



# THE ALTAMONT

## CORRIDOR RAIL PROJECT

### Draft Scoping Report

For the

Altamont Corridor Rail  
Project EIS/EIR

**March 2010**

*Prepared for:*

California High-Speed Rail Authority  
and  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Railroad Administration

*Prepared by:*

ICF International, Inc.  
268 Grand Avenue  
Oakland, CA 94610

A subconsultant to AECOM



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**SUMMARY.....1**

**KEY THEMES ..... 2**

**1.0 INTRODUCTION..... 3**

    1.1 Description of Project.....3

    1.2 Altamont Corridor Rail Section Alternatives .....4

    1.3 Process of Scoping.....5

    1.4 Notification of EIS/EIR Scoping .....5

    1.5 Scoping Activities.....7

    1.6 Additional scoping activities .....8

**2.0 PUBLIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT DURING SCOPING PERIOD ..... 10**

    2.1 Summary of Scoping activities ..... 10

    2.2 Summary of Noticed Scoping Meetings..... 10

**3.0 PUBLIC SCOPING COMMENTS..... 11**

    3.1 Summary of Comments ..... 11

    3.2 Summary of Alternatives Mentioned in Scoping..... 12

**4.0 NEXT STEPS IN THE EIS/EIR PROCESS..... 51**

**5.0 PREPARERS..... 52**

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: Scoping Meeting Locations and Times .....7

Table 2: Scoping Meeting Attendees Summary.....8

Table 3: Summary of Comments ..... 11

Table 4a: Scoping Comments on the Altamont Corridor Rail Project EIS/EIR  
(Organized by Commenter) ..... 15

Table 4b: Scoping Comments on the Altamont Corridor Rail Project  
EIS/EIR(Organized by Topic) ..... 33

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1: Study Area .....4

**APPENDICES**

- Appendix A Notice of Preparation (CEQA)
- Appendix B Notice of Intent (NEPA)
- Appendix C Scoping Meeting Announcements
- Appendix D Scoping Meeting Distribution List
- Appendix E Newspaper Notices/Articles
- Appendix F Scoping Meeting Attendance Lists
- Appendix G Scoping Meeting Handout Materials
- Appendix H Scoping Comments
- Appendix I Scoping Meeting Photographs
- Appendix J Scoping Meeting Display Boards

## SUMMARY

This report summarizes and presents the input received during the formal NEPA/CEQA scoping period for the Altamont corridor Rail Project Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR).

The Altamont Corridor was studied by the California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) and the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and was identified as a candidate route to the Bay Area in the Statewide High Speed Train (HST) System Program EIS/EIR. The Authority and FRA further examined the corridor in the 2008 Bay Area to Central Valley HST EIS/EIR and selected the Pacheco Pass via Gilroy as the route to connect the main line of the HST network in the Central Valley with the Peninsula and San Francisco. However, in the Bay Area to Central Valley HST EIS/EIR, the Authority also indicated that they would pursue a regional joint-use rail project in the Altamont Corridor as an *independent project* to meet a purpose and need separate from the proposed HST System, which might provide both HST compatible infrastructure and connection(s) to the statewide HST System. This project is the Altamont Corridor Rail Project (ACRP or proposed project).

The Authority worked with a regional partnership to plan a joint-use rail line through the Altamont Pass that would support new regional intercity and commuter rail services operating in Northern California between Stockton and San Jose and capable of accommodating HST-compatible equipment. The Authority and the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission (SJRRRC) propose to develop a new regional rail line from Stockton to San Jose through the Altamont Pass as well as eastern and southern Alameda County to provide both commuter and intercity passenger rail service that would improve connectivity and accessibility between the Northern San Joaquin Valley and the Bay Area. The rail line would be designed and equipped to accommodate electrified light-weight passenger trains and would be usable by HST-compatible equipment.

The development of the Altamont Corridor Rail Project as a complement to the Statewide HST System is consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Bay Area Regional Rail Plan, which identified Altamont Corridor as a key future northern California regional rail route and also noted that development of this corridor in conjunction with implementation of the statewide HST System could provide greater benefits to the State and region.

