existing and planned Mid-Coast Corridor to share the same general corridor between Old Town Transit Center and University City with evaluation of City right-of-way and property ownership. Consider tunnel alignment option in University City area and/or I-15 right-of-way instead of Rose Canyon between I-805 and I-5. Should station be located at University City, consider location at or in proximity to planned Multi-Modal Transit Facility served by Mid-Coast and other transit services. Include impacts associated with viewshed corridors associated with relevant plans and programs. Consider different grade alternative along downtown to Old Town Transit Center corridor with evaluation of City right-of-way and property ownership. Consider impacts to above and below ground utilities. Portions of route are in North Bay Redevelopment Project 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.5 Public Utilities and Energy; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	Area. Process should utilize City's published CEQA thresholds and evaluation guidelines. Pursue extension to the border. Consider ongoing/future plans for LOSSAN corridor. Supports effort to service other areas such as along I-15.	
City of San Diego Office of Councilmember Sherrri Lightner and Donna Frye Sherrri Lightner Donna Frye	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support bringing HST to San Diego. HST will benefit our region by adding jobs, stimulating the economy, decreasing the demand for auto travel, and reducing overall carbon emissions. Please consider an alignment alternative along the I-15 to a station at Qualcomm Stadium. This alignment would be cheaper to build, faster to the region, and will attract more intercity passengers by 2020 than the two proposed alignments along the I-15 to the I-5 corridor; this is according to data from the Final Program EIR/EIS for the proposed California High-Speed Train System. This alignment will have lower potential impacts to aesthetic, visual, archaeological, and cultural resources. A stop at Qualcomm is centrally located in San Diego and provides opportunities for Smart Growth and redevelopment. This route would not preclude a final stop at the Lindbergh Field or downtown San Diego. Route should have stops at Lindbergh Field or downtown San Diego and continue to border. An HST corridor to the border should be studied. Facilitate meaningful public participation as promised in the 2005 EIR/EIS. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality; Section 3.16 Cultural Resources; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use Eric Gibson LeAnn Carmichael	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County of San Diego accepting to become a Participating Agency with LeAnn Carmichael as the point of contact. County has guidelines to determine the significance of environmental impacts in unincorporated areas of San Diego County and associated mitigation options all of which should utilize this information. San Diego County currently completing a North County MSCP map and plan under the Natural Communities Conservation Program. Overall supportive in project goals and objectives. Favors routes along interstate corridors to minimize impacts to communities, property owners, natural habitats/corridors. Consider topographical constraints. Tunneling option would require geotechnical analysis. Concerned with faults, vibration, groundwater, traffic, and disposal of mined material from the rock formations at locations of tunneling which may produce high quality aggregate materials to be potentially used in the construction of the project and help defray cost. Proposed alignment does not completely align with existing state highway facility of I-15 and likely cross in unincorporated areas of northern San Diego County - need to identify any County roads that will be closed, realigned, or impacted by route or any other component of the project. Need to identify all details of project (i.e., alignment, tracks, right-of-way, stations, and other associated facilities/ infrastructure). Project should note the proposed route will not preclude the construction of any planned County Circulation (Mobility) Element roads and will accommodate all planned County Circulation Element roads. Permits needed for any work in County right-of-way. Consider County's Transportation Impact Fee program as mitigation for any cumulative impacts to County facilities. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.17 Cumulative Impacts; Chapter 7.0 Public and Agency Participation

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Marian Bear Natural Park Recreation Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports high-speed rail project. Opposes route in Rose Canyon or San Clemente Canyon. Concerned with effects on the park, creek/watershed, coastal sage scrub, riparian trees. Prefers route along I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium and then underground to the end of the route, which would be less expensive, reduced noise and visual impacts, faster/shorter travel times with higher ridership. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations</p>
Rancho Bernardo Community Planning Board Ellen Willis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project route along I-15 would divide the community of Rancho Bernardo. Concerned with surrounding land use and loss of property and community character, which includes Rancho Bernardo, San Pasqual, Rancho Peñasquitos, Carmel Mountain, Sabre Springs, Mira Mesa, and Scripps Ranch due to take and close proximity to project route. Concerned with construction and operation impacts to existing transportation facilities and traffic circulation along I-15, air quality, noise and vibration, geology and soils (especially landslides), water quality in watersheds, surrounding natural open space areas (i.e., Lake Hodges/San Pasqual Valley, Los Peñasquitos Canyon, Green Valley Creek, Battle Mountain); visual quality/aesthetics (particularly the hillsides of 4S Ranch and the area between Lake Hodges and Los Peñasquitos Canyon), and overall community character and cohesiveness with Sabre Springs, Rancho Bernardo, Rancho Peñasquitos, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Mira Mesa, and Scripps Ranch. Wants a formal opportunity to provide additional public scoping comments once 15% design is available. Alternatives to be evaluated at equal detail. Evaluate construction options and cumulative impacts. All communities mentioned have similar concerns as outlined. Also included a copy of previous comment letter dated 08/30/2004. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations</p>

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority Ted Anasis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments to a general plan or specific plan, zoning ordinance, or building code are subject to review by the Airport Land Use Compatibility (ALUCP). Destination Lindbergh is a multi-agency planning effort that evaluated off-airport alternatives for ground transportation to connect with San Diego International Airport. Destination Lindbergh should be referenced in evaluating the HST station locations. The HST should include analysis of circulation and traffic impacts. As vehicle parking is constrained at and surrounding San Diego International Airport, any potential uses that increase demand for vehicle and parking use should be analyzed and described how they will be served. Opportunities to improve transit connectivity to and through any HST stations are encouraged. Issues to be addressed: airport land use compatibility; consistency with airport Master Plan and destination Lindbergh planning efforts; circulation, traffic, and parking; and transit opportunities. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use
San Diego South County Economic Development Council, Chief Executive Officer Cindy Gompper-Graves	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the HST. Economic opportunities associated with bringing rail to San Diego and connecting cities. This project will lead to additional jobs. HST will allow additional modes of transportation for tourist offering lower costs option to visit portions of California. The HST is an environmentally sensitive solution to the overburden air and vehicle transportation modes that exist. 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
San Diego Unified School District Trustee, District A John Lee Evans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with route in Rose Canyon regarding proximity to schools, fencing, and the open space park. Request consideration of a route to follow an existing freeway corridor to avoid Rose Canyon/park area. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
South County Economic Development Council William W Tunstall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is sufficient pedestrian traffic that travels regionally within the state to support a shuttle from the Mexican border. Population in the border region is expected to double in the next 10 to 15 years. Suggest providing an extension of the HST between the cross border terminal and SD stations in the environmental studies. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation
Unified Port of San Diego John Helmer Candice Magnus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with impacts to Port tidelands from proposed project. Areas of concern include, but not limited to Pacific Highway Corridor, North Embarcadero, and Santa Fe Depot. Project to coordinate with Port Master Plan, which includes planning policies for the physical development of the Port tidelands. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources;

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use
ORGANIZATIONS, ASSOCIATIONS, & BUSINESSES		
American Society of Civil Engineers, President Phillip Kern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly objects to adoption of the Inland Empire route, parallel to the I-15, as the sole alternative under the EIR/EIS. This route has not received adequate review prior to being adopted as the preferred alternative for the preparation of the design and environmental documentation for the LA-SD via the Inland Empire segment. Little benefit to the HST following I-15, median or excess right of way will not be available to construct the rail facilities. Nearly the entire alignment along the I-15 between Miramar and San Diego County line will be built on structure or within tunnels. This will be expensive to construct and may render the LA-SD via the Inland Empire segment infeasible from a financial perspective. The Inland Empire route bypasses coastal population centers in favor of more lightly populated inland areas with fewer destinations and limited ridership. An established coastal rail corridor is easier to implement. Coastal bluffs, lagoons, and other habitat can be preserved and restored while locating transportation facilities where they can maximize ridership and minimize environmental impacts. Upgrading and realigning the existing coastal rail corridor for high-speed or conventional trains offers opportunity to construct improvements incrementally, while maintaining current revenue operations. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
CALPIRG, State Director Emily Rusch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In support of continuing to study a downtown station stop at Santa Fe Depot. Support HST because it will reduce traffic congestion, decrease harmful pollution, and cost less to construct than highway and airport expansions. Consider various alignments to reach Santa Fe Depot station stop. Should be strategically placing HST station stops at public transportation hubs to encourage travelers to take alternative transportation within San Diego. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Friends of Rose Canyon Michael Buczaczer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project should be along I-15 rather than through Rose Canyon because it is less populated along this route. There are also species and a large population along the canyon. The project will have a negative impact on the homes along Rose Canyon. Noise and construction noise is not acceptable. Rails must be along low density populations. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Friends of Rose Canyon, Executive Director Deborah Knight	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EIR/EIS should study the cumulative impacts of the proposed alignment on Rose Canyon, Rose Creek, and the Rose Creek watershed in relation to past, present, and future projects including but not limited to: Midcost Corridor Projects; Proposed Regents Road bridge project; Miramar trunk sewer project; wetland and upland mitigation project; sewer access paths; current and proposed storm water maintenance activities, including access roads. Should include activities proposed in the City of San Diego's Master Storm Water System Maintenance 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration;



Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	<p>Program Final Program EIR; Habitat fragmentation, including wildlife in the San Diego canyons; new development anticipated by the HST project; MSCP areas along the route. Should address impacts of construction and maintenance activities for the HST projects and projects mentioned in letter. Cumulative impacts should study impacts in relation to the above projects. 2) EIR/EIS should study the project's impacts on the Metropolitan Wastewater Department's current wetland and upland mitigation project in Rose Canyon. 3) The EIR/EIS should discuss any proposed HST alignment's compatibility with the MSCP and the impacts on the MSCP areas in Carroll Canyon, Rose Canyon, and San Clemente Canyon. 4) EIR/EIS should study all impacts on Rose Canyon Park, Marian Bear Memorial Park, and Rose Creek (including Rose Creek bike path). 5) The EIR/EIS should study all impacts on Rose Creek watershed. 6) The EIR/EIS should study impacts on recreational and educational uses of Rose Canyon, Marian Bear Park, Rose Creek, and the Rose Creek watershed. 7) The EIR should study the compatibility of the alignment through Rose Canyon with: University Community Plan, Rose Creek Watershed Opportunities Assessment, and City of San Diego General Plan. 8) The EIR should study the need for modifications to all bridges and freeway intersection along alignment through Rose Canyon and Rose Creek.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluate cumulative impacts associated with Rose Canyon in relationship to biology, hydrology, wetlands, water quality, landform alteration, retaining walls, wildlife movement and corridor impacts, MSCP, noise and vibration, visual/aesthetic impacts, sensitive and threatened and endangered species, recreational use, cultural resources, and neighborhood character. Study: any impacts to MWWWD wetland and upland mitigation project (in Rose Canyon); compatibility with MSHCP; Rose Canyon, Marian Bear Park, and Rose Creek; Rose Creek watershed; recreational and educational uses of Rose Canyon, Marian Bear, and Rose Creek; compatibility with applicable land use plans; any modifications to bridges and freeways. Oppose route in Rose Canyon. Prefers alternative routes along I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium, I-15 to SR 163 to Lindbergh or downtown San Diego, or I-15 to SR 163 to I-8 to the coast. Study Lindbergh and Qualcomm stadium as station options. 	<p>Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.8 Geology and Soil; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality; Section 3.16 Cultural Resources; Section 3.17 Cumulative Impacts; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations;</p>
Friends of Rose Canyon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Email includes two letter attachments: (1) USFWS/CDFG comment letter on Draft EIR with a received date of 04/15/2004 and (2) Regional Water Quality Control Board comment letter on Draft EIR dated 02/28/2005. Both letters are in response to the NOP of a Draft EIR for the University City North/South Transportation Corridor Study. 	
Friends of Rose Creek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support concept of high-speed rail. Oppose route in Rose Canyon. Concerned with impacts to natural open space, creeks, natural habitats, parks and recreational use, wetland ecosystems, water quality, and MSCP. Request analysis on cost, ridership, and parking. Support route evaluation of I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium and to serve the needs of East County and Chula Vista. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands;</p>



Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use
Genesee Highlands Association, President Gerry Senda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ [Mailing List Request]. ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon and the tunnel option underneath Rose Canyon. Concerned with impacts associated with noise, quality of life, and open space park. Prefer study of I-15 route to Qualcomm Stadium. Suggest alternative route to tunnel under I-5 and La Jolla Village Drive straight to existing Coaster Station in Sorrento Valley and then along SR 56 to I-15. Station at UTC would add to traffic and suggests to link with existing station at Sorrento Valley. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Hecht Solberg Robinson Goldberg & Bagley, LLP Paul E. Robinson Donna Nickens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned with the Carroll Canyon Road alignment alternative which will have a devastating impact to the existing Vulcan materials Company mining operation and the future Stone Creek project (future 293-acre mixed-use transit-oriented development) within the Carroll Canyon Master Plan Element of the Mira Mesa Community Plan. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use
Law Offices of Everett L. Delano III, on behalf of Friends of Rose Canyon Everett DeLano	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments submitted on behalf of Friends of Rose Canyon. The following need to be addressed in the EIR/EIS: scope of the project; all phases of project development; construction traffic impacts; land use impacts; traffic impacts; noise impacts; light impacts; toxics and human health impacts; water and air quality impacts; water supply impacts; historical and cultural resource impacts; cumulative impacts; global warming impacts; adequate and verifiable mitigation for project impacts; and adequate range of alternatives, including alternatives that avoid Rose Canyon Open Space Park and Marian Bear Park, as well as a "no project" alternative that is consistent with existing uses and existing conditions in the project vicinity. ▪ Issues to be addressed: scope of project and all phases of development, construction traffic, land use, traffic, noise, lighting, toxics/human health, airborne contamination, water and air quality, water supply, cultural and historical resources, cumulative, global warming, mitigation measures and alternatives that would avoid Rose Canyon, Marian Bear, and include "no project". 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environment Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual



Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Quality; Section 3.16 Cultural Resources
Mira Mesa Community Planning Group Linda Geldner, R.A.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requesting quarterly presentations on project status or at major milestones. Provide one viable alignment alternative that does not traverse through Mira Mesa in the alternatives analysis. Any alternative traversing through Mira Mesa would need to be evaluated for all impacts, especially noise and vibration in and across the canyons affecting surrounding residents. Explain how project would safely work and operate. Mira Mesa Transit Center is planned at I-15 and Hillary and should be incorporated into the alignment along I-15. Explain where and how stations would be incorporated into the high-speed rail project and how it affects the preferred alternative selection. Each alternative should evaluate ridership levels generated. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Old Town San Diego Community Planning Group, Secretary Geoffrey Mogilner Christine Robinson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect Old Town's historic resources, including Koa'aay and San Diego Presidio, Presidio Park, Old Town San Diego State Historic Park, and San Diego River and wetlands. Improve west vehicular circulation from Rosecrans Street to Hotel Circle without impacting Old Town Historic District. Improve south vehicular circulation from PCH to Morean Blvd. without impacting Old Town District. Provide a railroad grade separation for vehicles and pedestrians without impacting Old Town Historic District. Provide direct access from PCH to I-8. Respect private property. Cosoy.org/proposal.html presents example which comprehensively addresses many of these issues. Coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and other appropriate agencies. Concerned with visual and noise impacts at Old Town. Trains at grade. This will reduce visual and noise impacts from trains at Old Town. Suspect construction costs of Cosoy proposal will be less than cost to carry trains over I-8. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.16 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Pacific Energy Center; Senior Policy Advisor Don Wood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support high-speed rail and route along I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. Oppose the route through Rose Canyon, Rose Creek, Carroll Canyon, San Clemente Canyon or any canyon and creek with substantial natural open space. Concerned with impacts to water quality, wildlife habitat, MSCP, and recreation. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
<p>Rainbow Community Planning Group Curtis Nicolaisen Jim Anderson</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Believes the best alignment is along the I-15 freeway through the Rainbow community. This route would have the least impacts on human and natural habitats in the Rainbow area. The proposed alignment from Temecula would divert from the I-15 and tunnel through Rainbow and reconnect with the Stewart Canyon area. The proposed tunnel alignment will have high projected costs and the tunnel would result in right-of-way constraints, making the alignment alternative impractical. The alignment would not be compatible with existing development, would have seismic and hydrologic constraints, would impact the natural environment and agricultural land. It would also impact aquatic and riparian forest resources and threatened and endangered species. The water table is high in the Rainbow area. Changes to the water table would impact endangered and threatened species. Changes to Rainbow Creek, ground settling, loss of drinking and irrigation water, and would place a pressure for high density housing in Rainbow that is not compatible with the community plan. The project would impact property value in Rainbow if the route diverts from the I-15 corridor. The route will have potential impacts on existing aqueducts, natural gas facility, and high power transmission lines in Rainbow. ▪ Proposed tunnel through the community of Rainbow would be expensive, result in considerable right-of-way constraints, incompatible with existing development. Concerned with impacts associated with seismic and hydrological constraints, natural environment, agriculture, and biological resources. Suggest alignment on or under I-15 through Rainbow and enter a tunnel on the west side of I-15 just south of SR 79/Temecula Parkway in Temecula with the tunnel transitioning to the east side of the corridor just north of Old Highway 395 and 5th Street intersection and continue to follow the corridor until the intersection of Old Highway 395 and Reche Road and then the tunnel would pass back under I-15 with the south end of the tunnel on the side of a hill on the west side of I-15 in order to avoid highly sensitive habitat areas identified as preapproved take and preserve areas. Elevate route over San Luis Rey River and enter another tunnel south of river west of Old Highway 395 due to the grade along I-15. Concerns with high water table and associate impacts to potable water, agriculture, and natural vegetation/habitat. Concerned with property values, existing aqueducts, natural gas infrastructure, and high power transmission line. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.5 Public Utilities and Energy; Section 3.6 Biological Resources; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use. Section 3.13 Agricultural Lands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations</p>
<p>Sabre Springs Planning Group, Chair Craig Balben</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal for the HST line through I-15 corridor within San Diego is of particular interest because the Los Angeles to San Diego segment of the HST will traverse the western edge of the Sabre Springs community. The proposed alignment to residential development, potential need to condemn private properties to accommodate the new line, the impacts to transportation facilities, and the adverse impacts related to noise, visual quality, aesthetics, and community character all concern Sabre Springs and the communities near the I-15 corridor to the north and south. Request that the public be given a formal opportunity to provide additional public scoping comments once the engineering drawings are available. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources</p>



Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	<p>The project alternatives should be reasonable and implementable. Alternative Alignment: The EIR/EIS did not provide an adequate evaluation of a coastal route alternative; therefore, this alternative should be considered again in the draft EIR/EIS. Should include a comparison of the costs and benefits of a coastal alignment and an inland alignment that follows the I-15 corridor. Alternative Designs: Evaluate a variety of construction options including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) maximizing the length of rail line that is underground in areas where sensitive noise receptors occur and elevated lines would adversely impact visual community character. b) minimize the need for condemnation of private lands by incorporating the alignment into the existing ROW; and c) minimizing the length and height of elevated sections of the line where significant adverse impacts to visual quality could result. <p>Project Description: It is imperative that the project description provided in the draft EIR/EIS be sufficient in detail to allow impacted communities and decisionmakers to grasp magnitude of impacts that could result from the project. Existing Conditions/Project Setting: The discussion of existing conditions in the programmatic EIR/EIS was too generic and did not provide adequate information about the project setting and community character. The project EIR/EIS will require an extensive review and detailed description of the existing conditions. Environmental Impact Analysis: The residents of Sabre Springs have endured years of construction on the I-15 corridor. The ongoing construction impacts air quality; noise; traffic congestion; and replacement of green vegetation with concrete. Construction of a new rail line will result in similar impacts. Impacts to Existing Transportation Facilities: The portion of the I-15 corridor that extends from SR 78 in Escondido to SR 163 in San Diego is currently being upgraded. The project should describe how these new facilities could be impacted by rail line construction. Evaluate how the construction and operation of the project could impact the Transnet funded facilities. Impacts to Visual Quality, Aesthetics, and Community Character: Consider factors such as height, design, color, visibility, and placement of proposed structures and its impact on aesthetics and community character. Requirements for night lighting should be addressed. Ambient Noise Levels: Describe the anticipated noise impacts to sensitive receptors, such as schools, homes, and businesses, along the proposed alignment - particularly in areas where the HST would be elevated. Soil Related Impacts: Address potential impacts of existing soil problems on the proposed alignment. Evaluate the potential impact of increased vibration in areas with soil problems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project route along I-15 would traverse through the western portion of the community. Concern with surrounding land use, loss of property due to take, impacts to existing transportation facilities and traffic circulation, air quality, noise and vibration, geology and soils (especially landslides), water quality in watersheds, surrounding natural open space areas (i.e., Lake Hodges/San Pasqual Valley, Los Peñasquitos Canyon, Green Valley Creek); visual quality/aesthetics (particularly through Lake Hodges and Los Peñasquitos Canyon, SR 56 and Poway Road), and overall community character and cohesiveness with Sabre 	<p>and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality</p>



Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	<p>Springs, Rancho Bernardo, Rancho Peñasquitos, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Mira Mesa, and Scripps Ranch. Wants a formal opportunity to provide additional public scoping comments once 15% design is available. Alternatives should be evaluated at equal detail.</p>	
<p>San Diego Audubon Society Mel Hinton</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noted that I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium was a route not included as an alternative and should be included since it was previously rated as superior to other alternatives in relation to distance/miles of track, speed, time, cost and ridership. Clarify tunnel throughout the MCAS Miramar area if I-15 corridor selected and explain associated costs. Analyze wetlands and vernal pools in Rose Canyon and San Clemente Canyon. Evaluate Qualcomm Stadium as a station due to location and proximity to existing transportation options and also evaluate impacts to parks/trails, and impacts to floodplains. Consider route from Qualcomm Stadium to Santa Fe Depot downtown. Evaluate station options. Explain Lindbergh Field station option - reasoning and need unclear. Believes and supports project as being an efficient and environmentally superior mode of transportation, but alternatives to routes and stations must be conducted. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations</p>
<p>San Diego Audubon Society Jim Peugh</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support the I-15 corridor alternative route with terminal at Qualcomm Stadium or the Kinder Morgan site. Oppose disruption to Rose Canyon and concerned about protection of endangered species, wetlands, energy, construction costs, convenience for passengers, train speed, operating costs, and impacts on communities. Encourage revisions to the proposed plan with a better alternative route. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.5 Public Utilities and Energy; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operation</p>
<p>San Diego Canyonlands, Friends of Chollas Creek, and Sierra Club William Babcock</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support concepts and goals of high-speed rail. Would like I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium analyzed and feel this route would be less expensive, fewer visual and noise impacts, higher ridership and shorter/faster. Oppose the route through Rose Canyon, Rose Creek, Carroll Canyon, San Clemente Canyon or any canyon and creek with substantial natural open space. Concerned with impacts to water quality, wildlife habitat, MSCP, and recreation. Remain open to other alternatives to avoid negative impacts to open space resources, including underground. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and</p>

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Open Space; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
San Diego Canyonlands and associated member groups Eric Bowlby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support high-speed rail concept and benefits. Opposes route in Rose Canyon, Rose Creek, Carroll Canyon, San Clemente Canyon or any other canyon or creek with substantial natural open space. Concerned with impacts to water quality, wildlife habitat, MSHCP preserve areas, noise, recreational use and restriction in wildlife corridor movement. Support analysis of I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium route due to higher ridership and speeds with a lower cost and less noise and visual impacts. Also open to other alternatives such as I-5 and tunneling from UTC to I-5. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
San Diego Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In support of the rail project. The project would promote economic growth, change mode of transportation. A decision on the San Diego terminus should not be decided until SANDAG has completed a study. Would prefer a fast track on the EIR process and development. 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use
Sierra Club of San Diego Carolyn Chase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please show the right-of-ways for at-grade arterials. How wide are the right-of-ways? Do not agree with the project adding additional tracks to where the existing LOS/SAN corridor rails are. The existing tracks are not an environmentally preferred routing. If the HST is going to be underground at UTC, it needs to stay underground. It could rise up into the median of the I-5 and go downtown. It needs to get out of Rose Canyon. An environmental review was not performed for the original rail line and the impact would be unacceptable. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands
Tana + Associates Alice Tana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In support of the rail project. Project will help commuters travel through Los Angeles faster without traffic. 	Section 3.1 Transportation
Towill, Inc. Jim Youngs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Send updates to email address or regular mail. 	

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
University Community Planning Group Janay Kruger, Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1) Study the I-15 alignment from University City to Mission Valley to the Qualcomm Transit Center as a preferred Alternative. A trolley station and a connection to downtown San Diego exists at this alignment. This will serve a large population in eastern San Diego County and potentially connect to Mexico and Rodriguez International Airport. 2) Avoid Rose Canyon open space park, MSCP land, wildlife corridors, and biological impacts. The Rose Canyon Park contains endangered plant and animal life. A study and analysis should be made of potential impacts including grading, shading, displacement of habitat and wetland impacts. 3) No tunnels that impact University City. What is the feasibility, cost, construction impacts, soil stability, and where does the tunnel start and end? Is there an underground station? What is its size? How many tracks will there be? Is there venting for air circulation and what are the safety and precautions? 4) Study the impacts of the Rose Canyon Fault and other minor faults in the area. Study the impacts of the San Andreas fault. What is the potential for an earthquake? What damage could occur in a tunnel or above grade? What is the Geology? 5) What will the noise impacts be? 6) Will there be vibration impacts? Will residences be impacted? 7) Will there be visual impacts? 8) Perform a parking study to analyze need for parking. Will there be parking at UTC station? How will increased traffic be mitigated? Does the General Plan need to be updated? 9) Is there a storage and maintenance station proposed at the University community area? How many trains will be stored, maintained, and repaired? What are the visual, hazardous materials, screening, and noise impacts? 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Valencia Homeowner's Association, President Russ Craig	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support high-speed rail transportation. Against route through Rose Canyon. Rose Canyon is a peaceful nature preserve without a residential setting. Does not have the infrastructure, road access etc, to handle more development. Do not understand why HST Authority is not planning to include the I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium route in EIR/EIS. Suggest revisit the decision regarding the I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium route. Noise and vibration impacts would be devastating. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives, Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands.
INDIVIDUAL		
Theresa Acerro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High-speed rail is an interesting idea. Placement should avoid environmentally sensitive areas. I-15 route seems most practical with less impacts. Suggest I-15 to I-15 in National City and over I-5 or trolley tracks. Businesses should not be negatively impacted by the project. Project should be win-win for everyone. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Tanya Howe Aeria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supportive of route in Rose Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Robert Aizuss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Impacts to Rose Canyon would include noise, land use, and visual. Prefer consideration for other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Martha Alden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prefer route along I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium with a station at Miramar Road and I-15 (east side of freeway) and then parallel tracks south of I-8 along coast. Station at Miramar Way would serve inland communities that do not have easy access to rail, including MCAS Miramar. Oppose route in Rose Canyon and station in University City. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives;
Alejandro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose high-speed rail through Rose Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Dan Allen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Feels significant ridership would be achieved by the project if terminals included parking structures and new freeway access, but does not see these features included in the project. ▪ Will terminal stations be located in more suburban areas and then expand local transit to connect to reduce project costs and environmental impacts? ▪ What is the cost breakdown and comparison for a seat per mile against flying? Is ridership justified? ▪ Support a route along March AFB in case regional airport is located there. ▪ Will high-speed rail only operate at night? Considered safety issues (cows on the tracks), and frequency of maintenance. Want more information about the technology today. Concerned about noise from grinding rails during maintenance. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.17 Cumulative Impacts; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Havelica Amago-Melbol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose the project. Live on Centre City Parkway and concerned with noise, property value, and a decrease in quality of the community. There should be an alternate route than through Centre City Parkway where many people live. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
John Anderson Leslie Anderson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Impacts to Rose Canyon would include noise, land use, and visual. Prefer consideration of other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics,

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Alison P. Anthony	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose an HST in Rose Canyon as it would have a devastating impact on the natural flora and fauna of the canyon. Many use the canyon for recreational activities and adding an HST will change the beauty of the canyon. Consider other options. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
David Archbold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Large communities located along the route do not have stations within 5 miles. This would detract from ridership. Could communities along the route tax themselves so that they could have stations located close to them? In favor of the Mira Mesa station. Rail service along the I-15 is never developed and requests the establishment of the Mira Mesa station. There are a quarter million residents lacking commuter rail service. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Nancy Ash	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The HST should come to San Diego via the Inland Empire. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Janice Barnard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prefer study alignment to be I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium as the Program EIR found this to have higher projected intercity ridership, lower cost, less noise impact, fewer visual/aesthetic impacts, and shorter/faster routes for higher train speeds. Parking issues to be considered when routing alignment to airport. Why do high-speed train travel and airline travel need to be connected? Suggest trolley to help connect Qualcomm Stadium and downtown Santa Fe Station. Downtown pedestrian traffic is a safety issue. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Dan Barrios	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route along I-15, particularly in Rancho Bernardo. Unclear as to exact location of the alignment - have conflicting information on whether the route would be located to the east or west of I-15. Concerned with losing homes to eminent domain, particularly with homes that parallel and are adjacent to I-15. Want to know when a decision will be made on the route selection and construction schedule. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use
Robert Barto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in University City; Support route to the border. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Alison Barton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resides in North University City. Concerned with Rose Canyon. Daughter uses Rose Canyon for playing. Prefers the I-15 Corridor or anywhere else but Rose Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Sandy Bassier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon with impacts to park areas, recreational use, surrounding neighborhood, habitat for plants and wildlife. Rose Canyon also not compatible with land use and noise. Consider other alternatives, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Samuel Bennett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delighted that the Genesee Highlands Association Board of Directors issued a resolution in opposition to the HST line proposed for the Rose Canyon corridor. Save Rose Canyon Open Space Park and plan an alternative route on I-15. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Linda Bernstein	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon. Support I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. Concerned with open space and parks. Believe route would be have least impacts if it follows freeways and high traffic areas. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
William W. Berry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher voltage could result in higher sparks in the catenary. This could interfere with other electronic equipment. Consider less voltage. The current grade runs through Rose Canyon and the Elvira area. Elvira is a checkpoint for the current LOS/SAN grade railroad. Could the HST and the LOS/SAN group coordinate both rails? What efforts are being made to synchronize HST schedules? What are the engineering considerations in place for power failure? Is there any technology for energy storage in the train in case of power failure? Is there a diesel system or system other than electricity to allow the train to travel to the next station in case of power failure? Who will be staffing the train? 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.5 Public Utilities and Energy; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Kimberly Tays Binnie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose the HST through Rose Canyon. This area is a precious resource, not only for the wildlife but for the community. It is a place where one can get away from the stresses of urban existence. We enjoy using the canyon for walks. It is a peaceful and quiet area. Saw coyotes, owls, and other wildlife there. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wildlife; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Jennifer and Chad Bishop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I oppose the high-speed rail through Rose Canyon and request a full study of the I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. Concerned about the environmental impacts as well as the negative impact it would have on the community. Consider every other alternative. Concerns include: 134 trains per day, two new tracks, overhead wires supported by many large poles, continuous 12 foot high chain link security fence, big retaining walls, huge noise and visual impacts, increased traffic, big parking garages. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Jennifer Bishop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Route in Rose Canyon would include impacts to surrounding community. Prefer consideration of other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Jacquelyn Borden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appreciate that the public is involved early in the planning process of the project. A major station should be in Mira Mesa. Do not believe people will give up their cars. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land use
Lisa Brezina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider the I-15 corridor or 163 rather than cutting through Rose Canyon and University City. Prefers the I-15 alignment. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Shaun Briley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of sending the HST through Rose Canyon. The benefit of the HST terminus at UTC outweigh the cost. Would like to see an underpass or pedestrian bridge over the tracks at the start and end of the canyon for the public to have access to the walking trails beyond the fenced rail track area. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
John Brindle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be helpful if there was guidance on how the HST should be incorporated into local general plans. 	Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land use
Debra Briski	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The I-15 highway through Rancho Bernardo has been expanded from 4 to 14 lanes. No sound walls were erected, the environment was not considered, and parks should be protected. How is the high-speed train going to cross Lake Hodges without disrupting the ecosystem? How is this going to impact our property and will our properties be taken from us? This project will benefit those who do not live and work in North County or the coast. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities and Environmental

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Patricia Buczaczer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports the project but is concerned about environmental impact on Rose Canyon. There is a need for a train connecting to the SD airport to the UTC area. Why is the train designed to go inland? What is the cost of a train ticket from San Diego to San Francisco? 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Angela Budreika	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use. Prefer consideration of other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Hallie Burch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Issue to be addressed in EIR are all 3 routes around the Rose Canyon/University City/Miramar/Carroll Canyon area. No necessity for trains to be as frequent as envisioned because there is no possible way there would be enough people to fill them making them an efficient way to travel. Stops are poorly thought out. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Tiara and Lab Scheduler Peter Burch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Re-evaluation of I-15 corridor terminating at Qualcomm is essential. Proposal of surface train through Rose Canyon should be removed. Termination at Lindberg does not meet the goal of having a stop in downtown San Diego. Concerned with electric tracks with fences, quantity of trains, and underground would be expensive. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.4 Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils
Isadora Buroughs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route through Rose Canyon - not compatible with parks. Concerned with impacts to quality of life, recreational use, natural open space park, plants, and animals. Prefers to have alternatives that do not go through or near Rose Canyon, which includes I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Pamela Calquitt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like to express opinion regarding the HST going through University City and Rose Canyon. How can it be high speed with so many stops? Prefer the I-15 to Qualcomm route. Do not tunnel under University City. One stop should be at Qualcomm then downtown San Diego. Rose Canyon is our only quiet space. Consider alternatives and leave Rose Canyon as it is. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Georgia Cameron	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in University City. Concerned with faults and homes in the path of the tunnel and the financial compensation received would be small. Prefer alignment along I-15. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Eileen Carman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mira Mesa is the most populated neighborhood and it is a forgotten community. The HST needs to have a stop at Mira Mesa Boulevard for the community to have access to it. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Georgia Catton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose high-speed rail along I-15, particularly in Rancho Bernardo and impact the neighborhood. 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
LM Capital Group John Chalker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include potential HST station at the San Diego International Airport/Lindbergh Field. Include the SANDAG study on the San Diego Terminus for HST consideration and decision in the local terminus. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Andrea Chandler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with noise and visual impact from property. Property abuts the I-15. Do not believe anyone will ride the trains. Concerned with property value and is opposed to the project unless the trains run underground. Concerned about paying for the project. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Mike Chandler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with the amount of money spent on the project. Do not believe anyone will ride the trains. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Carolyn Chase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prefer analysis of route along I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium due to higher projected ridership, lower cost, shorter/faster speeds, and fewer noise and visual impacts. Prefer Qualcomm Stadium as a station with a destination to downtown and not the airport or continue down to SR 94 and into downtown. Opposes route in Rose Canyon, Rose Creek, Carroll Canyon, San Clemente Canyon, or any canyon, creek, and natural open space. Should I-5 be selected, consider tunneling under UTC to daylight at I-5 median as an elevated section. Consider transportation corridors for route options. Another option is to stay underground all the way to downtown. Concerned with noise impacts and home values. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use</p>
William Chatham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of the project. It is necessary to the health and welfare of the community. 	<p>Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice.</p>
Jane Chatham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of the project. There must be reliable alternative transportation systems without impacting the environment. Jobs and an economic boom are needed. 	<p>Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice</p>
Ching-Rong Cheng	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rose Canyon is ecologically frail. University City is a quiet residential area. Noise and environmental damage would occur with the project. Go through University City through tunnels. In favor of tation in University City, but station should be near I-5 or 805 to prevent traffic impacts. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands</p>
Mitch Clark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose trains and busses. 	<p>Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need and CEQA Objectives</p>
Crystal Clearwater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about construction, noise and property value. The project is a great idea other than these concerns. Include commuter trains and bus links in the metropolitan areas. SANDAG is interested in this idea. 	<p>Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice</p>
Karen Coleman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Impacts to Rose Canyon would include noise, land use, and visual. Prefer consideration for other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands;</p>

