RESOLUTION NO. 1902-04

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ATWATER SUPPORTING THE CALIFORNIA HIGH SPEED RAIL

WHEREAS, in 1996, the California State Legislature created the California High Speed Rail Authority to develop a plan for the construction, operation and financing of a statewide, intercity high speed passenger rail system, and

WHEREAS, plans are being developed for a High Speed Rail System that will run from Sacramento through the San Joaquin Valley to San Diego, with portions of the system branching out to the Bay Area, and

WHEREAS, the California High Speed Rail System will include Merced County, among the various stops within the San Joaquin Valley.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Atwater, a political entity duly incorporated and existing under and pursuant to the Constitution and Laws of the State of California, hereby supports the development of a California High Speed Rail System with the following conditions:

1. That the route includes the Merced/Atwater area as route stops on the High Speed Rail System.

2. That the continuing study of the Altamont Pass as an alternative will be included within the environmental impact review process.

3. That Castle Airpark Aviation and Development Center will be strongly considered as a maintenance hub facility for the High Speed Rail System.

4. [Additional conditions]

5. [Additional conditions]
Resolution No. 1902-04
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The foregoing resolution was hereby adopted this 26th day of April, 2004.

AYES: Abernathy, Paul, Prado, Krostik, Trevino

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

APPROVED:

[Signature]

RUDY TREVINO, MAYOR

ATTEST:

[Signature]

FRANCES M. BARRETT, CITY CLERK
Response to Comments of Rudy Trevino, Mayor, City of Atwater, Mayor's Office, April 29, 2004 (Letter AL007)

AL007-1
Acknowledged. The Authority has identified both the Downtown Merced station and the Castle Airport Aviation and Development Center as a potential HST station sites to serve the Merced/Atwater area.

AL007-2
Please see standard response 2.18.1.

AL007-3
Please see standard response 2.35.1.
The first step has been achieved: funding subsidy from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD). The next steps over the next year would include the preparation of the environmental documents, which should be completed in late 2004. After the approval of the environmental documents, the design and permitting steps would begin, which should be completed by 2006/07. Construction would then begin in 2007 and the facility would be operational in 2009/10.

3. The Short Tunnel Alternative would place double tracks adjacent to the Beach Road Community. This would create a number of serious impacts to the quality of life as well as to public safety access to this community.

4. While the City of Dana Point has vigorously worked to maintain and maximize coastal access for our visitors and residents, the CHSRA proposed Short Tunnel improvements would increase the likelihood of life-threatening conflicts at existing formal and informal grade rail crossings, leading ultimately to decreased public access to the beach. As the City of Dana Point deals with coastal access, Doheny State Beach is located where proposed rail corridor improvements will cause severe impacts upon the resources found in these parks, and the public’s ability to visit these areas. The grade Short Tunnel Alternative would create problems for safe public access to the County Beaches as well as Doheny State Beach. California State Parks has already voiced their strong support against at-grade double tracking through Dana Point for the aforementioned reasons.

5. In Dana Point, geologic stability and coastal processes near and under the rail corridor may be impacted due to improvements proposed in this project. The residential communities of Capistrano Beach will certainly be threatened. Given the aforementioned, I am sure you will understand the Community’s concern over the Short Tunnel alternative. Because the Long Split Tunnel is such a superior alternative, it appears to be the only choice. The Short Tunnel Alternative is double tracking along the Coast and has some serious public safety, as well as geological concerns due to its proximity to the fragile Coastal Bluffs in Capistrano Beach.

Thank you for your time and attention to ensure that the transportation needs of California are balanced with the environmental concerns of its residents as well as the safeguard of its precious resources.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ernest C. Obrians
City Manager

[Address]

The Honorable Mayor and Dana Point City Council
Response to Comments of Douglas C. Chotkevys, City Manager, City of Dana Point, Office of City Manager, May 5, 2004 (Letter AL008)

AL008-1

Acknowledged. The LOSSAN Conventional Rail Improvements have been removed from further consideration in the Final Program EIR/EIS. Conventional rail improvements are within the purview of Caltrans and the proposed conventional improvements to LOSSAN are the subject of the Caltrans and FRA LOSSAN Rail Improvements Program EIR/EIS (Draft PEIR/EIS SCH # 2002031067). These comments have been forwarded to Caltrans for consideration. Please see standard response 6.41.1.
Comment Letter AL009

FRANK H. OGAWA PLAZA
Office of the Mayor
Jerry Brown
Mayor

1 FRED ELOX, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612

April 20, 2004

Chairman
California High Speed Rail Authority

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement
Importance of Studying the Alameda Alignment

Dear Mr. Pattillo:

The proposed high-speed rail system under study by your Authority would represent the largest public works project in California’s history. A full and informed analysis of alignment options is essential for the success of this investment.