The Authority and SJRRRC encourages broad participation during EIS/EIR scoping and review of the draft environmental documents. The public scoping effort is intended to collect information on potential impacts, mitigation measures, and project alternatives to help define the scope of evaluation of the project. Comments and suggestions were invited from all interested agencies and the public to ensure the full range of issues related to the proposed action are addressed, including all reasonable alternatives. In particular, the Authority and SJRRRC solicited input in determining where there are areas of environmental sensitivity and where there could be a potential for significant impacts from the Altamont Corridor Rail Project.

Pre-scoping public outreach activities were initiated in October 2009, including the development of project information materials, establishment of a project information phone line, early engagement with interested parties, and media communications. On October 23, 2009, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) announcing the preparation of the EIR was distributed to the State Clearinghouse (Appendix A), elected officials (federal, regional, local), and federal, state and local agencies, including the planning and community development directors in each county, and the interested public. A Notice of Intent (NOI) announcing the preparation of the EIS was published in the *Federal Register* on October 29, 2009 (Appendix B).

In response to the NOP and NOI, public agencies with jurisdiction over aspects of the proposed project or resources that could be affected by the project were requested to advise the SJRRRC, Authority, and the FRA of the applicable permit(s) of each agency, and the scope and content of

the environmental information that is germane to the agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Four public scoping meetings were held (in San Jose, Fremont, Livermore, and Stockton) as an important component of the scoping process for both the State and federal environmental review.

In addition to the NOP and NOI and public meetings, a press release was sent to regional and local media outlets, and 12 scoping meeting announcements were placed in local and regional newspapers through paid advertisements in October and November 2009. In addition to the newspaper advertisements, over 2,400 project newsletters and 3,500 "e-blast" scoping meeting notices were e-mailed to project stakeholders. An informational phone line was also made available for people to provide more information on the proposed project. Along with newspaper advertisements in Spanish-speaking papers, a phone number was provided to access a Spanish-speaking outreach specialist for questions or comments. This outreach specialist was also available at the scoping meetings. Project information was also made available on the Authority's Internet Website at [www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov](http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov).

## KEY THEMES

Following are key themes and topics raised during the scoping process.

### **Alternatives (Alignment, Station, and Facilities)**

Major Issues Raised: Alignment options and alternatives for routes, stations, and facilities. Comments included suggestions related to potential tunnel/aerial structures and alternative design. The specific alternatives suggested in comment are summarized further below.

### **Cost/Funding**

Major Issues Raised: Project costs (capital and operating costs) and discussion of funding sources.

### **Environmental Impacts**

Major Issues Raised: Environmental impacts and effects including but not limited to: aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, environmental justice, geology and soils, hazards, hydrology/water quality, land use (property acquisition), noise and vibration, recreation/parks, and traffic and circulation, safety, section 4f/6f resources, construction, growth, and cumulative impacts.

### **Planning Process**

Major Issues Raised: Discussion of project objectives, purpose and need, and planning process (project outreach, environmental document review, and information availability), phasing, and schedule.

### **Project Coordination/Permitting**

Major Issues Raised: Federal, State, Regional, and local coordination and involvement related to environmental analysis, other transit and planning projects, and agency jurisdiction and permitting.

### **Support/Opposition**

Major Issues Raised: Support and opposition to project, and/or preferences of particular alternatives (alignments, stations, and facilities).

### **Other**

Major Issues Raised: Other miscellaneous comments received.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report provides an overview of the written comments received during the scoping process for the Environmental Impact Statement / Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) for the Altamont Corridor Rail Project (ACRP or proposed project). Verbal comments were not recorded during the scoping meetings. The purpose of this report is to summarize comments, issues, and concerns raised during the scoping process. The report will be used to help the California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority), the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), and the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission (SJRRRC) to determine the appropriate scope for the EIS/EIR.

Appendices can be found at the end of this document that contain the following information:

- Appendix A: Notice of Preparation under CEQA that describes the project and starts the environmental review process under state procedures
- Appendix B: Notice of Intent under NEPA that describes the project and starts the environmental review process under federal procedures
- Appendix C: Copies of scoping meeting announcements that introduces the public to the project and provide details on the scoping meetings
- Appendix D: Scoping meeting distribution list that provides information on contacts invited to all scoping meetings
- Appendix E: Newspaper notices and advertisements used to alert the public to the availability of scoping meetings
- Appendix F: Scoping meeting attendance lists that show who signed in and attended scoping meetings
- Appendix G: Scoping meeting handout materials that include informational materials provided to scoping meeting attendees
- Appendix H: Scoping meeting comments
- Appendix I: Photographs taken at the scoping meetings
- Appendix J: Scoping meeting display boards are digital copies of the exhibit boards presented at the scoping meetings for public review and discussion with the project team.