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Michael Collins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. 	
Robert Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are rich minerals and gems between Escondido and Riverside. Please perform an extensive environmental study for this area. 	Section 3.8 Geology and Soils
Russ Craig	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Run the train straight down I-15 and tie into Rodriguez airport instead of spending huge amount of money tunneling under University City and ruining Rose Canyon. Qualcomm feeds into San Diego Trolley and into the airport and downtown. Current plan may turn into "Big Dig-West". No understanding why the only options offered were through canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Valencia/La Jolla Colony HOA Russ Craig	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route through Rose Canyon, which would create blight and impact the canyon and quality of life. Wants I-15 to be analyzed at equal status. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Kimberly Croft	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose high-speed train and feels current public transit is underutilized/has low ridership. Project would cause disruption to homeowners, lower property value and displace families. Wants wider freeways and trucks to have dedicated lanes. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need and CEQA Objectives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Robert Crovetti	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support high-speed rail concept and benefits. Proposed route is flawed - prefer to see connection from Los Angeles to Ontario Airport to Las Vegas. Does not believe proposed route will relieve congestion along I-15. Prefer route along existing I-5/rail corridor from Anaheim to Camp Pendleton/Carlsbad, Del Mar Fairgrounds/Racetrack, and Lindbergh Field/downtown San Diego. Proposed route is challenged with topography and higher cost. Concerned with 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics,

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	loss of property values and businesses, noise, visual blight, and no benefit to local commuters.	Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Property3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Adriana Cuenca	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of high-speed rail. Oppose the route through Rose Canyon and would like alternative routes considered. Concerned with economic and environmental impacts. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Peggy L. Daly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should ensure the quality of life is maintained for residents. In favor of the HST but concerned with the transfer point at the UTC area. The infrastructure is overloaded and it does not make sense to have a transfer station at UTC because it is close to the station or the terminals. Miramar, Qualcomm Stadium, or Solana Beach stations make more sense. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Chris Davis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon due to undeveloped and natural state. Prefer consideration for other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands
Christopher de Grasse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route through Rose Canyon as it would be destructive. Need to fully evaluate I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium or other alternative route. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Serge Decorte	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Impacts to Rose Canyon would include noise, land use, and visual. Prefer consideration of other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Janice Devens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High-speed train nice, but does not feel it would be utilized enough and cost is not justified. 	Chapter 1 Purpose and Need and CEQA Objectives; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Maria A. Diaz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose high-speed rail through Rose Canyon due to noise and visual impacts, increased traffic and parking garages. Wants a full study of I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Bob Diehl	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nobody will use the high-speed train from the inland empire. It is a waste of money and a mistake. The routes should be from LAX or Union Station to San Diego. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Toni Doyle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose the route through Rose Canyon. Would like the study to be the route to Qualcomm Stadium. 	n Plan for the project.s
Joseph Drew	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support high-speed rail connecting major urban corridors, including downtown and UTC. Oppose any routes in areas that are not densely populated or a critical business center. Support station at Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use
Riley Drexel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why is the Murrietta stop called the Murrieta/Temecula stop? People know more about Temecula than they do Murrieta. Would like to see the station called the Murrieta/Temecula line because more people would use it and it would promote tourism. Please consider. 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Faye Duggan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Prefer consideration of other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium which would have increased ridership, access to East County and South Bay. Mira Mesa along I-15 would be shortest travel time and cheaper - why not being evaluated? University City Planning Group voted unanimously to oppose project through Rose Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Marilyn Dupree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned project will create "shanty towns" and devalue homes in the University City and UTC area. Route through Rose Canyon follows a fault line. Prefer route to follow I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium where there is parking and trolley services. Homes near the tunneling in University City from UTC to Rose Canyon and the I-5 could be bought and the remaining homes would be devalued. University City would become a shanty town. Trains would cause extreme vibrations, weakening our foundations, and creating unbearable noise. This new route follows San Diego's 2 active earthquake faults - the Rose 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.8 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental



Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	Canyon and San Andreas faults. Return to the original plan going down the I-15 corridor to Qualcomm. This would be non-invasive to communities and would service more hotels and businesses. In regards to downtown/Lindbergh Field, why not link Qualcomm to the I-8 to Lindbergh Field and connect to the I-5 to downtown. Use the I-15 corridor and not University City and earthquake faults.	Justice
Marty Eberhardt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prefer the I-15 alignment explored down to I-8 and then to the airport; Prefers to use existing freeway corridors; Do not want to use open space park (i.e., Rose Canyon); would like to see light rail go between Lindbergh Field and LAX. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Egnatia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose high-speed rail. Support freeway construction. Questions funding/cost. 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Thomas Eickner Sibyl Eickner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose the route through Rose Canyon. Would like the alignment on I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium which would be faster and cheaper as well as cause less damage to the environment and existing properties. Concerned with loss in property value, noise, visual impacts, increased traffic, parking garages, and effects from tunnels. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
John Ellis Bonnie Ellis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route along inland corridor, particularly since much work has been done to construct HOV lanes along existing freeways and not cost sustaining. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Lisa England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route along I-15 and Old 395 in the Rainbow/Bonsall area. Surrounding area is rural and noise would be an impact and in conflict with rural surrounding. This area has visual beauty, open space, plant and wildlife species, and agriculture. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics,



Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.13 Agricultural Lands; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Jim England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This project will be a waste of money and would be very dangerous to the hills and valleys. Do not approve the project. 	Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Mike Esco	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route on I-15 corridor. No room available on I-15 to support project. Project not cost effective and will create noise. Too many stops would just slow the travel and would be better in a vehicle. Better served to connect southern CA and central CA. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Johannes "Hanno" Falk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose the route through Rose Canyon. Would like the alignment on I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. Concerned about impacts to Rose Canyon since it is a natural park that is utilized and enjoyed by many recreational users. Monitoring upland and wetland mitigation area. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Kevin Farnam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do not build HST down Rose Canyon as it will cause destruction to the environment. Consider performing a full study of a HST straight down the I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Ricki Fay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route along I-15 corridor. Believe it is not cost effective and would not meet projected ridership. Believe existing Sprinter line in northern San Diego County is not being utilized by target ridership. Support widening I-15 and adding HOV lanes for commuters. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Jennifer Fellix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon. Concerned with associated recreational use at the park that also supports wildlife and plant habitat. Support route along I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium and believe it would have higher ridership, less expensive, faster, and less noise. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Jim Field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Rose Canyon option and support the I-15 option to Qualcomm. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Margaret Fillius	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon due to associated open space park, recreational use, and wildlife. Opposes UTC as a station. Prefer I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium route with Qualcomm Stadium as a station due to location and extend route to the border. Too much congestion downtown and by the airport already. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Jim Fischer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can local portion of route be shared with local transit without impacting travel time? If route cannot be shared with local transit, can stations be located in Rancho Bernardo or Carmel Mountain to support local transit? Can route be combined with local trains and express services? What is the frequency of service between key cities on route? 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Ellen Flouire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of the project. 	
Jeff Flowers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Impacts to Rose Canyon would include noise, land use/surrounding neighborhoods, and visual. Prefer consideration of other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Ron Floyd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support project along I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. Would be faster, safer, link to trolley system and downtown, have parking available, less impacts to environmental and socioeconomics, and increase ridership. Another alternative would be to extend trolley from I-15/Qualcomm Stadium to Kearney Mesa or Mira Mesa to meet a high-speed rail station. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual



Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Quality; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations;
Jack Forman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strong opposition to the development of the HST in Rose Canyon. Not opposed to HST if it is placed in areas that do not negatively impact people's quality of life and wildlife in natural preserves. The plan to develop HST in Rose Canyon is deeply flawed because the infrastructure and equipment of the rail system will devastate the natural life in the canyon. It will cause havoc to the lives of residents living adjacent to the canyon. Study the alternate proposal to built he rail through the I-15. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Susan L. Forsburg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed to construction of HST through Rose Canyon and University City. The UC community is already "maxed out" in development. Frequent HST trains would have significant and negative impacts on community with noise and vibrations, new hill cuts, unsightly overhead lines, and security fences. This would destroy part of the community's value. The tunnel option under UTC will add expense and safety concerns. Rose Canyon is an earthquake fault. ▪ Examine the Qualcomm or I-15 corridor option for the San Diego terminus. The current plan to route HST through Rose Canyon to Lindbergh Field does not serve the citizens of San Diego. You are cutting off a large number of San Diego residents in central and east county who would have better access with the Mission Valley route. Routing the HST through the Rose Canyon corridor would damage the parkland and wildlife refuge. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.8 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Jana Fortier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High-speed rail not feasible and not consistent with University City and does not support goal of creating walkable city communities. 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Jeannie Foulkrod	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose high-speed rail. Concerned with funding to support cost, associated noise, and visual impacts. Feels existing rail service is plenty. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need and CEQA Objectives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Chris and Amy Frank	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose train traffic through Rose Canyon. Support full study of I-15 to Qualcomm route. Concerns include air quality and noise. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; and Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration
Teacher at Spreckels Bilingual Magnet Michael French	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon or any other open space preserve/park. Support route along existing freeway alignments with associated noise and traffic. Prefer I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium to be studied and parking already exists with the trolleys. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Mike and Diane Frey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are UTC residents and strongly oppose the HST through Rose Canyon. 	
Rob Friderich	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about the cost, the time to complete the project, project being detoured by politics and lobbyists, and insufficient ridership to support the project. Prefer the mag-lev option technology. People will continue to fly. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Colette Fugraha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about the impact of the tunnels near the Rose Canyon fault line. Study the environmental impact on Rose Canyon and the UC community. What are the dangers of running under the Miramar base? How will the tunnel impact homeowners? Do not have the trains go through University City and Rose Canyon. Why not use the I-15 corridor? Do not disrupt the UC High School with the frequent trains. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Robert C. Gaddi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proponent of high-speed rail transportation. However against any routing through Rose Canyon. Revisit the decision regarding the I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium route. Noise and vibration impacts. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives, Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration
Marilyn Gallegos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A former and future resident of University City. Would like to know how you plan to deal with increased traffic in and out of the station? Will money be allocated for local traffic alleviation via light rail or shuttle buses? Will you be working with UCSD for more mass transit between the two locations? Would like to stay informed about the project and its progress/timeline projections. A member of Friends of Rose Canyon and support the HST but want to ensure it does not overburden the community's traffic. 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations;
Keller Williams Ed Gallo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of the project. 	

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Bill Geckler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support route along I-15 from Mira Mesa to Qualcomm Stadium. Oppose route through Rose Canyon and station in University City. Support route along I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium with the connection to existing trolley line to access downtown, adequate parking, and proximity to freeways. Suggested route from Qualcomm Stadium along I-15/I-805 corridor to Rodriguez International Airport (across international border). Oppose station in University City due to cost, tunneling, inadequate parking, and surrounded by congestion. Oppose route in Rose Canyon - impacts to open space park, visual and create disconnection, and noise. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Ellen Gerhard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with impact on the wild life corridor of Rose Canyon. Has very rare riparian habitat and is an area of coastal sage scrub and chaparral as well as oak woodland. The 12 foot + high security fence surrounding the track and would run parallel is unacceptable considering it would impede the movements of wildlife as well as unsightly barrier in a pristine canyon corridor. Consider I-15 corridor. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands
Anna Giacconi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be an alternative to the Rose Canyon alignment because: 1) noise and vibration would increase, 2) Rose Canyon is a park with wildlife and would be negatively impacted by additional traffic, 3) increase in visitors or tourists - the city is a residential/business area and not a tourist area, 4) construction of wires and large poles would hurt aesthetics of the area. Reopen the I-15 corridor from Miramar to Qualcomm. Where are the feasibility studies concerning tunnels? Where are the trains going to be stored? 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Morton and Evelyn Golden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support high-speed rail and a route along I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium which would be less expensive and faster. Oppose route through Rose Canyon. Concerned with impacts to Rose Canyon, specifically with biological resources/open space, noise, visual, increased traffic and parking structures as well as surrounding neighborhoods. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space;

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Rodger Goldman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route through Rose Canyon. Consider following an existing major traffic corridor instead. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Paul Goldstein	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of HST. Concerned about impacts to significant wildlife, recreation and open space resources, damage to urban communities, and quality of life in San Diego County. Rose Canyon is used daily by the community for recreation and exercise. It is home to species of native plants and animals and is an important flyway location in Southern California. UTC and University City are adapted to the presence of rail. Security, electrification, noise, and density issues are concerns at UTC. Please see alternative to Rose Canyon right-of-way. High-speed rail is unacceptable at this location. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.4 Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference; Section 3.6 Biological Resources; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Marilyn Goldstein	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please do not put the HST in Rose Canyon. It is a beautiful nature reserve. Enjoy the joys of nature. The train running through that area would destroy plants and wildlife. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation and Open Space
Michael Goldstein	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose Rose Canyon route and the associated noise impacts. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration
William G. Griswold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of high-speed rail. Oppose the route through Rose Canyon. Would like the study to be the route to Qualcomm Stadium. Concerned about impacts to Rose Canyon since it is a natural park that is utilized and enjoyed by many recreational users. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Julia Groebner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon. Concerned with wildlife corridors and edge effects, MSCP, water quality, noise levels, CA gnatcatcher and other federally-listed threatened and endangered species. Prefer consideration for other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. Concerned with noise impacts on surrounding residents. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Sandra W. Groebner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with impacts to open space encroachment, decline in wildlife species and biological diversity, noise, and quality of life. Prefer route along I-15 to be examined. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Pei Gu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Impacts to Rose Canyon would include noise, land use/surrounding neighborhoods, and visual. Prefer consideration for other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
UCSD Nancy Guy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of the project. 	
John Haas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not understand why Regional Segment #3 (Mira Mesa to San Diego) is not being evaluated. I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium would have benefits - high ridership, faster, less expensive, less noise, avoids sensitive areas like Rose Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Nina Hale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon. Need to preserve open space and not overbuild and would have visual and physical impacts. Rose Canyon is enjoyed by many recreational users. The I-15 is a better route location due to more traffic and accidents. Other opposition to Rose Canyon has been stated. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Louis Harris	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supportive of high-speed rail. Feels I-15 is a natural choice. 	
Susan M. Harrison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose high-speed rail through Rose Canyon. A line from the Stadium down to I-15 would be an improvement for people living north of San Diego since it would lessen traffic on the freeway and ease parking in the city. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Leigh Haubach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose high-speed rail through Rose Canyon. High-speed train would disturb precious wildlife habitat with noise and vibration. Send it down to existing transportation corridor of I-5. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives, Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands
Greg Hazelquist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed to rail alignment through Rose Canyon. Also opposed to a hub or transit station in the UTC community, which is already overbuilt. Rose Canyon is a local gem that provides recreational, scenic, and environmental resources. A proposed HST would destroy this resource. Please consider alternatives as Rose Canyon should not be an option. The I-15 seems a more sensible solution. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Lisa Heikoff David Katzer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon. Concerned with biological resources, open space, watershed, and recreational uses. Support the consideration of I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Joe Heimer Virginia Heimer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route along I-15, particularly through Rancho Bernardo. No room for this project and cost prohibitive. Ridership is not there to support project, especially since existing cuts to public transit services are already being made. 	Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Jim and Sue Heleniak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose the Rose Canyon route. There will be negative impacts on Rose Canyon natural preserve, to the residential homes located on both sides of the canyon, and on the Rose Canyon Earthquake fault as a result of the proposed tunnels. Prefer the northern alternatives through Carroll Canyon, which is a predominantly industrial area parallel to Miramar Road. Oppose the tunnel at Elvira Curve and would prefer the proposed route to turn west before connecting to the south route. More planning is required for the project. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice;