Alternative Pass was identified by the High Speed Rail Commission in 1996 as the preferred option for connecting the Bay Area to the Central Valley and points south. This alignment was dropped from consideration in 2000 in favor of a Passaro Pass alignment. Before the environmental review process was begun. Now that the EIR/EIS on the project is set for public comment, and many of the background documents on which that decision were based are now available, it is clear that the decision to drop the Alternative alignment was premature.

From the perspective of Oakland specifically, and the East Bay generally, a Phase One high-speed rail project over Passaro Pass or Mount Hamilton (the Diablo Direct alignment) would provide little or no benefit to Oakland. Oakland residents would first have to travel west to San Francisco in order to go south to L.A. There would be no service between Oakland and the large and growing cities in the Central Valley south of Madera. High-speed rail would also not provide time-competitive service between Oakland and any Central Valley cities. If so planned, future phases of the rail project included extensions to Sacramento and Oakland, the travel time between these two cities via a Passaro Pass or Diablo Direct alignment would be longer than today’s conventional rail Capitol Corridor service.

A prime argument made by the Authority against the Alternative Pass alignment is that it would require an awkward splitting of service between San Jose, San Francisco and Oakland. However, Oakland does not get direct service in Phase One. In fact, considering the other extensions of the rail system which are not included in Phase One—San Diego, Sacramento and numerous other services—it seems highly unlikely that an Oakland extension will happen any time in our lives. The argument about a three-way split is specious.

By contrast, an Alternative alignment for high-speed rail would provide real service for Oakland and East Bay residents starting the very first day of Phase One operations. This service would be improved further if a small amount of funding were used to upgrade the BART system with passing tracks so that express service between Oakland, Fremont and Pleasanton could be maintained.

I urge you to do a full analysis of the Alternative Pass alignment, and consider how to optimize the real benefits to Oakland of a Phase One system. This will increase public support and the likelihood that Phase One will be funded and built. Later generations can then judge whether other extensions are worthwhile.

Sincerely,

Mayor Jerry Brown
Response to Comments of Jerry Brown, Mayor City of Oakland, Mayor’s Office, May 7, 2004 (Letter AL009)

AL009-1

Please see standard response 2.18.1 in regards to the investigation of the Altamont Pass. Please see standard response 10.1.7 in regards to the phasing of the HST system. Please also see standard response 6.2.3.
Comment Letter AL010

Tulare County Association of Governments

May 6, 2004

California High-Speed Train Draft Program EIR/EIS
925 I Street, Suite 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Draft Program EIR/EIS

To whom it may concern,

Thank you for allowing the Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG) the opportunity to review and comment on the above referenced environmental document.

In general, it is suggested that the first phase of development for the High Speed Train connect or link up with existing rail services in the Bay Area, San Jose, Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Diego. This will significantly reduce the initial cost of the project and promote ridership for those existing urban rail services. Future phases could include independent right of ways into those urban areas.

Regional Alignment and Station Options

San Francisco to San Jose (Map 1)

The High Speed Rail (HSR) should make every effort to link up with existing rail lines (i.e. Caltrain, B.A.R.T.), take passengers into San Francisco, SFO, etc. and defer funding to create a separate, independent line. This would save millions in taxpayer dollars which may be necessary due to escalating costs if the bond election is delayed beyond November 2004.

Oakland to San Jose

The High Speed Rail (HSR) should make every effort to link up with existing rail lines (i.e. Amtrak, Caltrain, B.A.R.T.), to take passengers into Oakland, Oakland airport, etc. and defer funding to create a separate, independent line. Use both BART and the San Jose light rail system. The HSR will connect areas beyond the rail lines to each other.