### 1.1 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The Authority and SJRRRC are proposing to develop a dedicated regional rail corridor through Altamont Pass and the Tri Valley area capable of supporting intercity and commuter rail passenger services. The project would improve the existing Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) service managed by SJRRRC by accommodating more trains per day, reducing travel times, and eliminating freight railroad delays by providing separate passenger tracks. The Altamont Corridor will serve as a feeder to the Statewide High Speed Train (HST) System being planned and developed by the Authority. The project will consider connections between the Altamont corridor and the HST mainline between Stockton and Modesto and HST-compatible infrastructure that would allow trains to run from one rail line to the other in order to accommodate intercity travel between stations along the Altamont Corridor and regional stops on the greater Statewide HST system. The preparation of the Altamont Corridor Rail Project EIS/EIR (project EIS/EIR) will involve development of preliminary engineering designs and assessments of environmental effects associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project including track, ancillary facilities, and stations along the Altamont Corridor. Figure 1 shows the identified study area for the project.



connection to the Dumbarton rail service in the Fremont/Union City vicinity as well as an intermodal connection to the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) light rail network in Santa Clara County. Additionally, the project will accommodate feeder and connecting bus services providing access to proximate market areas and interfacing with regional bus links where appropriate.

### 1.3 PROCESS OF SCOPING

“Scoping” is one of the first steps in the environmental review process that assists with determining the focus and content of an EIS/EIR. Scoping is also intended to inform and educate the public and public agencies about the project, the potential range of actions, alternatives, environmental effects, the overall schedule for the environmental review process, mitigation measures to be analyzed in the EIS/EIR, and is a means of providing input to the Authority, SJRRC, and the FRA.

Scoping also provides opportunities for the public, affected agencies, and other interested parties to express their concerns about the project. Scoping is not conducted to resolve differences concerning the merits of a project or to anticipate the ultimate decision on a proposal. The intent of the scoping process is to involve the agencies and the public in defining the major issues to be analyzed in the EIS/EIR.

The objectives of the Altamont Corridor Rail Project EIS/EIR scoping process were to:

- Inform the agencies and interested members of the public about the proposed Altamont Corridor Rail Project, including NEPA and CEQA requirements.
- Identify concerns and issues regarding environmental topics.
- Identify concerns and issues regarding alignments and station locations in the Altamont corridor to be analyzed in the Project EIS/EIR.
- Identify mitigation measures or approaches to avoid and minimize impacts; these measures and approaches may be useful and explored further in the Project EIS/EIR.
- Develop a mailing list of agencies and individuals interested in future opportunities to review the EIS/EIR.

The scoping process and the input gathered during the scoping period are documented in this report.

It is important to note that although scoping is a distinct stage in the project EIS/EIR process, public involvement activities extend throughout the entire project EIS/EIR process. These activities allow for interaction and identification of public and agency issues and concerns with the project EIS/EIR throughout the study process.

During the scoping process, agencies and interested members of the public raised questions and concerns related to the Altamont Corridor Rail Project section. Comments received during the scoping process will assist the Authority, SJRRC, and FRA in their review and evaluation of alternatives.

### 1.4 NOTIFICATION OF EIS/EIR SCOPING

A California State NOP was distributed to the State Clearinghouse; elected officials, local, regional, and state agencies, and the interested public on October 23, 2009 (Appendix A). A NOI was published in the *Federal Register* on October 29, 2009 (Appendix B). The NOP and NOI stated the purpose of the project, the project limits, a description of alternatives to be considered, the need for agency input, potential environmental impacts of the project, points of contact for additional information regarding the project, and the dates and locations of the scoping meetings. The scoping comment period ran from October 23, 2009 through December 4, 2009.

In addition to the NOP and NOI, a press release was sent to regional and local media outlets, and 12 scoping meeting announcements were placed in local and regional newspapers through paid advertisements in October and November 2009.