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Sue Heleniak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to the Rose Canyon route because of impacts to: environment and the natural preserve, earthquake fault, and quiet residential neighborhoods. Where will the power for the rail come from? California has a power shortage. Will there be more power plants? Would there be noise pollution? Will high-speed rail tickets be affordable for its patrons? 	Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.5 Public Utilities and Energy; Section 3.6 Biological Resources; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Derren Henderson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with noise and environmental impact in the University City area. The current plan states a train crossing would occur every 10 minutes. This would impact residents of University City and property values would decrease. Consider an underground tunnel that would not disturb the community and Rose Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Tonya Henderson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with environmental and noise impacts to UTC and Rose Canyon. Would like an alternative such as an underground route through UTC without disrupting Rose Canyon. Concerned with the value of UTC's housing. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Charley Herzfeld	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon - not compatible with noise and visual impacts. Want a noise assessment for all communities along I-5 at and south of Rose Canyon because of the surrounding residents (especially since windows have to be opened for ventilation and noise mitigation will add to project costs). Concerned with impacts to natural open space, recreational use, diverse flora and fauna, wildlife and plant habitat. Support evaluating other alternatives, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Richard Higgins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the project. Wants a station at UTC. Would enjoy taking the rail to LAX and SFO. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Sara Higgins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the project. Lives behind UTC and is the association board president. How can the community be more informed? 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
John Higgins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rose Canyon would be destroyed if the rail lines were constructed through the canyon. Have observed the community enjoying the canyon. People use it recreationally, aesthetically, and they enjoy the plant and animal life. Opposes HST being constructed on Rose Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Betty Hill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not see Qualcomm station as a good alternative. Consider Carroll Canyon tunnel and an alternate alignment directly to Lindbergh Field. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Louise Hofheimer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Impacts to Rose Canyon would include noise, land use, and visual. Prefer consideration for other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Derek Hofmann	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes the route along I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium would be inconvenient and detrimental to ridership. Realizes I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium would be an alternative to avoid impacts to Rose Canyon, but indicated route should continue on to downtown or Lindbergh Field. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Larry Hogue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prefer the route from Miramar to Qualcomm Stadium along the I-15 corridor and it should further be evaluated. The rail line should be kept out of Rose Canyon Open Space Park. The Program EIS/EIR failed to identify Rose Canyon as dedicated park land. Consider two additional alternatives if the rail line must run through downtown San Diego: tunnel under North University City to the I-5 and follow the I-15 to the 94 then to downtown. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Linda Hollingsworth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must complete a full analysis on all possible routes before identifying University City as the preferred route. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Hong's Flower Nursery Hyon Piyo Hong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need clean air. We have to build the project. 	Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change
Phyllis Huckabee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support high-speed rail. Would like to see full studies on other alternatives other than Rose Canyon. Concerned with natural resources and recreational use of Rose Canyon. Believes I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium/existing transit station or I-15 to SR 56 to I-5 would be better options. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Michelle Huffaker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the station located in University City. Support high-speed rail line. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Kathleen Hughart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route through Rose Canyon due to disruption with trenching and impacts to noise, plants and animals, and recreational/educational use. Rose Canyon does not make economic sense. Believe I-15 is a better option and supports a more straight route. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Carl Ito	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect Rose Canyon Park. Rose Canyon is a wilderness in a city. Consider the alternative plan of using the I-15 corridor, which is already designed to transport vehicles. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Andrea Ito	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect Rose Canyon Park and natural resources. Prefers the I-15 corridor alternative. The I-15 alternative is a better choice because it corresponds to traffic flow. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Andrea and Carl Ito	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support HST. Oppose route through any canyons, specifically Rose Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternative

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Farokh Jamalyaria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the route along I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. Oppose the route through Rose Canyon. Concerned with the route going through Rose Canyon associated with the ecosystem/biological resources and various plant and animal species, park/recreational use, noise pollution impacts to health issues, and the socioeconomic impacts to the values of the surrounding homes. Want to know about the cost, feasibility, location, and impacts to nearby homes and Rose Canyon - information has not been provided to the public. ▪ Perform a full study of the I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium route. Opposed to the Rose Canyon alternative. I run, birdwatch, and bike through the canyon and witness a variety of fauna and flora that flourish in its ecosystem. The trains that pass by create noise pollution that reverberates through the canyon and disturbs all life. Have to cover my ears because the noise can be intolerable. It has been shown that noise pollution increase circulating levels of stress hormones and the rates of heart disease and myocardial infarction. No estimates of the cost, feasibility, and impact on homes and on Rose Canyon have been provided to the public. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Op</p>
Sherry Jansma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned with route through Rose Canyon since it is used for various recreational enjoyment, has natural vegetation and wildlife. Request a study along existing freeways (I-15 and 163) where neighborhoods won't be greatly impacted, costs would be lower, and no earthquake fault. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations</p>
Ariane Jansma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hope the HST will not go through Rose Canyon. There is an alternate route down the I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium where transportation belongs. ▪ Concerned about the HST going through Rose Canyon. In favor of the I-15 to Qualcomm route. Opposes the HST going through Rose Canyon and tunneling under homes. Qualcomm will unite most of San Diego - it will provide access to east San Diego County. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives</p>
Ariane Jansma-Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose the route through Rose Canyon. Inquired why I-15 route to Qualcomm Stadium is not being analyzed. Concerned about impacts to Rose Canyon since it is a natural park that is utilized and enjoyed by many recreational users. Concerned with safety. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space</p>

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Ariane Jasnma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full study of the alternative route to go straight down I-15 to Qualcomm and not through Rose Canyon. The impact this train would have on natural habitats and the residents of this community is astounding and would be devastating. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands
Charleen Johnson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rose Canyon should be not be considered because of impacts to wildlife and the environment. What noise impacts would residents experience? Opposes a tunnel running under homes. Considers 8 percent planning too low. There should be more design and planning. Where and how will the energy power the trains? 	Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.5 Public Utilities and Energy; Section 3.6 Biological Resources; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Keith Johnson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route on I-15 and do not see the need for one with all the freeway lanes. Concern with associated noise, cost, and property loss and decrease in value. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need and CEQA Objectives; Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Robert A Johnston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information presented at the public scoping meeting was useful. Interested in following the progress of the project. 	
Mike Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upset with the impact the project will have on residents who live along the I-15 corridor. Growth along the I-15 has impacted wildlife and the noise level. The project will further impact the noise along the corridor. The local and state government does not have the funding. Concerned about terrorists using the trains. 	Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Beverly Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project will negatively impact the community. The noise, air quality, and wildlife will be impacted. Do not want to pay for the project as a tax payer. 	Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities and Environmental

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations.
David H. Jones, PhD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of high-speed rail. Oppose route through Rose Canyon. Need to evaluate alternative routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. Concerned with biological and recreational impacts related to Rose Canyon, traffic analysis, and noise impacts. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Doug Jower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Freight rail would reduce truck traffic into San Diego and impacts to the coast. Warehouses could reduce the smog produced by diesel trucks. An alignment that runs through Riverside and San Bernardino would place March ARB and Norton Air Force Base on the map. There should be alternate means for funding this project. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations.
Jennifer Kahn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with: train going by homes, noise, negative impact on aesthetics, decrease in value of housing, vibrations from the project, and safety in Rose Canyon. Would prefer other possible routes or alternatives such as the Qualcomm option. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Harry Kaplan Carol Kaplan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes route in Rose Canyon. Concerned with highly sensitive open space and habitat resources, visual impacts, security fencing, and eminent domain. Supports route along I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space;

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
William Karbosky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose high-speed rail. Believes it would be expensive and ridership would be low. 	Chapter 1 Purpose and Need and CEQA Objectives; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations;
Roy Katzen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of high-speed rail and route along I-15 or other existing corridor that would be less disruptive to sensitive environments and less expensive. Oppose the route through Rose Canyon, Rose Creek, Carroll Canyon, San Clemente Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Karin Kenyon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route through Rose Canyon. Conduct a full study of the I-15 to Qualcomm route. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Ted Kersh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support high-speed rail. 	
Timothy King	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support route to downtown. Opposes route to Mission Valley and station at Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Laura Kligman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route through Rose Canyon. Concerned with flora and fauna, wildlife, open space, and recreational uses. Request depth study of I-15 to Qualcomm route. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands
Mariette Kobrae	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the high-speed rail also travel to LAX? Why is the station 12 miles from downtown San Diego? Will the high-speed rail become a commuter train? Could the trains run parallel to the I-15? Concerned with impacts to canyons. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Mildred Koenig	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believe there is ample transportation between San Diego and Los Angeles and the current economic situation should put this project on the back-burner. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need
Aaron Konvisser	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should have stations at San Diego and Los Angeles airports. Should have an alignment that connects to San Francisco. Concerned with proposed path through Rose Canyon. There is a high density of housing in the area and existing trains can be heard through most of the community, Doyle Park, and Doyle Elementary School. Rose Canyon is a community resource with trails and a fragile ecosystem. The train should not appear above ground until it joins I-15. The proposed location of the University Station should leverage existing parking from the UTC mall. Reconsider the I-15 corridor. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternative Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Judy Kopp	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support high-speed rail, but do not want impacts to canyons. Oppose route in Rose Canyon and impacts to recreational use and natural state. Prefer consideration of I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium and a station at Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Janay Kruger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prefers the I-15 alignment to Qualcomm Transit Center. Can make a transfer by trolley to Lindbergh Field. Previous program level EIR showed this route - please keep it. Concerned that noise and vibration would impact residents, schools, and Rose Canyon Park. Avoid Rose Canyon Park. It is the community's only urban open space with wildlife corridor and habitat. Community is concerned with tunnels. What is the cost, feasibility, construction impact, and soil stability for tunnels? Concerned with the visual impact of the catenary poles. Additional parking at UTC would increase traffic and impact storage and maintenance stations at the I-805 and La Jolla Village Drive. UTC is not as attractive as Lindbergh Field, Ontario Airport, Escondido, and Qualcomm. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.5 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.8 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.11 Public Utilities and Energy; Chapter 5 Project Costs and Operations
Petr Krysl	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The project should avoid disrupting Rose Canyon Park. Consider the I-15 alignment. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Bobbie Kunath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose high-speed rail along or near I-15 corridor. Issues with noise, eminent domain, particularly in the Rancho Bernardo neighborhood. Suggests a route in areas less developed such as East County without impacting families. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Rocky Kuonen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose the project. The project is too expensive. Improve existing modes of transportation and better utilize closed military air bases. Do not want the government to manage the HST. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Freda Kuonen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Funding should be spent on improving roads or improving the community. Save funding and reduce the state's tax deficit. 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Linda R. Laird	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Impacts to Rose Canyon would include noise, land use/surrounding neighborhoods, and visual. Prefer consideration for other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Dick Larsen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rose Canyon route would have impacts to the park and surrounding communities. Consider an alternative route to Rose Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Kurtis Lau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the HST have similar technology to the bullet train in Japan? How often will the trains be scheduled? Will the HST schedule coincide with other mass transit to serve commuters? Will there be a station in Escondido? If there are tunnels planned from Temecula to Escondido, how will it impact the communities? Will this be an electric or diesel train? Will the tracks be elevated since there is no room along the median of freeways? What safeguards will be placed for safety? Is there an I-5 or I-405 corridor being planned? LAX should be served with the commuter rail. Will the north side of MCAS and south side of Miramar Road tie into downtown San Diego? 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations.
The Perfect Solution Martin C Lauber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will there be public input during the Alternatives analysis? Depict railroads that will tie into the proposed rail system in the study's exhibit. An average of \$56 million per mile seems low to include significant tunnels and elevated portions. The total cost appears low. Does the federal government require an independent engineering analysis and at what point in the analysis would this be included? 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
I Lin Law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose the route through Rose Canyon. Would like the alignment on I-15. Concerned about impacts to Rose Canyon and surrounding UC neighborhoods. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, Environmental Justice



Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Robert Lerner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pleased with information presented in Escondido public scoping meeting. 	
Jean M. Lewis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route along I-15, particularly Lake Hodges and Rancho Bernardo. Concerned with impacts to eminent domain, congestion, physical constraints along I-15 for the project, and visual blight, particularly with elevated tracks. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Arend Lijphart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supporter of the high-speed rail. Oppose the high-speed rail through Rose Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Dr. Ernie Lippe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposes the project. The demand for the HST is not there. The train will not recover its cost. It will ruin Rose Canyon's natural habitat. Rose Canyon also has a severe seismological fault. The trains will create noise pollution. The HST should be placed on pre-existing freeways such as the I-15, Route 8, and the I-5. The proximity of the HST to homes will negatively impact property values. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Sandra Lippe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. However, does not support the Rose Canyon route. Prefers the I-15 corridor to Qualcomm - it is less expensive, will be faster, will have less noise impact on animals. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands
Mary Ann Loes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose alignment through University City area. prefer alignment on I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium with a transit center there since parking is plentiful and accessible to Lindbergh Field, downtown, and points of interest/tourist attractions. Concerned with Rose Canyon - park land and wildlife habitat area, which should remain as such. UTC area should remain as the community it is today. Concerned with tunnels, noise and vibrations, visual impacts from associated infrastructure, storage, and maintenance. Feel transit stations are not good for a professional community. Concerned with noise, congestion, and environmental impacts with high-speed rail and the existing nearby MCAS Miramar. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Ann Lopez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ University City has its share of noise from the Miramar Base aircraft congestion. It does not need more disruptions and inconveniences added to the community. 	Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice.
Anthony Lynch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A second route of the HST coaster is needed that would run from the Santa Fe depot to 32nd Street Naval Base, and run up the middle of the I-15 corridor. It should make one stop at each community to Escondido. ▪ In favor of the project. The rail system works. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation
Manitou Leitch & Company Cathy MacHutchin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose the route through Rose Canyon. Would like the alignment on I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. Concerned about impacts to Rose Canyon and biological resources. Concerned with noise impacts to surrounding residents of Rose Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands
Nan Madden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commenter is the director of Mission Bay Montessori Academy. They revere Rose Canyon as an extension of the campus. The school shares the campus with the nature habitat and believes the project would ruin their chance to experience nature as they do now. Are impacted with traffic now and the project would destroy the feeling of community. The construction would devastate University City. A divided community and running the HST through the middle would destroy the community as a good place to live. 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Rose Mah-Ta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Am a resident of University City. Strongly oppose the HST in Rose Canyon because it would destroy the few open spaces in San Diego. A full study of alternate routes should be performed that are less damaging to the environment and make more financial sense. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
La Jolla Country Day School Mark Marcus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about the routes around and into UC San Diego and UTC. Do not use Executive Drive or Regents Road in front of schools. Concerned about safety and security around the schools with children. Request a realistic schedule for construction. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.10 Safety and Security
Christopher Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support high-speed rail to connect San Diego and University City. Concerned with safety and dividing Rose Canyon with project and suggests including crossings for pedestrians and bicyclists utilizing Rose Canyon. Also concerned with impact to recreational use of Rose Canyon. 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Ann McCrory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed to the Rose Canyon route through University City. Concerned about property value since home is located adjacent to the canyon. Additionally, concerned with noise and visual. Would prefer alternative route along Miramar Road into the UTC station. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Justice; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Bob Mcdevitt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of the project. 	
Margaret McKnight	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to further destruction of the natural environment in Southern California (areas containing a variety of native plants and animals such as Rose Canyon). Is there an international movement toward saving the planet by preserving wild areas? 	Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands
LuAnn McSwiggen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes route in Rose Canyon. Concerned with the impact to open space, aesthetics, noise, traffic, and disruption to an existing community. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Lisa Medeiros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use. Impacts to Rose Canyon would include noise, air, and visual. Prefer consideration for I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium because it will be cheaper, more convenient, less noise, higher ridership. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Charles Mignola	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have a home within a quarter mile of Rose Canyon in San Diego County. The house is in the La Jolla Colony region of University City. Oppose HST through Rose Canyon because it will devastate and change Rose Canyon and the surrounding neighborhood. It would create noise, pollution, traffic congestion, and would diminish the enjoyment of my property. Concerned 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global



Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	that value of my home will be negatively impacted and I will suffer monetary damages as well or if sold property. Demand a full study of the I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium route.	Climate Change; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Mark Miller Kathryn Miller Patrick Miller Julia Miller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Prefer consideration of other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Paul Mills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose HST through Rose Canyon. Do not understand how a precious parkland resource for citizens could be identified as possible site for the rail line where another route which is better suited for HST i.e.) Route 15. 	Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
UCSD USP Student Audrey Mitchell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. It would solve issues with freeways and funding spent toward freeways. 	
Geoffrey Mogilner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned with visual and noise impacts as well as costs. Trains to stay at grade to reduce visual impacts. Concerned with approved long term transportation and resources management planning efforts for the Old Town Community. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Charles Mulhall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose high-speed rail and a stop at UTC mall. Flying is more cost effective than high-speed train. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
John Mustol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alternate route for the proposed rail line. Rose Canyon is a valuable preserve. As a Christian, I believe we have a duty to care for God's creatures and allow them a place in the world. Agree we need a rail line to reduce use of cars, we can find another route such as I-15 and leave Rose Canyon as one of the last refuges for these precious creatures. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Gretchen Nell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The I-15 to Qualcomm alignment should be studied in the DEIR. The proposed UTC/Rose Canyon option should be discarded. This is an environmentally sensitive area, is part of the MSCP, and is an open space park in the San Diego Park System. Habitat and wildlife would be destroyed during construction. Negative impacts would occur to flora and fauna. The UTC/Rose Canyon route is located very close to homes. Noise pollution would occur. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Gandydancers of S.D. JR Newcom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. 	
Christopher Nielsen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route through Miramar, Rose Canyon, and along I-5 because it would affect value of homes. Oppose station in UTC and Lindbergh Field. Prefer station downtown San Diego and Qualcomm Stadium. Believe route along I-15 would be an easier operation, less environmental and neighborhood impact, reduce travel time, better construction, support station at Qualcomm stadium, has the right-of-way, and cost less. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.17 Cumulative Impacts; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Don Nieto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposes route along I-15. Concerned with the cost to construct and the effort to redo previous transportation construction efforts. No room/space along I-15 to support project. Suggest route through MCAS Miramar, undeveloped/vacant land, and up to Temecula. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operation

