

March 3, 2016

California High-Speed Rail Authority
770 L Street, Suite 620
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Comments To The 2016 High-Speed Rail Draft Business Plan

The 2016 Draft Business Plan does not contain one word concerning the need for security to prevent a terrorist attack on the High-Speed Rail system. How could this have been overlooked with the threat and execution of bombings, murder and mass destruction a 24/7 worldwide reality? Security is not something that High-Speed Rail can ignore if it expects passengers to actually ride its trains. It must be part of the business plan.

Why was a security plan left out of the business plan? Possible reasons are:

1. It would be impossible to execute a security plan, given the conditions necessary to adequately protect rail travel passengers.
2. The cost would be prohibitive.
3. It would reduce ridership because of increased wait times at train stations.

Imagine the terrorists' eyes lighting up when they see a beautiful shiny blue and gold bullet train flying down the track at over 200 miles per hour. It is a dream target for them. What a spectacular way to kill hundreds of the Infidel and obtain worldwide attention for their Jjhadist goals.

The methods for attacking a train are endless. Start at the stations. Preventing a terrorist attack should include the same system as the one we have in place for our airports. The dream expressed by some members of the Authority is how wonderful it would be to just park your car and walk over and board the train, instead of enduring the hassle one has to go through in airports and other public venues that now require extensive security checks. That dream puts rail passengers in a highly vulnerable position, given all the small stations on a rail line with passengers boarding and leaving with suitcases in hand...or leaving their suitcase bomb behind.

The Authority needs to explain how they are going to protect 800-miles of open track. Imaginations can run wild with various methods terrorists can potentially use to derail or blow up a train. Any type of fencing is useless because of drones and ultra-lite aircraft. All road crossings are open. Keep in mind that people have been blowing up trains since the first ones made it out onto the tracks. It was perfected in World War II.

Since there isn't a security plan there isn't any way to make a cost analysis of it. But one thing for sure you would be adding \$ billions more to an already over budget

bottomless pit. The present low cost is at \$99 billion for the entire 800-mile statewide system and the Authority continues to hide the high range cost estimate.

The first terrorist created high-speed train wreck would potentially end the demand for high-speed rail travel in the United States, for the simple reason that fear would drive people to make the choice to fly or drive instead. Of course planes are vulnerable, but so far they have a great safety record. It's hard for the bad guys to attack a plane once it is in the air, whereas a train is exposed the entire trip. And, it is impossible to convince Californians to give up their favorite mode of travel-their cars.

Fear is a great motivating factor. And people who fear a terrorist attack are not going to buy tickets on the California High-Speed Rail.

The High-Speed Rail Authority must address these serious security issues.

I look forward to their response in the Final 2016 Business Plan.

Ted Hart
6847 Terreno Dr
Rancho Murieta, CA 95683

From
Jed Hart
@ Board mtg
9/8/16
Bry

California High-Speed Rail Authority
Comments To The 2016 High-Speed Draft Business Plan



Robert Allen <robertseeallen@gmail.com>

For CHSRA, March 8, 2016; Draft Business Plan

1 message

Robert Allen <robertseeallen@gmail.com>

Mon, Mar 7, 2016 at 11:23 PM

To: California High-Speed Rail Authority <info@hsr.ca.gov>, Robert Allen <robertseeallen@gmail.com>

Your 2016 Business Plan is far better than those of previous years. It totally misses, however, the important role of another state agency, the California Public Utilities Commission.

CPUC has safety oversight responsibility over railroad operations. Yet I find no mention of CPUC's role in safety. Until a note at the bottom Page 93 not related to safety, CPUC is not even mentioned. You ignore CPUC at your peril. They are fierce, even overbearing at times, in pursuing safety issues. Let me cite an example with a publicly-owned railroad like yours.

In January, 1979, a third rail power pickup paddle on a BART train broke, sending a high voltage power surge that set a train on fire in the trans-Bay tube. I have retired from engineering and operations on three Class 1 railroads now part of Union Pacific. Any of those railroads after such a freak incident would have repaired the damage and continued operations.

CPUC here, though, ordered BART to keep their vital trans-Bay tube closed, causing chaos in the Bay Area commute for well over three months. Nobody would deny that the changes were needed, but the regional havoc was a stiff price to pay.

You plan "Blended Rail", operating on Caltrain tracks that now have a maximum speed of 79 mph. You and Caltrain talk of raising that speed to 110 mph or more and running your trains at close to the maximum speed.

Bourbonnais is a good example of a train at 79 mph hitting a truck loaded with steel. Two Amtrak locomotives and 11 of 13 cars derailed, with many deaths and injuries. Had that train been going faster, the toll would have been much higher. Or the truck could have been a gasoline or chlorine tanker or loaded with explosives.

Trains are vulnerable to accidents, suicides, sabotage, and even terrorism at grade crossings. Demand grade separation of roads crossing tracks where you operate. CPUC will likely demand it.

One thought re CPUC: operate your trains only south of San Jose. Let Caltrain either pilot or run your equipment north of San Jose as Caltrain.