These newspapers included:

<b>Newspaper</b>	<b>Publication Date</b>
Bilingual Weekly (Stockton area – Spanish language)	Nov. 1, 2009
Central Valley Business Journal	Oct. 30, 2009
The Fremont Argus	Nov. 2, 2009
The Hayward Daily	Nov. 2, 2009
The Independent (Livermore area)	Oct. 29, 2009
La Oferta (San Jose area – Spanish language)	Nov. 6, 2009
Manteca Bulletin	Oct. 30, 2009
The Modesto Bee	Nov. 2, 2009
The Record (Stockton area)	Nov. 2, 2009
San Jose Mercury News	Nov. 2, 2009
Tri-Valley Herald (Livermore area)	Nov. 2, 2009
Tracy Press	Oct. 31, 2009

In addition to the newspaper advertisements, over 2,400 project newsletters were mailed the last week of October 2009 and 3,500 “e-blast” scoping meeting notices were e-mailed on November 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2009, to project stakeholders. The stakeholder mailing list included almost 6,000 stakeholders and was compiled with input from the Authority, ACE, San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG), the City of Livermore, and other members of the Altamont Corridor Partnership Working Group (Working Group).

A poster was provided to the Working Group for placement on community bulletin boards and public offices, as were extra copies of the newsletter, which were handed out at community meetings and placed in lobbies. Members of the Working Group were also encouraged to forward the e-blast to their local contacts.

An informational phone line was also made available for people to provide more information on the proposed project. Along with newspaper advertisements in Spanish-speaking papers, a phone number was provided to access a Spanish-speaking outreach specialist for questions or comments. This outreach specialist was also available at the scoping meetings.

Project information including the NOP and NOI, newsletter, scoping meeting boards, FAQ handouts, study area maps, scoping comment forms, contact information, and other project-related information was also made available on the California-High Speed Rail Authority’s Internet Website at [www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov](http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov).

**1.5 SCOPING ACTIVITIES**



The scoping meetings for the Altamont Rail Corridor Project EIS/EIR were conducted in November 2009. The open house/scoping meetings drew 180 participants. The geographical extent of the project led to scoping meetings being held in Livermore, Stockton, Fremont, and San Jose.

The scoping process included four public scoping meetings (see **Table 1**). Each meeting included an open house providing attendees with the opportunity to ask staff questions about the project.

**Table 1: Scoping Meeting Locations and Times**

Date	City	Location/Address	Time
11/10/2009	Livermore	Robert Livermore Community Center, 4444 East Avenue, Livermore, CA	3:00–8:00 p.m.
11/12/2009	Stockton	San Joaquin Council of Governments, 555 E. Weber Avenue, Stockton, CA	3:00–8:00 p.m.
11/17/2009	Fremont	Fremont Teen Center, 39770 Paseo Padre Parkway, Fremont, CA	3:00–8:00 p.m.
11/18/2009	San Jose	Petit Trianon Theater, 72 North Fifth Street, San Jose, CA	3:00–8:00 p.m.

Materials used during the scoping meetings included exhibits and handouts distributed at the meetings and through the Authority’s Internet Web site ([www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov](http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov)).

These materials are included as appendices located at the end of this document:

- NOP (see Appendix A)
- NOI (see Appendix B)
- Scoping Meeting Handout Materials (see Appendix G)
- Scoping Comment Forms (see Appendix H)
- Scoping Meeting Display Boards (see Appendix J)



At each meeting, attendees were asked to sign-in and provide contact information so that they could be notified of future project activities. **Table 2** provides a summary of meeting attendees based on information they provided on sign-in sheets, comment cards, or maps. Authority and consulting staff facilitated the scoping meetings to provide general information and instruction on ways to provide public comment.

**Table 2: Scoping Meeting Attendees Summary**

Date	City	Description of Participants
11/10/2009	Livermore	30 Individuals 6 Public and Private Organizations 22 Governmental/Regulatory Agencies or Representatives (Federal, State, County, City) 3 Transit Agencies <b>Total 61 attendees</b>
11/12/2009	Stockton	6 Individuals 32 Public and Private Organizations 17 Governmental/Regulatory Agencies or Representatives 7 Transit Agencies <b>Total 62 attendees</b>
11/17/2009	Fremont	17 Individuals 5 Public and Private Organizations 9 Governmental/Regulatory Agencies or Representatives 1 Transit Agency <b>Total 32 attendees</b>
11/18/2009	San Jose	11 Individuals 1 Public and Private Organizations 6 Governmental/Regulatory Agencies or Representatives 6 Transit Agencies <b>Total 24 attendees</b>

Each meeting was conducted in an open-house format, where boards were on display to the public. Authority project staff and consultants were on hand to answer questions regarding the Altamont Corridor Rail Project. A short video was run on a loop during the open house, which featured simulations of the Statewide HST system and Altamont Corridor, and interviews from Authority team members.