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Mary Norton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon. Impacts to surrounding neighborhood and recreational use. 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Morgan O-Hayre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route through Rose Canyon. Why aren't other alternatives, including I-15 route to Qualcomm Stadium being analyzed? Concerned about impacts to biological resources and recreational use associated with Rose Canyon since it is undeveloped and utilized and enjoyed by many recreational users. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Claremont High School Ray Olson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposes the Rose Canyon route. Supports the northern route and station. An earthquake fault runs under or near Rose Canyon and this should be addressed. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils
Dorothy Orman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not in favor of the HST. The HST runs through the middle of my community. There are other routes from Escondido to existing rail lines along the coast. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Joseph Ormsby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Impacts to Rose Canyon would include noise, land use, and visual. Prefer consideration for other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Matthew Papuga	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unclear on route. Concerned with route location. Believes Escondido is not populated enough to support the demand for high-speed rail along I-15. prefer route to follow I-5 and existing rail line along coast. Feels I-15 is already overbuilt and concerned with associated noise impacts. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Jacqueline L. Parker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. Concerned about wildlife in Rose Canyon. Prefers the I-15 corridor because: meets goals of connecting with mass transit; I-15 could connect with the trolleys to airports and other parts of town; and would better serve South San Diego as well as North San Diego and allow for inland growth. The geology of the area west of the 805 is just compressed sand. Much of it does not have the stability that the area east of the 805 has. Concerned with vibration west of the 805 and in areas where businesses have sensitive equipment like UCSD, Sorrento Valley. There is more area for growth near the I-15. The tunnel is supposed to be separated from existing roads. Tunnels can have adverse impact on the stability of the road. University City is densely populated and there is sensitive scientific equipment located here that would be impacted adversely by ground movement. The project will impact the community's culture. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice</p>
Jonathan Parkinson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support and prefer route through University City rather than I-15 to Qualcomm. Believes University City to Lindbergh Field would connect with other modes of transportation. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation</p>
Lynn Parrish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like to see the cost for passengers. Consider some alternative ways of relieving traffic. Do not see a need for the train to go to the airport. The alignment should stop at University City because it would be sufficient for the County. There will be trolley lines built to connect at University Point through the Mid Coast Corridor Project. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations</p>
Ethel Pascal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports the project and the UTC station. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives</p>
Billy Paul	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about the I-15 corridor to San Diego route. It's a mistake having the route divert at Miramar and run over to the I-5 through Rose Canyon on Carroll Canyon. This would result in a loss of habitat. The area I have been working on is considered to be a flood control area with a lot of natural vegetation and riparian areas that has great potential to be turned into a natural park with a bike path. Makes more sense to have the HST continue down the I-15 corridor to Qualcomm Stadium. Qualcomm Stadium can be a major transportation hub and continue to provide a stadium for SDSU football. There are several ways the Qualcomm Stadium transit hub could connect to the airport and downtown San Diego. There could be a plan to extend the HST System. There could be an express Trolley on the existing system or a new route tunneling under Balboa Park. Qualcomm Stadium makes a better transit hub. There is a parking lot provided there. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space</p>
Jeremy Pearl	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of Lindbergh Field as an alternative station. In favor of pushing the project forward. Disappointed that the San Diego section of the project will be built at a later stage. 	<p>Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Chapter 2.0 Alternatives</p>

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Patti Perma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route along I-15 through Rancho Bernardo. Concerned with noise impacts to surrounding neighborhoods. Curious about impact to property value. Support public transportation because it reduces traffic, green house gases, addresses airport capacity issues, promotes job growth, and reduces dependency on foreign oil. Recognize it has voter support. Not concerned with visual blight. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use</p>
Carole Pietras	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why is the station in University City? There should be a station at the airport. 	<p>Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Chapter 2.0 Alternatives</p>
Shelley Plumb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rose Canyon should not be the preferred route. Favors the route on the I-15 to Qualcomm or further south to the airport. The project would destroy the migratory paths of birds and other animals. It would make the park unusable and is the last open space in San Diego. The project would impact quality of life. ▪ The I-15 to Qualcomm is the preferred route for the residents of University City. There is adequate parking at Qualcomm and development. University City does not have the infrastructure to support the riders that will be using the station at UTC. Opposes construction through Rose Canyon. It is unthinkable to place a station at UTC and run the train into or under the canyon. University City is built out. ▪ In favor of high-speed rail. Oppose the route through University City and Rose Canyon with a stop at UTC. Feels University City is already overbuilt. Rose Canyon is a heavily utilized open space park by various recreationalists and Support a wildlife ecosystem. ▪ Request full study of I-15 to Qualcomm route, Oppose route through Rose Canyon and stop at University Town Center. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space</p>
Eric Poppick Marilyn Perrin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support high-speed rail. Oppose route in Rose Canyon. Concerned with impacts to vegetation and wildlife in Rose Canyon and impacts associated with noise, security, and parking lots. Noted I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium would have better ridership, faster, cheaper, less noise, and avoid Rose Canyon. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operation</p>

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Jerry Potts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project is expensive. Supports route along I-5 or I-15. Oppose tunnel option due to high cost, crossing fault lines (particularly Rose Canyon), cause decrease in property values, and noise and vibration. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Nancy Powell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is little open space and the project should not disrupt Rose Canyon. Explore the I-15 to Qualcomm alternative route. Opposed to tunnels running through Rose Canyon. There is no funding at the state or federal level. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Charles Pratt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I-15 route should be restored. I-15 would have higher ridership and earnings, Qualcomm Stadium station more accessible, economic benefit to the City of San Diego and promote development, potential expansion to East County and Chula Vista/the border, be an alternative to air travel, and less damaging than Rose Canyon or tunneling. Lindbergh Field does not make sense as a destination. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Virginia Prutow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High-speed train station at University City will have negative impacts. Does not believe many will use public transit. Neighbors do not use public transportation. Favors routing the train to Qualcomm with shuttle service to the airport, convention center, and downtown San Diego. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Richard J. Prutow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Time and cost for high-speed rail travel does not appear to be worthwhile. Provide breakdown. Opposed to route via the UTC-Rose Canyon - I-5 route to the airport. Supports the route via I-15 to Mission Valley near Qualcomm Stadium with continued routing south along the I-15. Site station at I-15 near Miramar Road and build trolley out to UCSD/UTC area. The main HST station should be in Mission Valley due to trolley and parking access, costing less. San Diego lacks a functional local public transit network. Therefore, siting an HST 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration;



Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	<p>station at UTC would worsen the transportation gridlock in University City. The governor stripped \$327 million from SANDAG's requested funding for rail improvements from San Diego to San Clemente. This was a shortsighted move since this coastal route is an integral part of the local transit network and would help feed passengers into the HST System. Should improve existing rail along coast corridor. High-speed trains create noise and vibration impacts. Noise Impact: HST would generate noise impacts. Having more evening and nighttime trips would increase noise. The noise would have a negative impact within the Rose Canyon - I-5 corridor. Electromagnetic interference: This needs to be investigated regarding interference with poorly shielded electronic equipment, sensitive equipment used by Qualcomm, and other research institutions, and medical devices. Earthquake Damage: A fault is a risk that should be avoided. Rose Canyon is an active fault line. Concerned with tunnel ventilation system and associated air quality, noise, and safety. Tunnel ventilation system: Tunnels require an active ventilation system sufficient to exchange air during a tunnel fire. Use of Maglev to reduce impacts to energy use, noise, costs, travel time. Suggest that Maglev technology be reconsidered. It is the technology of the future. Would like to see information on the minimum curve radius as a function of speed. Noise component at higher frequencies increases in sharp curves. What is the distance and rate of deceleration into and acceleration out of stations? What would be the noise and speeds for sharp curves?</p>	<p>Section 3.4 Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.10 Safety and Security</p>
Joseph Puzo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports the project. The project will relieve automotive congestion and reduce air pollution. Concerned about the proposed alignment through Rose Canyon. Rose Canyon is the last open space area in the city. There is coastal sage scrub habitat and rare and endangered plants and animals located at Rose Canyon. Recommends the rail project circumvent Rose Canyon and use another alignment. The project will provide an alternative to driving cars. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.6 Biological Resources; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space</p>
Valerie Ramey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like other routes studied other than Rose Canyon and suggests I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. Rose Canyon utilized by various recreational user groups, Support wildlife and plants as an open space park. Request Authority to rethink station at Lindbergh Field, don't feel this makes sense and would consider extending the trolley. Support route to Ontario Airport 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space</p>
Elizabeth A. Randol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support concepts and goals of high-speed rail. Would like I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium analyzed and feels this route would be less expensive, fewer visual and noise impacts, higher ridership and shorter/faster. Oppose the route through Rose Canyon, Rose Creek, Carroll Canyon, San Clemente Canyon or any canyon and creek with substantial natural open space. Concerned with impacts to water quality, wildlife habitat, MSCP, and recreation. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources;</p>

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Michael Reilly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like the alignment to be down I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium to meet with existing trolley line. La Jolla Colony (residential community) just north of Rose Canyon and University City presents concerns related to the proximity of the proposed alignment through Rose Canyon. Concerns are associated with noise, vibration, soils/geology/seismicity, fire safety, visual, traffic, wildlife corridor, open space, and park land. The project is not compatible and cohesive with the surrounding residential and canyon area and leads to concerns regarding loss of property value. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environment
Thomas Reinhardt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The planned HST down interstate 15 would not benefit the community of Rancho Bernardo. Having lived here for 22 years, the latest freeway changes increased noise. The community is beautiful and the train would create problems. 	Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Patrick Reynolds Sharon Reynolds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route on I-15, particularly through Rancho Bernardo. Already excessive noise, visual impacts with elevated ramps, no need for high-speed rail with other public transit options - although local rail like a trolley with more frequent stops would be a better option. Too costly and no additional room on I-15 to support high-speed rail. Only option to reach University City from I-15 would be through 4S Ranch and SR 56, all not possible. prefer to have high-speed rail underground and follow I-5. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Nancy L. Richardson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route through Rose Canyon. Concerned with impacts to associated recreational use in Rose Canyon and maintain open space. Concerned with noise and vibration impacts, fault lines, wildlife, disconnect in Rose Canyon due to security fencing. Would like alternative on I-15 to be studied. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Jane Richardson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use. Currently little native open space within this area of San Diego. Rose Canyon is a valuable resource of future generations when a reasonable alternative exists. Prefer consideration of other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium which would offer connections with trolley. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Gary Ritzman Theresa Drouillard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose the route through UTC and Rose Canyon. Would like the alignment on I-15 which would cause less damage to the environment and existing properties. Concerned with loss in property value. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Allan Roberts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route on I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. Believe route along I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium would lead to loss and impacts to trolley lines and traffic in this area is terrible. Support route through UTC/Rose Canyon because UTC is the 2nd largest business center outside of downtown and should be served by rail, Council already approved new Westfield Mall/UTC to serve as the area's transit center (money spent for this mall expansion to include a rail stop), and the plans for Mid-coast extension of the trolley are consistent with rail in the UTC area. Downtown should have a direct stop. ▪ In support of high-speed rail serving business center in the Rose Canyon/UTC area. Alignment along I-15 would not serve downtown. Money spent on high-speed rail should serve populated areas. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
John M. Roberts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Encourage the project to be sensitive to the environment. In favor of the project and wants to see it in San Diego County. Opposed to route going through Rose Canyon because of environmental issues. Prefers the alignment on highway 15 or across the Miramar exit - not through sensitive areas like Rose Canyon. Electric poles are detrimental to Rose Canyon area. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.4 Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Delia and Ed Rose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do not understand necessity of high-speed rail in this state at this time when infrastructure is failing and we need to replace our levee system. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources;
M. Rosenber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose high-speed rail and the Rose Canyon route. Concerned with impacts to open space, noise, and visual, particularly to surrounding residences. Would like the alignment on I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium which would be less damaging to the environment and have a larger ridership. Believe high-speed rail is a big money loser. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Lisa Ross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose any route through Rose Canyon, Peñasquitos Canyon, and Los Peñasquitos Lagoon. Support high-speed rail, but need to consider alternative routes. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Ferrocet Co. Glen E. Roy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Own a concrete company and would like to help with construction of the project. 	
Patrick Rye	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. Prefer route through Rose Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Deborah Sampson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like to know the current, proposed route through Escondido 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
SEIU, Sierra, Move On Valerie Sanfilippo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Impacts to Rose Canyon would include noise, land use, and visual. Prefer consideration of other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Valerie Sanfilippo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The following are impacts to nearby residents: 1) Up to 134 trains per day; 2) two new HST tracks on the north side of existing tracks; 3) Multiple overhead wires supported by large poles (like the trolley); 4) 12 high chain link security fence, retaining walls on slopes, and nose. Speak up to insist on the full study of alternate routes. Say no to HST in Rose Canyon and insist on a full study of the I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium route. This route has many advantages over the Rose Canyon route - it is faster, cheaper, better ridership, less noise impacts, and no impact on Rose Canyon Park). The Authority is not currently planning to include the I-15 to Qualcomm route in the EIR. Possible routes: The HST line will go through Riverside County and down the I-15 with a station at Escondido. From there, the alternatives are: 1) Going straight down the I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 2) From the I-15 coming west through Carroll Canyon or along Miramar Road, entering Rose Canyon off Miramar Road well east of the 805 and running beside the existing tracks through Rose Canyon, turning south just east of the I-5 to the airport and/or Santa Fe depot. This is the current "preferred route." 3) A vague new proposal for a 150 feet deep double track tunnel from Carroll Canyon or Miramar Road with a huge station under the UTC; the tunnel would emerge into Rose Canyon west of Genesee. No estimates of feasibility, cost, location, and impacts on homes and Rose Canyon Park have been disclosed to the public. Oppose HST through Rose Canyon and support full study of the I-15 to Qualcomm route. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Maria I Santos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned with property value, relocation impact, acquisition impacts, and land use issues. ▪ Reside on Carroll Canyon Road. Concerned about housing property and market value of house. What will happen to homes? Wants to know if there will be relocation or acquisitions. 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Fred Saxton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon. Request other alternatives be considered and evaluated, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium which would serve as hub for trains traveling south and east/west and be less expensive, more safe, and fewer environmental impacts. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
David Sayre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose high-speed rail. Concerned with potential take of property and decrease in values for the homes along I-15, particularly in Rancho Bernardo. Money should be better spent. 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
S C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of high-speed rail. Concerned with earthquake zone. 	Section 3.8 Geology and Soils
MB Schapiro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demand a full study of the I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium route. It makes no sense to disturb a quiet neighborhood and Rose Canyon views with HST when there is a route along the I-15. Support the wildlife and scenic value of leaving Rose Canyon as it is. Strongly support the HST, especially in reducing freeway congestion. Best position would be along the I-15. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
William V. Scheffel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like to know why I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium is no longer being considered and was rejected - feel this route is still valid with more advantages. Rose Canyon would be impacted by the project. Rose Canyon is irreplaceable parkland and wildlife corridor supporting habitats and species. Trains would create a noise impact for surrounding residents and schools and those utilizing the recreational use of Rose Canyon. Would like to know more about the design for the tunnel option through Rose Canyon and associated impacts and costs. Multiple pole catenary system would be a visual impact in Rose Canyon. Will the catenary system be contained within a 12-foot high fence to keep the public out? Where is parking for the UTC station located? What is the size of the required parking lot? Has increased development around the parking spaces been considered? Where is the train storage and maintenance station to be located and is Rose Canyon being considered and would repairs be done in the evening at this location? 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality; Recreation, and Open S

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Barbara Scheidker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support high-speed rail. Oppose route through Rose Canyon. Rose Canyon location of important watershed and part of biological heritage. Concern for noise for those who live on top of canyon walls. Need to have a full EIR on I-15 route ending at Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration
Vince Scheidt Melissa Scheidt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon. Concerned with wildlife corridors and edge effects, MSCP, water quality, noise levels, CA gnatcatcher and other federally-listed threatened and endangered species. Prefer consideration of other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Alice Schilling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not want route through Rose Canyon. Concerned with impact to natural resources and recreational use of Rose Canyon, the surrounding property/neighborhoods, visual and noise impacts (particularly with nearby schools), and the faults. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Rita Schipper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ride the MTS buses in San Diego and experienced the faulty planning that MTS and SANDAG already had. They change things for the worst and the HST is another example of that. The project will end up with a 50 billion dollar system that no one will ride. Traffic will worsen on the freeways. Spend the funding wisely and improve the current transportation infrastructure instead of creating a new mess that will dry out the state. Reconsider and listen to the people rather than rich developers, government bureaucrats, and politicians. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Section 3.1 Transportation; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Sidney Schipper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How will the project pay for itself in California, the land of the freeways? The \$10 billion could be spent more cost effectively by improving the current transportation infrastructure. Rapid bus transit lanes could be added to the I-5 and the I-15 for significantly less money than the \$50 billion that is proposed for the project. The state is already bankrupt and the project 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and



Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	<p>proposes to bankrupt our children and grandchildren. Rich developers want this project so they can be richer. Politicians are in favor of the project so protests from the community will fall to deaf ears.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose the route through Rose Canyon. Would like the alignment on I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. Concerned about impacts to Rose Canyon since it is a natural park that is utilized and enjoyed by many recreational users. Concerned with traffic and hardship to surrounding residents of Rose Canyon. 	<p>Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations</p>
Cynthia Schofield	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Other routes mentioned would be preferable to Rose Canyon. Real estate would rapidly deteriorate. A route closer to the coast would be more applicable and the scheduled 15 minutes should be increased to 0.5 to 1 hour 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Andrea Seavey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. The alignment should not go down Centre City and it should stay towards the freeway. A good place for a station would be at the Westfield Mall. If Centre City Parkway is torn up, the town will be a wreck. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land use
Cindy Senussi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route through Rose Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Stephanie Sexton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Impacts to Rose Canyon would include noise, land use, and visual. Prefer consideration of other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Moti Shalom Diane Shalom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Impacts to Rose Canyon would include noise, land use, and visual. Prefer consideration for other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space;