May 6, 2004
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San Jose to Merced

The HSR Authority should reconsider the Altamont Pass route instead of the Pacheco Pass Route, linking up with BART’s Pleasanton station. This alternative would connect Modesto to the Bay Area, thus saving a higher population and customer base. A connection from San Jose to Pleasanton via the I-80 route would link up both San Jose and the Bay Area to Modesto.

Another alternative to consider is the extension of SR 130 (at Mt. Hamilton) to Patterson and eventually to the City of Modesto.

Sacramento to Stockton

Connect the HSR with the Sacramento light-rail system. This action would save millions in taxpayer dollars and provide supplemental ridership to the Sacramento light rail system.

Merced to Fresno

Utilize the Union Pacific line.

Fresno to Bakersfield

Utilize the Union Pacific line, which serves a higher population base, especially in Tulare County, the cities of Tulare and Visalia.

Bakersfield to Bakersfield (Map 8)

On the Antelope Valley route, in a future phase, consider a connection from Palmdale to San Bernardino via the Cajon Pass. This would allow for an entirely independent eastern route for those riders from San Diego or Sacramento desiring to avoid the Los Angeles basin.

Salinas to Los Angeles

As a first phase, the HSR should link up with existing rail systems (i.e. Metro Link).

Los Angeles to LAX (Map 16)

Great route would serve a high population.

Los Angeles to Anaheim/Irvine (Map 10)

Recommend Option 2 or 3

Irvine to Oceanside (Map 11)

Recommend Option 1 bypassing San Juan Capistrano

Oceanside to San Diego

As a first phase, the HSR should link up with the San Diego rail system.
Comment Letter AL010 Continued
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Environmental

Noise
Consider Tulare bypass because of noise impacts on the Union-Pacific line.

Agricultural Lands
New alignments through Hanford will be impacting agricultural lands. Should use already established lines on the Union-Pacific, which in turn would serve higher population centers.

Traffic and Circulation
In the discussion of traffic, the document states “Encourage use of transit to stations”. We support this policy and further recommend the Authority “Encourage the use of existing light-rail, medium rail and heavy rail systems situated in San Francisco, San Jose, Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Diego”.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the EIR/EIS. Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Scott Cochran of my staff at (559) 733-6653 ext. 4893.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
George Finney, Executive Secretary, TCAG

GFSC.Ae
Response to Comments of George Finney, Executive Secretary, Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG), May 10, 2004 (Letter AL010)

AL010-1
Acknowledged. Should the HST project move forward, phasing of the system would be determined as a part of future studies. Please also see standard response 10.1.7.

The Authority has identified the Caltrain alignment as the preferred alignment with potential multi-modal HST stations at the Transbay Terminal, SFO (Milbrae), Redwood City or Palo Alto, and San Jose.

The Authority has identified the Hayward Line to I-880 alignment as the preferred alignment with potential multi-modal HST stations at West Oakland, Oakland Coliseum, Union City, and San Jose. Please also see standard response 6.2.2.

The proposed HST system would be designed to connect with other existing rail and transit services.

AL010-2
Please see standard response 2.18.1.

AL010-3
Acknowledged. The Authority has identified the multi-modal Downtown Sacramento station as the preferred station to serve the Sacramento area. The Sacramento light-rail system is being extended to serve the Downtown Sacramento station site. The proposed HST system would be designed to connect with other existing rail and transit services.

AL010-4

See Chapter 6A of the Final Program EIR/EIS document identifying preferred alignments and giving the reasons they have been so identified.

AL010-5
Please see standard response 2.36.3.

AL010-6
Phasing of the HST project would be determined in future, more detailed studies. Please also see standard response 10.1.7. The purpose of the proposed HST system includes providing linkage and integration with public transit systems, including existing rail systems. See response to Comment AL010-1.

AL010-7
Please see standard response 6.39.1.

AL010-8
Acknowledged. The Authority has identified the LOSSAN Corridor HST option to Irvine (Option 3) as the preferred alignment between Los Angeles and Orange County (see Chapter 6A).

AL010-9
Please see standard response 6.41.1.

The phasing of the HST system is beyond the scope of this program-level document. Should the HST project move forward, phasing of the system would be determined as a part of future studies. Please also see standard response 10.1.7. The proposed HST system would be designed to connect with other existing rail and transit services.
AL010-10
Please see standard response 6.15.4. The proposed HST system would be designed to connect with other existing rail and transit services.

AL010-11
Please see standard response 6.15.4.

AL010-12
Acknowledged.
RESOLUTION NO. 23-04

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
TOWN OF LOS ALTOS HILLS
SUPPORTING THE CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY'S
USE OF ONE OF TWO ALIGNMENTS INTO
THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA FOR THE
STATE'S HIGH-SPEED RAIL SYSTEM

WHEREAS, a high-speed rail line connecting northern and southern California would relieve highway and air traffic congestion between the Bay Area and Los Angeles, which is one of the busiest air traffic corridors in the nation.

WHEREAS, the California High-Speed Rail Authority, the organization responsible for planning, designing, constructing, and operating the state's high-speed rail system, plans to run the first leg between Los Angeles and San Francisco through San Jose. Ultimately, the line would be extended to Oakland, Sacramento and San Diego.

WHEREAS, the California High-Speed Rail Authority is recommending two alignment options—through the Palos Verdes or a series of tunnels through the Diablo Range—to bring high-speed rail into the San Francisco Bay Area through San Jose. The line would then split, with one set of tracks paralleling the Caltrain Commuter Rail Corridor up the Peninsula to San Francisco and the other set running up the East Bay to Oakland.

WHEREAS, the California High-Speed Rail Authority concluded that entering the Bay Area from the south would offer faster travel times; more frequent service to San Jose, San Francisco and Oakland; higher ridership; and more revenue.

WHEREAS, the California High-Speed Rail Authority considered and rejected one other Bay Area alignment, the so-called Almaden Pass alignment. Following this route, the high-speed rail trains would enter the Bay Area over the Almaden Pass to Union City. From Union City, the trains would then split into three lines—one south to San Jose, another north to Oakland and a third to San Francisco over a new bridge across the bay.

WHEREAS, the California High-Speed Rail Authority concluded that the Almaden Pass alignment would be problematic from an operational and environmental standpoint. According to the authority, splitting the service into three, rather than two, lines would reduce train frequencies and ridership, while substantially increasing operating costs. In addition, the authority noted that the costs of building a new rail bridge across San Francisco Bay and the environmental hurdles that would need to be overcome to do so make the Almaden Pass alignment impractical.

May 10, 2004

High Speed Rail Authority Board
Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments
925 L. Street, Suite 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Chairperson Petullo and Members of the Board:

At their regular Meeting of May 6, 2004 the City Council of the Town of Los Altos Hills approved Resolution 23-04 supporting the California High Speed Rail Authority's use of one of two alignments into the San Francisco Bay area for the State's High-Speed Rail System. A copy of the resolution is enclosed for your records.

Sincerely,

Karen Jost
City Clerk

cc: Maureen Cassingham, City Manager
Gillian Moore, Santa Clara Cities Association
WHEREAS, the California High-Speed Rail Authority released its program-level environmental document in late January 2004 and is now in the process of holding a series of public hearings on it throughout the state. In addition, the authority will be accepting written public comments on this environmental document until mid-August 2004.

WHEREAS, a southern alignment into the Bay Area for the proposed high-speed rail system will maximize ridership, minimize operating costs and ensure that Silicon Valley is well-served by the new high-speed rail line.

WHEREAS, a southern alignment into the Bay Area, by utilizing the entire Caltrain Commuter Rail Service Corridor, will help Caltrain achieve several of its long-term goals, such as electrification, grade-separating the corridor, and increasing the speed and frequency of the service. These benefits could not be achieved for the entire CalTrain Corridor by using the Altamont Pass alignment for the state’s high-speed rail system.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the Town of Los Altos Hills supports the California High-Speed Rail Authority’s conclusion to use one of the two southern alignments (Pacheco Pass or Diablo Range) into the San Francisco Bay Area for the state’s proposed high-speed rail system.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Town of Los Altos Hills will communicate this position to the California High-Speed Rail Authority in writing as part of the public record for the authority’s program-level environmental document.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 6th day of May, 2004.