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Robert M. Shaughnessy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Impacts to Rose Canyon would include noise, land use/surrounding neighborhoods, and visual. prefer consideration for other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Janet Shelton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support high-speed rail and route along I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. Oppose the route through any canyon and creek with substantial natural open space. Concerned with impacts to water quality, wildlife, habitat, MSCP, and recreation. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Jay Shumaker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HST should pass through Miramar and stop at Miramar, and continue to downtown San Diego on the 15 corridor. With the current economy, there is the risk that no one would invest in the project. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Pat Silver	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of the project. Live in the canyon and railroad tracks were always in the canyon. City allowed homes to be built close to the tracks. 	Section 3.1 Transportation
Jeannette Slagill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route along I-15. Concerned with operation costs and speed of train operation versus driving. No available room/space along I-15 to support project. Impacts to surrounding communities immediately adjacent to I-15 and impacts associated with noise, visual, and traffic. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Freya Smallwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon. Concerned with inappropriate land use and noise impacts to surrounding residential homes. Also concerned with the natural state of Rose Canyon. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Chapter 7.0 Public and Agency Involvement
J Kevin Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The two alternative routes through University Town Center (UTC) would be very costly and "vulnerable" to earthquakes. Would prefer route that goes through Rose Canyon along Miramar where a station would be built on the surface. This alternative would allow San Diego to use the MCAS airport if there is political will. Miramar could then become an Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) because it has freeways on three sides and existing rail lines could be converted to rapid transit to the airport and downtown. Temecula and communities along I-15 could be provided with transit if built lower on the same HST structure as in Japan. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils
Conor Soraghan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Impacts to Rose Canyon would include noise, land use, and visual. Prefer consideration of other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Pablo Soto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose high-speed rail through Rose Canyon due to noise and visual impacts, increased traffic and parking garages. Wants a full study of I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Loretta D Spano	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prefers route I-15 to Qualcomm and connecting with trolley or bus. This alternative creates less disruption to neighborhoods and economically connects to existing businesses. Rose Canyon is a chamber for noise. An updated decibel study is required since the last one was performed in 1996. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Dennis Spillane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trains should be bike friendly and allow passengers to utilize bicycles as a mode of transportation at arrival and departure locations. 	Section 3.1 Transportation
Joseph Steinbach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How will the train line go through Rose Canyon and maintain the wildlife corridor? 	Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands
Manton and Pamela Steinberg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prefers the I-15 freeway to Qualcomm Stadium alternative with a Trolley connection to Lindbergh field Transit CTR. Save Rose Canyon - this is the only water way to Mission Bay and the only natural park area for northern UTC where families can use. Concerned with electric poles going down a natural parkway, which is also a fire zone. Placing electric poles along freeways is more sensible. The stop at the UTC mall is not a great plan. The mall is going downhill, the cost of the tunnel will be very expensive and it is a poor choice for a transportation hub. The Marine base by the 15 freeway would be better and there could be a bus hub outside of the base for a more reasonable price. Buses go up and down Miramar rather than a train going down a congested roadway. Also, UCSD uses the parking at the UTC mall. A stop at the UTC will cause more parking requirements so people will not be able to use the mall. UTC already has too much traffic. The storage of trains along the 805 freeway will keep people awake at night at the Renaissance complex of condos. This is also located by office buildings and the mall where the traffic is congested already. There are also single family homes behind Renaissance who will experience the noise. There are more public properties towards Qualcomm stadium that would be perfect for a train station or closer to Temecula/Corona where there are not many homes so densely situated. Would tunnels and continued train vibrations cause damage to homes that are above ground? How far down will the tunnel go? Oppose the destruction of Rose Canyon and tunneling under homes when other alternatives are available. Qualcomm Stadium is a more central downtown location. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Phel Steinmetz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advocate of mass transit and high-speed line. Support I-15 to Qualcomm route. Will not support any route above or below ground that would impinge upon the remaining quality of life in and around coastal canyons and communities. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
Jeff Stevens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stations at only Escondido and downtown San Diego is very inconvenient, adds to congestion, and restricts ridership. Support Station at Miramar College just west of I-15 and south of Mira Mesa Boulevard (already plans for a bus transit station there and direct access to freeway). 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Pamela Stevens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support a station at the Mira Mesa Transit Center next to Miramar College campus (just west of I-15 and south of Mira Mesa Boulevard) to better serve Mira Mesa/Scripps Ranch and all of northern City of San Diego. This location is already a planned bus transit center with direct access to HOV lanes on I-15. Consider this an intermediate stop or have a commuter train. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use
Kay Stewart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing rail alignments in many places are not appropriate for HST. They are often placed in quiet parts of communities. Trail routes were designed for scenic value and an HST is not for scenic touring. It is for fast transport from point A to point B. For an HST to be economically feasible, it must run more frequently than the current train schedule and on many of these routes. HST fits best with freeway systems, which are devastated landscapes in every regard. Human beings cannot live with such intense activity in their face all the time. It is harmful to our health. The proposed line from Riverside County should follow the I-15 corridor to Mission Valley. It should not deviate and be placed through Rose Canyon. Do not approve a route through Rose Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Helga M Strong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of the project. In favor of the Rose Canyon option. Lived in West University City for 34 years. The trains have been no problem for Flora and Fauna. Songbirds and raptors are plentiful and enjoyed hikes through the canyon. They will co-exist with the HST. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.5 Noise and Vibration
Samuel O. Strong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lived approximately 1 mile from the current railroad track in Rose Canyon for 35 years and love hearing the trains. Enjoy the open space that the canyon provides. You will receive comments from those living in University City that will say Rose Canyon is a pristine ecological wilderness. This is not true and is a code for "not in my backyard". The canyon has tracks, trails, pipelines, and transmission lines in it and they coexist well with the open space provided. In favor of the project and excited about the proposed route through Rose Canyon. 	
Jason Strunka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes Mission Valley as a destination. Supports destination in downtown San Diego. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Chris Sullivan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with noise impacts associated with project along I-15, particularly with recent expansion of I-15 in the Rancho Bernardo neighborhoods. Consider noise barrier to mitigate impacts. 	Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Tim Swift	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I do not think putting the rail line in Rose Canyon is a good idea. The I-15 path seems more feasible. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Judith A. Swink	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned with the preferred route through Rose Canyon and the I-5 corridor. This is an inappropriate direction and the EIS/EIR should give equal weight to studying the I-15 corridor to Qualcomm Stadium to downtown San Diego. Rose Canyon is an earthquake fault. Rose Canyon is an ecological and recreational resource. There is a creek that flows into Mission Bay from Rose Canyon. There should be a direct route down the I-15 down to Qualcomm then downtown SD. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Lynn Tagge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If the alignment is down the freeway, please take care of noise abatement. If the alignment runs through Centre City Parkway, please address traffic and vibrations concerns. 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration
Peter Tereschuck	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose project and route along I-15, especially through Rancho Bernardo. Oppose the route change from existing alignment along coast to inland. Concerned with cost of project and source of payment/funding. Concerned with location of route along I-15 with lack of space to support project, land acquisition, and noise. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Sharon Thomson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of HST linking Los Angeles to San Diego to reduce traffic and carbon footprint. Opposes a train stop at UTC and traveling through Rose Canyon. Lived in University City for past 18 years. Rose Canyon has always been important to my family to enjoy nature and get away. People walk, bike, and take advantage of the quiet and green space at Rose Canyon. Do not want to have Rose Canyon's open space interrupted regularly by HSTs. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
SuSan Traganza	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High-speed rail system would be beneficial to San Diego and support the idea of this method of transportation. Request a full study of the I-15 Qualcomm high-speed rail route to be done before final route selection is determined. This route has many benefits over the proposed route through Rose Canyon and has less environmental impact. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Jim Treadway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to the project going through Rose Canyon unless it goes underground. It is a natural state. Opposed to going through Rose Canyon because of noise and the power poles. Does not want to look out at elevated wires. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Emily Troemel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full study of alternatives should be performed. For example route going straight down I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. Oppose route through Rose Canyon and would ruin eco-friendly bike commuting options. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Lauren Underwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose high-speed railway through the Rose Canyon area. It would be devastating to our natural wildlife, our neighbors, and the enriching nature programs. A full study of alternative routes such as I-15 south down to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Unidentified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Rose Canyon route. Alternatives that need to be studied include I-15 corridor to Qualcomm. A high-speed railway is not the answer to transportation problems 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Unidentified Speaker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The route should end at the 15 to Qualcomm Stadium rather than around to UTC and downtown. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Diana Vallese	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lives in the community of Rancho Bernardo - a community below Escondido on the proposed I-15 route from Los Angeles to San Diego. This route shows the section of the I-15 highway from Escondido through Miramar as a raised rail section. The height of the rail is set at 10 feet 8 inches tall. The height of the bridges along this route are well above this height. To retrofit these bridges again to accommodate the raised rail track would potentially cost millions of dollars more out of the taxpayers pockets. If the train runs at ground level down the center of the I-15 through Escondido to the UTC, this area would lose the new HOV lanes. Our community has greatly benefitted by these lanes in faster commutes and decreases in rush hour congestion. It is important to keep these HOV lanes intact. Another major concern is if a ground level track is not feasible down the center of the I-15 highway, eminent domain would be used to take land near the highway. What could be displaced by eminent domain? The adjoining communities of Carmel Mountain Ranch, Rancho Peñasquitos, Sabre Springs, Mira Mesa, and Scripps Ranch are also densely populated along the I-15 freeway and would be greatly impacted. Why isn't the HSRA considering an I-5 highway route from Los Angeles to downtown San Diego using existing railroad tracks along the coastal area? 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Ann Van Leer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support high-speed rail. Route in Rose Canyon has major conflicts with the Rose Creek watershed unless placed completely underground. Concerned with route and fencing impacts on open space park, recreation, wildlife corridors, and public safety with crossings. Prefer to have route located in an area with plenty of parking and already highly impacted by traffic, to be cost-effective, and serve a larger ridership. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources;

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Vince Vasquez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon with impacts to park areas, recreational use, surrounding neighborhood, habitat for plants and wildlife. Rose Canyon also not compatible with land use and noise. Consider other alternatives, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Kim Vonk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of the project. Concerned with safety and earthquake construction. 	Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.10 Safety and Security
Patricia Walsh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect Rose Canyon and divert the rail to another alternative such as I-15 to Qualcomm. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Associate Professor Elizabeth Waters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose HST through Rose Canyon/UTC/I-5 Route. These areas ecologically sensitive and have residential housing lining the route. Concerns include destruction of habitat and noise pollution. High-speed Rail line run all the way down I-15 to Mission Valley and from other over the airport. Oppose Rose Canyon/UTC/I-5 Route. Concerns include noise pollution, Rose Canyon fault. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils
Thomas Wegman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Impacts to Rose Canyon would include noise, land use, and visual. Prefer consideration of other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station



Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
J. Wentworth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon. Concerned with associated trails, recreational use, wildlife, noise impacts to surrounding residences, security measures, and visual. Support route along I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium and believe it would have higher ridership, less expensive, faster, and less noise. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.10 Safety and Security Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Andrew Wiese	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon. Concerned with impacts to natural open space, recreational use, diverse flora and fauna, coastal sage scrub, wildlife habitat, CA gnatcatcher and other wildlife species. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Northrop Grumman Berry W. William	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned with potential electromagnetic interference from high voltage catenary sparking. This could interfere with HST safety communication and other communication networks away from the rail line. What happens if there is power failure? What happens when the HST power fails while under a tunnel? With regards to the track through Rose Canyon in the vicinity of the Elvira switch point, the current Surfliner/Coster must slow down for the junction and for a winding roadbed down the canyon. Consider mitigating the Surfliner/Coaster and the proposed UCSD trolley extension. Defined the quantity, roles, and responsibilities of the train crew members for routine and emergency operations. Design considerations must consider passenger comfort. Want the track to proceed as straight as possible. The physics of motion must be evaluated so passengers maintain comfort and safety. 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.4 Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference; Section 3.5 Public Utilities and Energy; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Page Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the project. The project would relieve traffic congestion. Hopes the train will be affordable since Amtrak is expensive. Concerned about impact on Rose Canyon. Noticed decrease in owls, deer, rabbits, and frogs in the past ten years. Is concerned that animals will be driven out. Wants to consider a more northern line since it may have less of an impact. Wants more space below the tracks for animals and pedestrians to cross. Is concerned about teenagers trying to cut across the canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations.
Charlie Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support high-speed rail along I-15. Feels this route would be a benefit for the senior citizens who live in the Rancho Bernardo area. Project would relieve congestion and clean the environment. 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
D.R. Win	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High-speed rail should be viable alternative to driving and flying between major destinations. Station stops should be located in accessible and convenient locations. Ignore those who see high-speed rail as tourist vehicle or means of getting to sports event. A station at Qualcomm should not be considered. Proposed stop at UTC has nothing to do with tourist destinations. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Tanja Winter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose route through Rose Canyon. Protect all parks and have community input. Wants to see full study of I-15 to Qualcomm route. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Kevin Wirsing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes route in Rose Canyon, near Rose Canyon or lower Rose Creek. Concerned with highly sensitive open space and habitat resources. Suggest making Rose Canyon as an option for mitigation for project impacts. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Richard Wolf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like to have bags checked at the HST. Would like to see right-of-way and provide a corridor for bicycle travel or have bike trails adjacent to the right-of-way. Concerned about environmental impact on Rose Canyon. Rose Canyon is a delicate environmental area with wildlife. Prefer the route down the I-5 to the I-8 to reach downtown rather than through Rose Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation,

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
		and Open Space; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
Katherine Wood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed to installing a high-speed rail line through Rose Canyon. Other alternatives need to be studied right away, such as I-15 Qualcomm route. San Diego is a good place to live with its balance of natural and urban areas. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Ben Wroblewski	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like a full study of the I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium route. Oppose the HST project through Rose Canyon. This is how the project will impact me: bought a property to enjoy the view and the quiet of living on a canyon. I am a senior citizen who worked to enjoy retirement. Now someone who is not from the San Diego area will mess up the life of many seniors who bought in this area. If the project goes through it will reduce our property values. Build the rail line where you live and stay out of my neighborhood. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice.
Kim F. Wu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose route in Rose Canyon since it is an open space park supporting recreational use and habitat for wildlife and plants. Impacts to Rose Canyon would include noise, land use, and visual. prefer consideration for other routes, including I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Howard Yeh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disappointed that University City was dropped as a station option by SANDAG due to the surrounding demand/potential ridership and would like this location to be reconsidered. Support a station in University City. Oppose route in Rose Canyon, unless project will tunnel to protect the recreational use, reduce noise and impacts to the park's beauty. If University City station is dropped, MTS needs to extend the trolley to UTC and NCTD/SANDAG needs to build a Coaster station at Nobel Drive - believe the surrounding population/ businesses/ university will support the demand/ridership and supports a station at Qualcomm Stadium. Unclear to the reasoning for the station at Lindbergh Field with the airport capacity issues and lack of demand/use from the Inland Empire. Would like project information easier to find and with more details on the website. 	Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need; Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality; Section 7.0 Public and Agency Involvement
Robert Yonehitsu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. 	

Table 3-4 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Marjorie Zhou	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How will the project be integrated with air, road, and other rail/trolley modes of transportation? Is the project desirable? Will adding the infrastructure for high-speed rail to Lindburgh Field be a good alternative? 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation
Karin Zirk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support concept of high-speed rail. Oppose route in Rose Canyon. Concerned with impacts to natural open space, creeks, natural habitats, parks and recreational use, wetland ecosystems, water quality, and MSCP. Request analysis on cost, ridership, and parking. Supports route evaluation of I-15 to Qualcomm Stadium and to serve the needs of East County and Chula Vista. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land

Table 3-5 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Regulatory Agency Meetings

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
FEDERAL AGENCIES		
Army Corps of Engineers Veronica Chan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the 404 Clean Water Act requirements, there is also the Section 408 for impacts to levees and flood control channels that should be considered. It would be good to involve the entire USACE in the project. 	Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources
United States Fish & Wildlife Service Sally Brown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will you address growth-inducing effects in your environmental documents? During the presentation, it was stated that in some locations it has already been determined that tunneling will be required. We have experienced problems in the past with tunneling affecting the groundwater table and dewatering springs, resulting in high levels of environmental impact. We request that once it has been determined that a certain type of design, such as tunneling, must be used at a given location, that that information be shared with our agency right away such that we can share our concerns with regard to environmental impacts early in the process. 	Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice
REGIONAL AGENCIES		
Air Pollution Control District (APCD) for San Diego Andy Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How deep will the air quality analysis go? There are immediate and induced impacts. There are impacts within 10, 15, and 20 years. This project is like an airport and a train station for a conventional train. This provides an opportunity for the state to demonstrate best practices in terms of the local streets and roads and the urban design. It would be good to have funding provided to the local governments to mitigate traffic, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit designing within a certain vicinity of the station. Local governments would do these things but do not feel like they can afford to. There will be traffic safety issues, not only in the vicinity of the station but further away from the station. There would be traffic diversion from airports and net air quality benefits. There will be some relieving of development in the area and what would be its impacts? Parking would require land or building upwards. How far away can you build parking and still allow them to serve the station in a way that is attractive for passengers for downtown San Diego. Where and how will parking alternatives be managed? What is the pricing on parking? Free parking is not a good idea for this facility. New transit services are induced as a result of parking. Net air quality impacts should include new transit services. Applaud the idea of providing an urban design guideline for the stations. Induced pedestrian and bike trips outside of stations and safety issues these present. There are traffic issues as well. The project would create traffic diversion from airports and there would be a net air quality benefit. The project would create traffic diversion from local roads and interstates, state highways, etc. Provide parking alternatives, including pricing. Likely induced new transit services. Likely induced land development near stations, air quality impacts or benefits. Would like an opportunity to comment on the Urban Design Guidelines. 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

Table 3-5 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Regulatory Agency Meetings (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region Linda Pardy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of the proposed project is likely to result in impacts to water quality, wetland, and riparian resources. Addressing the protection of water resources and quality in the early stages of the project offers the most cost effective strategy for reducing the physical impacts to on-site streams and wetlands and minimizing the potential impacts to pollutants in urban runoff from the site to downstream surface waters. 	Section 3.6 Biological Resources; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources
City of San Diego Planning and Use Department Tait Galloway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider or evaluate the grade structure or below grade for the I-15 aerial structure. There is an option of looking at a route that went through University City that could avoid using the Rose Canyon right-of-way and connecting with the I-5. Study the different alignments both at grade, below, and aerial structures to minimize visual impacts. In regards to SB 375 and the work that the local jurisdictions in the County of San Diego are working with SANDAG at the long range assumptions that we're making for 2050 to avoid the commute out of the region. In other words, look at how to house future population for 2050. Are you going to work with jurisdiction in terms of what land use assumptions to use? Or are you going to assume that the current plans are in place? How are you going to address that in the environmental document? Parking at the station is going to be a huge issue for the City of San Diego - in the University City area and downtown San Diego. Study alternate transportation means using transit and other measures to reduce the parking demand and number of trips to the facilities. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Regional Water Quality Control Board Glenn Robertson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide status of memorandum of understanding with USACE. Note that MOU is being created for Los Angeles to Anaheim Section and wonder whether the LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section could be included in that MOU. Will there be a standard approach to building bridges over channels and natural drainage systems? Are there plans to have elevated bridges over waterways, with footings placed in embankments and streams? 	Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority Ted Anasis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest an analysis or compatibility with the adopted airport master plan, the proposed airport use compatibility plan for San Diego International Airport, and consistency with the destination Lindbergh multiagency planning effort, and specifically where the rail would connect to Lindbergh Field. Collaborate the forecast for passenger demand, and coordinate the assumptions and the technical analysis for passenger demand. Around an airport there are federal aviation requirements and safety and security concerns. This should be considered in terms of the proximity of the station to the airport. There are local road and intersection challenges around an airport station or connection. Consider circulation, traffic, and parking issues, the rail crossings, and cooperation among parking facilities. 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

Table 3-5 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Regulatory Agency Meetings (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
LOCAL AGENCY		
City of Industry Joshua Nelson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the planned frequency of stops? Would parking structures be needed for the system? 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
ORGANIZATIONS, ASSOCIATIONS, & BUSINESSES		
Friends of Rose Canyon Debbie Knight	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Study the I-15 to Qualcomm option, which was in the program EIR. This option had advantages - better ridership, less impacts, shorter route, and a quicker time. There were also route options from downtown to Qualcomm. It is not listed because SANDAG and the City of San Diego did not want it considered. It would be a mistake to go forward with an alternative through University City, potentially through the canyon, or the only way to avoid the canyon - massive tunneling. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
INDIVIDUAL		
Tom and Pamela Burke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will the system be double-tracked? Would parking garages be available for long-term parking? Note that in Southern California, people won't give up their cars. System needs to accommodate car culture. Will tunneling will be required in LA-SD via the Inland Empire Section? 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

Table 3-6 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Multiple Counties

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
STATE AGENCIES		
Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources Paul Frost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed project passes through the administrative boundaries of the Montebello and Rowland oil fields as well as the counties of Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, and San Diego. There are several abandoned wells within or in proximity to the project boundaries. Recommend that all wells within project boundaries be accurately plotted on future project maps. Building over or in proximity of abandoned wells should be avoided. If this is not possible, it may be necessary to plug or re-plug wells to current Division specifications. If abandonment or reabandonment of wells is necessary, the cost of operations is the responsibility of the property owner upon which the structure will be located. If plugged and abandoned or unrecorded wells are damaged or uncovered during excavation or grading, remedial plugging operations may be required. 	Section 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use

Table 3-6 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Multiple Counties (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
INDIVIDUAL		
Michael Allen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fully support high-speed rail. Prefer an accelerated build out of Los Angeles to San Diego route because of high dense population. Support an increase to the gas tax. Prefer Escondido station be located at the Escondido Transit Station/Sprinter Line Terminal and not on El Norte Parkway due to practical location. Route from Escondido to Ontario should be located with the least environmental damage. Concerned with wetlands and wildlife corridor in Temescal Canyon north of Murrieta. Consider restoring wildlife corridor in Temescal Canyon. prefer route along I-215. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations</p>
David Archbold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1) The Mira Mesa station would not only take advantage of the proposed route along the I-15, it would also eliminate the need to accommodate a station near UTC. This would avoid a redundant station at the Coaster station at Sorrento Valley. 2) If UTC is a station, most people would continue using their cars because Mira Mesa is centrally located between downtown SD and Escondido. 3) There are several marines stationed at the MCAS Miramar as well as civilians. This population would use the HST if it were as close as 2 miles within the MCAS. 4) Passengers in SD would use the route if it were along the I-15 corridor between downtown SD and Riverside. This would incentivize ridership by decreasing commute times. If Mira Mesa was selected as a station, bus service should service passengers from their homes, businesses, and shopping to access rail. Travel times between most points in SD County should be less than an hour. The Mira Mesa station should be at Mira Mesa Blvd adjacent to the I-15 at the existing Park and Ride. However, that area contains a high volume of traffic and is undergoing freeway expansion. An alternate station in the area is north of Mira Mesa and Mercy Road adjacent to I-15. This area is relatively vacant. A second alternate station is at Miramar Road adjacent to the I-15, though high volume of traffic, south of the TRACON building is open land. Siting the downtown SD station to feed passengers to other vehicles at the Santa Fe Depot would have the same impact as siting at the Escondido transit center in partnership with NCTD given that SD Trolley, Coaster, and Amtrak have a presence at the Depot. 7) Commercial and government venues are located close to the Santa Fe Depot. Some are within walking distance while others are available by trolley or bus. a) The first stop north of Santa Fe Depot should be the County Center and Little Italy. b) The second stop east is the Civic Center neighborhood c) The third stop east should be at a bus hub walking distance of the SD downtown library. d) The fourth stop should connect with SD city college. 8) The Santa Fe Depot connections beyond downtown SD include military bases around SD Bay. Santa Fe Depot by Coaster serves and overlaps with Amtrak service following several communities along the coast. If Lindbergh field was selected, this would feed more passengers into an already capacity dense airport. Ontario airport is the preferred alternative to LAX for international flights. The Authority could effectively promote Ontario over LAX if it were more accessible to the region at large. 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice</p>

Table 3-6 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Multiple Counties (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Dennis Campbell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In favor of the project. Believe there will be environmental impacts to the state if the project is not installed; particularly, air quality and climate change impacts. Suggest DEIR cover the following impacts: 1) Air Quality impacts. Comparisons between single occupancy vehicle usage and benefits of the HST. 2) Could the system be used for freight travel as well? This could increase revenue to the system and reduce travel time and expenses for freight or postal service. 3) Review the possibility of extending the tracks to LAX. Interstate 405 is overburdened and a connection might be desirable, depending on costs and potential impacts. 4) If the HST passes through residential areas, the visual qualities of the areas should not be impacted severely. Stations should be designed using soft architectural principles and appropriate landscape design to mitigate possible impacts. Examples in San Diego include the Solana Beach Station. A comparison between highway noise and the HST should be included in the study. What are the noise impacts on the surrounding land occupants and how will the system reduce noise? Noise barriers and walls should be included and aesthetically pleasing to those viewing the walls from homes. 6) In favor of the inclusion of environmental justice review. All people of all income levels and quality of life deserve fair treatment regarding placement of the track and stations, as well as experience of noise and visual quality impacts. 7) Agree with the north-to-south alignment for HST. Recommend additional tram/rail and public transport facilities and services considered to serve the main HST line. 8) Agree with the track alignment that brings people to the San Diego Airport. Agree with need to review impacts to biological resources. The route in the central and east portion of San Diego County will traverse through biological resources and could impact conservation efforts. 10) If the HST is elevated, potential impacts due to flight paths of military jets should be reviewed. 11) Similar trains in Japan are elevated high above neighborhoods. Potential hazards relating to rail derailments or other disasters should be addressed. Will a disaster plan be developed by the Authority? 	<p>Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality</p>
Joyce Dillard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned with grade separations, accommodations for disabled, oil/gas/methane and hazardous substances, odors, health and safety. Concerned with impacts to floodplain management, parks and trails, equestrian areas, hospitals, schools, churches, wildlife crossings/migratory bird routes, and historic and cultural resources. Will hillsides be mapped? What are the electrical and energy supplies/demands along the route? What are the greenhouse gas effects? Consider the Integrated Regional Water Management Plans regarding spreading grounds, water quality and water supply issues, rural and urban needs related to the Transit-Oriented Development efforts, housing density, and traffic/circulation. Economic growth should identify small businesses and economic hubs. Supports route through or near Hazard Park and Lincoln Park in the Los Angeles area. Questions San Gabriel Valley Industry Program Alignment Route because of pending football stadium; Orange County may benefit, but concerned with traffic and housing. Believes San Gabriel Valley El Monte Option Alternative Route would have to connect with bus hub in that area to be 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.4 Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources;</p>



Table 3-6 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Multiple Counties (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	beneficial; San Gabriel Valley West Covina Option Alternative Route would have to be analyzed in relationship to the Silverstreak bus route to determine degree of benefits; El Monte Option combined with West Covina Option would make a better choice over Industry Program Alignment route. San Gabriel Valley Cal Poly Option Alternative route needs to analyze benefit to college and mitigation regarding agriculture; San Gabriel Valley Pomona Option Alternative route needs to analyze benefit to LA County Fairgrounds and residents. Ontario Airport connection is most beneficial. San Bernardino Option Alternative route and Riverside Option Alternative route should analyze the industry and residential data for a connection to Los Angeles and/or San Diego. Riverside March AFB Option Program Alignment route appears to be beneficial - what about Homeland Security? Murrieta Option Program Alignment route is needed and evaluate economic impacts. Corona Option Alternative route does not seem an appropriate option.	Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Section 3.13 Agricultural Lands; Section 3.16 Cultural Resources; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
John Gallivan Maureen Gallivan Tim Gallivan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support high-speed rail to decrease vehicle traffic, energy, air pollution. Would like to connect Lindbergh Field and John Wayne airports and stops in Escondido and University City and place it above HOV lanes on I-15 as an elevated track. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change
Larry Geyerman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project will fail if there is a stop in Escondido instead of the Qualcomm Stadium. Nobody will use the HST if there is a stop at UTC and traffic is not alleviated on the I-5 and I-805. Nobody can get in and out of there in a timely manner. The project should be near the existing airports for a fly and ride. It should go above the I-5 as an elevated train, turning into the I-405 and meeting again with the I-5 northbound. More people would be served quickly this way. Construction could be planned without impacting the flow of traffic. The UTC station is flawed because the route would go through Rose Canyon. Rose Canyon is an active fault line, a sensitive wildlife area, and a park. What is wrong with the Qualcomm Stadium option with a stop at the airport? Is it because the City owns it and nobody else will benefit? 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.6 Biological Resources; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
Heather M. Greenberg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of having an HST line between San Diego and Los Angeles. San Diego's green space is a precious community resource and I'd gladly sacrifice a little convenience to maintain them. Son and I visited Rose Canyon and saw several owls from two species. This sort of educational or family experience is irreplaceable. Please perform a full study of the HST line going to Qualcomm Stadium rather than through Rose Canyon. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

Table 3-6 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Multiple Counties (continued)		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Dr. Allen Job	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of high-speed rail and route via Inland Empire. Believe project will revitalize the Inland Empire and promote public transportation use. 	Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
ORGANIZATIONS, ASSOCIATIONS, & BUSINESSES		
Californians for High-speed Rail Daniel Krause Brian Stanke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Routes should ensure best possible station locations, pedestrian accessibility, and reduce traffic congestion/trips while considering selection criteria and mitigation particularly related to land use, growth inducement, and transportation issues. General support for alternative alignments for Los Angeles and Riverside Counties - Metrolink corridor is not a good option due to residential areas, however, Metrolink should consider a station in downtown San Bernardino. City of Industry is not a good option for a station and should be considered for elimination. Support station downtown Pomona or Cal Poly Pomona (especially with development and parking to support); final alignment to Ontario International Airport to locate station adjacent to air passenger terminal; station in downtown San Bernardino; downtown Riverside although the route along I-215 would be expensive and near residential areas and may have to focus station location at UC Riverside. Oppose: Corona station; March AFB station; and I-15 corridor in Western Riverside County. Concerned with the direction San Diego County is pursuing. Opposes: route in Rose Canyon where there is no area appropriate for a station or promotes walkability. Oppose terminal station at Lindbergh Field - should really be Santa Fe Depot to provide and support a variety of transportation options and accessibility and no development opportunity at airport. Oppose the I-805 to Tijuana alternative. Supports considerations for: Escondido station to also connect with Sprinter line (may need to relocate existing transit center to also help promote walkability and access); tunnel/underground from UTC to I-5 via Nobel Drive down to SR 52 to join with LOSSAN corridor; new option to bring route from I-15 to LOSSAN corridor to downtown San Diego (i.e., SR 56 around Carmel Mountain Road to I-5, Sr 163 to SR 52, SR 613 to I-8, others?); station at Qualcomm Stadium if a downtown San Diego station is still included or just eliminate if not feasible, extend route to Tijuana along I-805; new route option to include dual stations (downtown San Diego at Santa Fe Depot and Lindbergh Field), route with downtown station at Santa Fe Depot and not at Lindbergh Field (oppose efforts to eliminate downtown station in favor of Lindbergh Field). 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.10 Safety and Security; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

Table 3-6 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – Multiple Counties (continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
Quasi Public		
Union Pacific Railroad Jerry Wilmoth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UPRR owns Los Angeles, Alhambra, and Yuma subdivisions rights-of-way in fee simple between central Los Angeles, and the Colton-San Bernardino urban complex and will not voluntarily make any part of these subdivisions available for high-speed rail alignments. Any high-speed rail alignment on or adjacent to these subdivisions would terminate UPRR's ability to serve major shippers crucial to the Los Angeles area and would be considered a serious economic loss. Slow and high-speed trains are not compatible on the same tracks, anytime and any location, including grade-separated cross-overs. Project must comply with all applicable FRA regulations regarding freight. Current UPRR capacity in this area is already strained with current traffic growth. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Chapter 5.0 Project costs and operations

Table 3-7 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – General Comments		
Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
FEDERAL AGENCIES		
Bureau of Land Management, Palm Springs-South Coast Field Office Greg Hill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include the BLM on the mailing list for the project. Project may require application for a right-of-way across federal lands. Impacts to public lands and special designations should be analyzed in the EIS/EIR. 	Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use
FEMA, Deputy Regional Environmental Officer Donna H. Meyer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FEMA is declining invitation to be a participating agency as we do not have jurisdiction or authority with respect to the proposed improvements. 	
United States Department of the Army, Deputy Division Chief Mark Cohen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several alternatives to be considered for the project would require approval by the USACE. USACE approval would be required for 1) any proposed modifications to an existing USACE project, 2) the use of land in which the USACE holds a property interest, and 3) discharges of dredged or fill material into jurisdictional waters of the United States. These approvals would be considered major federal actions for which the USACE has independent legal responsibility to comply with NEPA. The USACE's responsibilities to maintain the function of its flood risk management features, including Los Angeles County Drainage Area, which includes Whittier Narrows Dam and other channels and dams, are of paramount importance. The USACE is required to comply with the terms of a federal law which requires that before any alteration, occupation, or use of a flood control work, the USACE must determine that such use will not be injurious to the public interest and will not impair the usefulness of such work. USACE approval is required for modifications to all existing USACE projects, regardless of whether they are operated by the USACE or by a non-federal sponsor. To ensure that the USACE will be prepared to issue a timely recommendation regarding the preferred alternative, USACE staff need to be involved in the review, screening, and analysis of alternatives that would propose modifications to any USACE project. Please coordinate with USACE staff regarding the potential impacts on flood risk management systems of USACE projects. The USACE must also determine that the project would not affect our property interest or our ability to manage the area in question. A consent to use or alter our easement area may only be granted after the Section 408 analysis is completed. The third USACE approval that may be required for the project is a Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 permit for the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources

Table 3-7 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – General Comments (Continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please note that if the required Section 408 review and analysis exceeds our normal and ordinary capabilities under our appropriations, we may require additional funds to handle necessary actions under the environmental review process. We are in the process of discussing the potential authorities to accept funds for that purpose. Please coordinate with Phillip Serpa, the lead Project Manager for Section 408 issues. ▪ During the Programmatic EIS (Tier 1) phase of the project, the USACE concurred on the alternative “most likely to yield” the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA). The decision was only commensurate with the level and breadth of the environmental data made available to the USACE at that time and was only based on the coordination of the CWA Section 404 issues. Such concurrence does not obviate the need for FRA to fully comply with all requirements of the CWA 404(b)(1) Guidelines (40 C.F.R. Part 230) during the preparation of any subsequent project level EIS. ▪ While potential alternatives are evaluated at both the Tier 1 and Project-level NEPA stages, it is not usually until the last stage that substantive determinations regarding the adequacy of alternatives development and analysis occur. A CWA section 404 permit can only be issued for a discharge of dredged or fill material to waters of the U.S., if the discharge is determined to be the LEDPA. For non-water dependent projects that require filling of wetlands or other special aquatic sites, like this transportation project, the CWA 404(b)(1) Guidelines presume that there are upland alternatives available and that these upland sites are less environmentally damaging. The “No Action” alternative, and alternatives that avoid or minimize fill in waters of the U.S. must be carefully analyzed. Impacts resulting from the build alternatives must be compared to the No Action alternative to understand the overall intensity and magnitude of impacts. ▪ The USACE suggests that the project be constructed within or adjacent to existing transportation corridors where there are lower occurrences of potential sensitive biological and aquatic resources. The USACE suggests that the State Route 56 and State Route 8 corridor be analyzed as alternative routes. 	
United States EPA Carolyn Mulhill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commend the coordination with EPA to highlight potential impacts of an HST System. Methods to incorporate effective public participation in the NEPA process should be fully described and implemented. Green design and operations: Include a commitment to achieving LEED certification for the proposed stations and train facility; Identify measures to conserve water and stormwater runoff. Produce energy onsite and incorporate into design of project; provide estimates of energy saving from proposed measure to improve efficiency; and develop an environmental management system (EMS) for the proposed facility. Relationship to regional transportation projects: Identify how other proposed rail projects in Southern California relate to this project, as well as how the HST would integrate with other existing transportation systems, such as Metrolink. Coordinate with local transportation 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources;



Table 3-7 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – General Comments (Continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	<p>agencies to ensure the HST is integrated with other public transportation systems. Land Use and transportation linkage: Identify all transportation improvements proposed to provide access to the project from rider groups in Los Angeles; San Diego; and other population centers. Study construction impacts associated with constructing the stations, parking, maintenance and storage facilities, infrastructure, road construction. Avoid impacts associated with construction of passenger stations and maintenance facilities. Water resources: Demonstrate that project impacts to waters of the United States have been avoided and minimized. March Air Reserve Base to Mira Mesa: describe the impact of the proposed HST alignment to the Santa Margarita River and to wildlife habitat and movement corridors in the region. Carroll Canyon and Miramar road: Avoid placement of an HST route in canyons; study impact to vernal pools; ensure mitigation measures listed in the table on p. 3.17-28 of the Final PEIS are incorporated into the Draft EIS; Avoid potential impacts to waters at the United States; Minimize impacts to water resources; identify resources with special designations and all special aquatic sites and waters within state, local, and federal protected lands; include a compensation proposal for unavoidable impacts to CWA regulated waters. Water Assessment: Identify sensitive areas or aquatic systems with highly susceptible change. Study the impacts to biological resources and wildlife; Noise; Energy Resources; Air Quality; tunneling methodology and impacts; cumulative impact analysis; Environmental Justice; and Invasive Species.</p>	<p>Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Section 3.15 Aesthetics and Visual Quality; Section 3.16 Cultural Resources</p>
<p>United States Department of Homeland Security, United States Coast Guard, Chief, Bridge Section David H. Sulouff</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Include the Coast Guard Bridge Office from the City of Los Angeles to the City of San Diego via the Inland Empire for all bridge related issues over existing or proposed navigable waters of the United States. 	<p>Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources</p>
STATE AGENCIES		
<p>California State Lands Commission; Assistant Chief, Division of Environmental Planning and Management Marina Brand Jim Porter Mary Ann Hadden</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use of any sovereign or school lands for any part of the project requires that the applicant first obtain a lease from the California State Lands Commission (CSLC). Requesting more detailed project maps be provided for review once available; CSLC is a responsible agency under CEQA and will use the EIR to approve any leases on land within their jurisdiction. CSLC would like as part of the air quality analysis in the MND, greenhouse gas emissions information to be included and consistent with the California Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32). Each alternative would include a determination of the greenhouse gases that would be emitted, a determination of the significance of the impact, and mitigation measures to reduce that impact. Any impacts to aquatic, riparian, and terrestrial species should be fully discussed in the EIR, including a determination of the significance of the impact, and mitigation measures to reduce that impact. Contact Jim Porter for information concerning the CSLC leasing requirements. Contact Mary Ann Hadden with questions on the environmental review. 	<p>Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use</p>



Table 3-7 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – General Comments (Continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
California Transportation Commission Bimla Rhinehart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No comments with respect to the project's purpose and need, the alternatives to be studied, impacts to be evaluated and evaluation methods to be used. The Commission does not have a role as a participating agency for the project. Consideration of the environmental impacts of a project are required prior to the Commission's allocation of funds for design, right of way, or construction activities, and new public road connections and route adoptions. 	Chapter 7.0 Public Participation and Agency Involvement
State of California, The Resources Agency, Department of Parks and Recreation Ruth Coleman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Thank you for invitation to participation in the preparation of the EIR/EIS for the LA to San Diego section of the HST. Accept your invitation and please include my department in discussions pertaining to all other HST routes. ▪ Include my department in discussions to all HST routes. Rick Rayburn will serve as your point of contact at State Parks. 	
State Mining and Geology Board, Department of Conservation; Executive Officer Stephen M. Testa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accepting invitation to become a Participating Agency. 	
State Water Resources Control Board, Executive Office Dorothy Rice Bill Orme Darren Bradford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accepting invitation to become a Participating Agency. 	
State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality; Deputy Director Darrin Polhemus Bill Orme Darren Bradford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project has potential to adversely impact water quality and beneficial uses during construction and maintenance/life of the project. State Water Board would issue certification and appropriate documents are to be filed and appropriate permits are to be obtained. Project should avoid and minimize impacts to all waters of the State to the maximum extent practicable and ensure no net loss of any type of wetlands and their beneficial uses. Full consideration and analysis of all project alternatives, including No Project, to be included in the EIR/EIS as related to construction and maintenance to avoid disturbance to riparian and wetland vegetation, drainage channels, and intermittent and perennial stream banks (consider watershed to protect the hydrology), or to any landforms which, if disturbed, might affect water quality or beneficial uses of waters, to the greatest extent feasible. When such avoidance is infeasible, construction and maintenance activities should specify that minimized disturbance to the fullest extent possible. Avoidance measures should include site configurations that minimize the number of stream crossings and require natural channel design for all relocated segments of streams. Project design should include scientifically based buffers between wetlands and streams and any impervious surface. Unavoidable impacts to waters of the State would require mitigation of the loss of functions and beneficial 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.13 Agricultural Lands

Table 3-7 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – General Comments (Continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	<p>uses. Clearly define selected routes and associated infrastructure in EIR/EIS. Clearly identify all waters of the State in EIR/EIS that may be affected by various alternatives. Clearly identify lead agency under CEQA in EIR/EIS along with appropriate consultation with all responsible agencies. Address development of all avoidance, minimization, and compensatory mitigation measures for alternatives. Incorporate "low impact development" design techniques and for proposed change to existing flow volume, channel location/size, or rate of discharge, an evaluation should be made of the effects on current patterns, water circulation, normal water fluctuation, and salinity. Consider potential diversion or obstruction of flow, alterations of bottom contours, or other significant changes in the hydrology. Evaluate surface and ground water effects. Evaluate loss of natural and agricultural lands as well as habitat and animal and plant species, particularly waterfowl. Include provisions for monitoring environmental compliance/mitigation measures and related time frames by qualified persons. Efforts should be made to avoid impacts to wetlands and waters of the State in areas of ecological integrity. Evaluate cumulative effects for these issue areas.</p>	
REGIONAL AGENCIES		
<p>Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), Associate Regional planner Bernard Lee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SCAG is the authorized regional agency and regional transportation planning agency preparing Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP). Project would be regionally significant. RTP and Compass Growth Visioning (CGV) would be applicable to project and policies would need to be reviewed for consistency. SCAG encourages list of mitigation measures from RTP to be consistent with regional plans and policies. SCAG requests minimum 45 days for review. 	<p>Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use</p>
LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES		
<p>Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Chief of Regulatory Division Mark H. Wills</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Portions of the project traverse or may be located within limits of Special Flood Hazard Areas. The proposed project must comply with National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) regulations and local floodplain management ordinances. It is anticipated that the project will impact various District maintained drainage facilities. The District, along with the incorporated cities and the County of Riverside, are Permittees under the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The Authority will need to demonstrate that the project is consistent with MSHCP. The project will require coverage under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit. Certain waterbodies within the region have been identified, listing of impaired waterbodies and Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Waste Load Allocations have been adopted by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. <p>Permits are required to minimize the discharge of pollutants from their respective MS4s to the maximum extent practicable.</p>	<p>Section 3.7 Hydrology and Water Resources; Section 3.9 Hazardous Materials/Wastes</p>

Table 3-7 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – General Comments (Continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
ORGANIZATIONS, ASSOCIATIONS, & BUSINESSES		
<p>The Transit Coalition, Chair, Advisory Board Kenneth S. Alpern</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The following are recommendations on the Authority's Inland Empire HST Segment. Better coordinated planning with local transit and transportation and local jurisdictions. Noise impacts from passing trains be addressed. Proper use of grade separations would accomplish the goal of being cost-effective and non-disruptive to communities. Coordination with cities regarding Smart Growth and other planned redevelopment. Final decision between the I-15 versus the I-215 project-level rail alternative between Ontario and Murrieta should be based on coordinated data between the Authority and the local jurisdictions. The advantages of the I-15 and the I-215 - suggest private sector rail engineers be invited to bid on taking responsibility of the study and analysis of the I-15 and I-215 Alternatives. Authority should consider a demand analysis of airport and HST parking. Evaluate the current demands of the aviation market, analyze cost time of patrons taking short airline trips to/from airport, and consider code-sharing opportunities between airlines and HST. Concerned with the proposed project-level location of the Corona Station. If the project finds the I-15 alternative most feasible, we request that the Corona Station be placed closer to the central portion of the city, adjacent to Magnolia Avenue corridor or the existing North Main Corona Multi-Modal Transit Facility. Object to the I-15 Alternative utilizing the Milliken/Hamner Avenue. Trenching and tunneling may be required to settle local opposition and possible lawsuit regarding visual and noise impacts from passing trains. Suggest that the I-15 freeway be included as a right-of-way alignment between Ontario and Corona for the I-15 alternative. Request local communities between Ontario and Corona be notified of all noise impacts from passing trains. Whichever route is selected, either the I-15 or I-215, the corridor not selected should be considered for further study of extended Metrolink service. San Bernardino proposed station: We recognize that a station in San Bernardino would provide a strong ridership base; however we believe this deviation must not cause the total trip between San Diego and Los Angeles to increase significantly nor cause a serious increase of operational cost or track mileage. Riverside Station: The proposed station at UC Riverside and the proposed Moreno Valley Station are both far from the downtown Riverside area. Proposing an HST station in the UCR area would expose the RCTC and the project to potential lawsuits as it has sparked community opposition. Consider relocating the proposed HST station closer to the downtown area and possibly utilize the SR 60 as an alignment between Riverside and Ontario Airport. HST would attain better ridership at reduced costs if placed closer to downtown. Murrieta Station: Murrieta and Temecula are long overdue for upgraded regional transportation alternatives, rapid bus, and rail options. Strong concern about lack of local coordination - two separate intermodal transit centers currently planned with no coordination. Land north of the I-15 and I-215 junction is slated to be developed into a mixed-use center with program level proposed HST station. The Riverside Transit 	<p>Chapter 2.0 Alternatives; Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.11 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice; Section 3.12 Local Growth, Station Planning and Land Use; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operation; Chapter 7.0 Public and Agency Participation</p>



Table 3-7 Summary of Public Scoping Comments – General Comments (Continued)

Commenter	Comments	Relevant EIR/EIS Section(s)
	<p>Agency (RTA) and City of Temecula are working on the development of a future intermodal transit station in Temecula. Believe this conflict of planning is due to lack of coordination between Authority and local transportation planners. Community of Rainbow: Urge that the Rainbow community impacts from tunneling remain minimal. Suggest tunneling be developed under existing roadway corridors like Rainbow Valley Road. Escondido Station: A station stop at Escondido will yield benefits such as connections to established mass transit services offered by the North County Transit District. Higher track mileage to highway mileage ratio: Reduce the overall HST track mileage as much as possible from the current program level alignment. This would result in lower set-up and operating costs. Allow trains to travel below 150 mph through developed areas and reduce noise impacts.</p>	
INDIVIDUAL		
Dan Allen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why don't maps show connection between Los Angeles to Las Vegas and how it will integrate with high-speed rail. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Carson Dwight	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I do not want to pay for another train that cannot pay for itself. Money is wasted and I vote no. California is spending more than it earns. 	Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations
University Container, Inc. Kimberly Lagsdin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do not support high-speed rail. Does not make sense to do something like that where it will disturb and uproot all of the pre-existing residents. Multitude of other choices that are available. 	
Michael Mainiero	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Couldn't the rail line be run over Highway 101. 	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives
Carol Stultz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support HST. Would like to see legally binding written statement address how HST is going to eliminate or reduce the effect of dust and dirt and noise during construction; noise, traffic, ground shaking, parking, safety during operation. 	Section 3.1 Transportation; Section 3.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change; Section 3.3 Noise and Vibration; Section 3.8 Geology and Soils; Section 3.10 Safety and Security
Lauren Underwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose high-speed rail - huge cost and destructive to environment and wildlife. 	Section 3.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands; Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations

4.0 Next Steps

Following the public scoping process, the project team will conduct an alternatives analysis (AA) to evaluate proposed alternatives at a more general level than would be conducted in a Draft EIR/EIS in order to provide the California High-Speed Rail Authority Board of Directors with information necessary to determine which alternatives should be fully evaluated through the EIR/EIS process. This analysis will be partially based on the comments received during public scoping, including alternatives proposed in public scoping comments. Throughout the AA process, the project team will coordinate with federal, state, and local agencies.

Once the Authority has determined which alternatives will be evaluated in the Draft EIR/EIS, the project team will begin in-depth analysis of existing conditions in the project area and potential impacts of the project alternatives. Throughout the evaluation process, the project team will coordinate with federal, state, and local agencies. The Authority will also continue to conduct public outreach to ensure that the public is apprised of the project's progress and has the opportunity to provide input.

The analysis of existing conditions and potential impacts of project alternatives will then be synthesized into the Draft EIR/EIS, and the FRA and the Authority will publish the Draft EIR/EIS. Publication is anticipated in 2012. A 60-day comment period will begin following publication of the Notice of Availability in the *Federal Register* and after filing a Notice of Completion with the California State Clearinghouse. The Authority will distribute notices of availability to those on the project mailing list and to potentially affected property owners. In addition, the EIR/EIS will be posted on the Authority's website. Public hearings will be provided in the project area to provide the public the opportunity to discuss the project based on information in the EIR/EIS with the project team and provide comments. These public hearings will be advertised in local newspapers, included in the Notice of Availability and Notice of Completion, and posted on the Authority's website.

After close of the public comment period and review of agency and public comments on the EIR/EIS, the Authority's Board of Directors, in conjunction with the FRA, will select a preferred alternative based on the analysis in the EIR/EIS and comments received. Identification of the preferred alternative is anticipated in 2012. Additional analysis of the preferred alternative will be conducted and a Final EIR/EIS published. The Final EIR/EIS will respond to comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS and specify mitigation measures for project impacts. As with the Draft EIR/EIS, a Notice of Availability will be published in the *Federal Register*. The Authority will select the project to be built and prepare a Notice of Determination for the California State Clearinghouse pursuant to CEQA. With appropriate completion of the Final EIR/EIS, the FRA will issue a Record of Decision for the project, which will present the basis for the decision and summarize the mitigation measures that will be incorporated into the project. After the Record of Decision, project final design and construction can commence contingent on funding availability.

APPENDICES

Notice of Preparation

Appendix A



Notice of Intent

Appendix B



April 2010

**Public Scoping Meeting Announcements – Public Meetings and Residents within 500 feet of
Proposed Alternative Alignments**

Appendix C



**Public Scoping Meeting Announcements in the Media (Display Ad and Legal Notice in
Newspapers)**

Appendix D



Media Coverage

Appendix E



Public Scoping Comment Card and Handouts

Appendix F



Public Scoping Comments – Los Angeles County

The following letters are listed in the same order as Table 3-1 presented in Section 3.5

Appendix G



Public Scoping Comments – San Bernardino County

The following letters are listed in the same order as Table 3-2 presented in Section 3.5

Appendix H



Public Scoping Comments – Riverside County

The following letters are listed in the same order as Table 3-3 presented in Section 3.5

Appendix I



Public Scoping Comments – San Diego County

The following letters are listed in the same order as Table 3-4 presented in Section 3.5

Appendix J



Public Scoping Comments – Regulatory Agency Meeting

The following letters are listed in the same order as Table 3-5 presented in Section 3.5

Appendix K



Public Scoping Comments – Multiple Counties

The following letters are listed in the same order as Table 3-6 presented in Section 3.5

Appendix L



Public Scoping Comments – General Comments

The following letters are listed in the same order as Table 3-7 presented in Section 3.5

Appendix M



Written Public Agency Responses to Notice of Preparation/Intent

Appendix N



Formal Public Scoping Meeting Attendance List

Appendix O



PowerPoint Presentation and Public Scoping Boards

Appendix P



April 2010

Corona Chamber of Commerce Form Letters

Appendix Q