By

[Signature]

Attest: [Signature]

City Clerk
Response to Comments of Karen Jost, City Clerk, City of Los Altos Hills, May 11, 2004 (Letter AL011)

AL011-1
Please see standard response 6.3.1.
Comment Letter AL012

AL012

May 11, 2004
Mr. Dan Leavitt
Deputy Director
California High-Speed Rail Authority
925 I Street, Suite 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBJECT: Comments on the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report/ Statement for a Proposed High-Speed Train System

Dear Mr. Leavitt,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report/Statement (Program EIR/EIS) for a proposed High-Speed Train (HST) extending from Sacramento and the San Francisco Bay Area in the north, through the Central Valley, to Los Angeles and San Diego in the south. The Draft Program EIR/EIS addresses the potential environmental impacts of the proposed high-speed train system at a conceptual and planning level and will be used in the selection of preferred corridors. It analyzes a proposed HST alternative and compares it with a No Project alternative and Modal alternative that include potential improvements to the highways and airport serving the same intercity travel demand as the HST alternative.

The ACCMA respectfully submits the following comments:

- The proposed High Speed Train Project is not consistent with the Alameda County’s 2003 Congestion Management Capital Improvement Program. The long-range Countywide Transportation Plan is being updated to 2004 and the proposed rail project is not included in the current update. It is expected that all costs for the proposed service would be the responsibility of the High Speed Rail Authority.

- We are pleased to see that the alignments and options being considered in the Program EIR/EIS include an East Bay alignment from San Jose to Oakland with stations proposed at San Jose, Fremont (Auto Mall), Pleasanton, Union City, Coliseum BART Station (Hayward/Milpitas), 12th Street/City Center and West Oakland. Since the connection to Bay Area is described in the report as ‘Peninsula Alignment and/or East Bay Alignment’, it also implies that the East Bay Alignment may potentially be considered as an alternative to the Peninsula Alignment. We wish to reiterate the importance of providing an exclusive East Bay alignment for the growing East Bay population and for providing convenient and accessible intermodal connections as described by the ACCMA Board in the attached October 22, 1998 letter to previous

Chair Michael Tennentbaum, and request that this alignment be considered as a stand alone option and not as an alternative to the Peninsula Alignment.

- Section 2.6.9, Alternative Alignment and Station Options Considered in Screening Evaluation, Hayward Line to I-880, Page 2-12: For the East Bay Alignment, one of the options being considered is using the UPRR’s Hayward Line and then transition to I-880 Aerial Configuration on the I-880 median from Fremont. Should this option be considered further, it should be evaluated for seismic impact & noise. Since many of the aerial structures and tunnels in the Bay Area are under going or planned for seismic and/or noise/traffic noise at this point, constructing another aerial structure along a highly congested freeway like I-880 would entail making the structure more seismic proof and could result in very high costs.

- For future Project EIR/ EIS: Impacts to the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) highway and transit networks, which includes the entire Congestion Management Program (CMP) designated roadway system, should be addressed for 2010 and 2025 conditions.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on this program EIR/EIS. Please do not hesitate to contact me or Sarawara Suhthanith at 510/836-2560 if you require additional information.

Regards,

Jean Hart
Deputy Director

cc: Sarawara Suhthanith, Associate Transportation Planner
file: CMP/Environmental Review Options - Responses – 2004
ALAMEDA COUNTY CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AGENCY

October 22, 1998

Michael Tennenbaum, Chair
California High Speed Rail Authority
925 L Street, Suite 1425
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Chair Tennenbaum:

We are writing to the Authority to reiterate our position on the alignment of a high speed rail line in the Bay Area.

We request that the Authority consider options to the Bay Area route proposed by your predecessor organization. We believe an alignment through the East Bay, including Oakland, offers many advantages as outlined below:

1. The East Bay, with a current population of over 2 million, is projected to grow much more rapidly than the San Francisco peninsula in the coming decade. The population of Alameda County alone is currently almost that of the entire peninsula. A station in the central East Bay will create a larger market for high speed rail, without sacrificing easy access to San Francisco as explained below.

2. A connection with BART in the East Bay will put travelers only minutes away from downtown San Francisco, with the advantage of BART as a distribution system to multiple points in San Francisco. As noted by your Authority, we must take advantage of the existing urban passenger rail network to reduce the cost of a high speed rail proposal.

3. Oakland and other East Bay cities to the south can provide intermodal connections with the Capital Corridor service, with Amtrak services to the Pacific Northwest and the East, with Oakland International Airport and with BART.

4. We believe the Authority will forgo a significant market opportunity – the East Bay to Sacramento market – should it choose to terminate in San Francisco. The proposed approach which requires going through Stockton to reach Sacramento is simply not competitive with the automobile for most East Bay residents. Furthermore, we believe an alignment that provides a station in San Jose will open up additional Bay Area to Sacramento opportunities, if the existing Capital Corridor route is used. More analysis of the market segments is necessary before a final decision on a Bay Area alignment is made. We question the wisdom of terminating high speed rail on a peninsula with little opportunity to go on to Sacramento.

Very Truly Yours,

[Signature]

cc: CMA Board members
Mehdi Mostadbizadeh, Executive Director, California High Speed Rail Authority
Lawrence D. Dahms, MTC
Lynn Stuer

Projects/California Intercity High Speed Rail
Response to Comments of Jean Hart, Deputy Director, Alameda County Congestion Management Agency, May 13, 2004 (Letter AL012)

AL012-1
Please see standard response 1.1.112 and 6.2.3. The Authority encourages Alameda County to include the pertinent proposed HST alignment and station options, according to the preferred alignment options identified in the Final Program EIR/EIS, in the next update of the County Transportation Plan to support future corridor preservation activities, should a decision be made to proceed with the proposed HST system. A financing plan is beyond the scope of this program EIR/EIS process.

AL012-2
Acknowledged. Please also see standard response 6.2.3.

AL012-3
Please see standard response 2.16.1 and 2.16.3.

AL012-4
Acknowledged. The Authority has identified the Hayward Line to I-880 alignment as the preferred alignment for HST service between San Jose and Oakland. This Program EIR/EIS includes a planning level evaluation of seismic and noise impacts. If the HST project is advanced, more detailed seismic and noise analysis would be required on the Hayward Line to I-880 alignment as part of future project-specific environmental reviews.

AL012-5
Acknowledged.
Comment Letter AL013

May 12, 2004

High Speed Rail Authority Board
Draft Program EIR/EIS Comments
925 L Street, Suite 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Chairperson Petrillo and Members of the Board:

The Moffett Park Business and Transportation Association (MPBTA) would like to express our support for the conclusion reached by the High Speed Rail Authority in its draft EIR/EIS to use one of two southern alignments (Pacheco or Diablo Range) into the Bay Area and to eliminate the Altamont Pass from further consideration.

The MPBTA is a nonprofit organization that represents our member companies on transportation and other business issues. Our members comprise approximately 14,000 employees in Sunnyvale, California.

The MPBTA supports the concept of a high-speed rail (HSR) line connecting southern and northern California. High-speed rail would relieve highway and air traffic between the Bay Area and Los Angeles, one of the busiest air traffic corridors in the nation. It would increase the capacity of our airports, many of which are at or near their limits. And it would be two to three times less expensive—as well as less polluting and more energy efficient—than expanding highways and airports to accommodate the same number of people.

We support the Authority’s decision after careful study and deliberation to reject the Altamont Pass alignment from further consideration. The Altamont Pass faces three insurmountable obstacles. It would require the construction of a new bridge across the Bay, necessitate a three-way split to serve Oakland, San Francisco and San Jose, and result in operational costs twice that of the other options under consideration.

For demographic and economic reasons, Silicon Valley must serve as the axis for the high-speed rail system in Northern California. Consequently, we strongly support the High Speed Rail Authority’s decision to pursue a southern alignment—Pacheco or Diablo Range—into the Bay Area and eliminate the Altamont Pass from further consideration. Studying the Altamont Pass further will not increase its operational or environmental viability.

Thank you for your leadership on this important project.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Paedem
Executive Director

1144 Thomas Street, Sunnyvale, CA 94086
Phone: 408-736-7313 / Fax: 408-727-6157
Response to Comments of Jennifer Paedon, Executive Director, Moffett Park Business & Transportation Association, May 14, 2004 (Letter AL013)

AL013-1

Please see standard response 6.3.1.