During the scoping meetings, a total of 37 comment forms and 30 route maps were received. Written comments via mail and e-mail were also received. As of December 10, 2009, 67 mailed or e-mailed written comments were received. Copies of the written comments, scoping meeting comment forms, and marked-up maps are provided in Appendix H.

**1.6 ADDITIONAL SCOPING ACTIVITIES**

In addition to the four scoping meetings discussed, throughout 2009, leading up to and during the scoping period, numerous meetings and presentations were conducted with stakeholders, agencies, and community organizations, including:

- |   |                                      |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Alameda County Congestion Management Agency       | City of Livermore                    |
| Altamont Commuter Express                         | City of Milpitas                     |
| Altamont Corridor Partnership Working Group       | City of Sacramento                   |
| Bay Area Rapid Transit District                   | City of San Jose                     |
| California Assemblymember Cathleen Galgiani       | City of Tracy                        |
| California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley | City of Union City                   |
| Caltrain  | County of Alameda                    |
| Caltrans - District 4                             | Fresno Regional Council Policy Board |
| Capital Corridor Joint Powers Authority           | Great Valley Annual Conference 20/20 |
| City of Dublin                                    | Foresight                            |
| City of Fremont                                   | Great Valley Center                  |

Governor's Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley  
Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority  
Merced-to-Sacramento Segment of California High-Speed Rail Scoping Meeting  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission  
Sacramento Council of Governments

San Joaquin County Council of Governments  
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
Stanislaus Council of Governments  
Tracy Rotary Club  
Valley Futures Forum presentation at Great Valley Center in Modesto  
Valley Transportation Authority

## 2.0 PUBLIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT DURING SCOPING PERIOD

### 2.1 SUMMARY OF SCOPING ACTIVITIES

Notice of scoping meetings was mailed to a comprehensive list of almost 6,000 stakeholders, including: various federal, state and local agencies; elected officials; community, business, and environmental leaders and organizations, and other interested individuals. Scoping included implementation of a communication infrastructure, development of themes and messages, execution of a project information line, early engagement with key stakeholders, and media communications.

Newsletters that provided meeting information for the four public scoping meetings, the Authority web site address, and project information line phone number were mailed via the U.S. Postal Service to over 2,400 stakeholders and were made available to the Working Group for distribution. In addition, 3,500 e-blast emails were sent to stakeholders with known e-mail addresses.

Notification of the scoping meetings was published in twelve local newspapers in October and November 2009. A press release was sent to local and regional media outlets to publicize the scoping meetings and encourage public comments. At least 10 newspaper articles were published about the event.

Project information was also provided on the Authority's Internet Website at [www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov](http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov).

Reference to an information line was provided on scoping meeting materials to accommodate special translation or signing services and access to a Spanish-speaking outreach specialist was indicated in the Spanish-speaking newspaper advertisements and at the scoping meetings.

### 2.2 SUMMARY OF NOTICED SCOPING MEETINGS

As shown in **Table 1**, four meetings were scheduled to provide the public with an opportunity to learn more about the project, to ask questions of project managers and staff, and to officially provide feedback for the record. Four scoping meetings were held: (1) the first scoping meeting was held at the Robert Livermore Community Center in Livermore on November 10, 2009; (2) the second scoping meeting was held at the San Joaquin Council of Governments in Stockton on November 12, 2009; (3) the third scoping meeting was held at the Fremont Teen Center in San Jose on November 17, 2009; and (4) the fourth scoping meeting was held at the Le Petit Trianon Theatre, 72 North Fifth Street, San Jose, CA on November 18, 2009.

Appendix H includes the complete copies of letters, emails, comment forms, and maps submitted during the scoping process.

### 3.0 PUBLIC SCOPING COMMENTS

Between October 23, 2009 and December 10, 2009, written comments were received from 104 commenters, including 67 letters and emails and 37 comment forms. In addition, 30 route maps of the Altamont Corridor were submitted at the public scoping meetings.<sup>1</sup>

#### 3.1 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

**Table 3** highlights approximately how many comments were made by topic area.

**Table 3: Summary of Comments**

Topic	# of Comments	Commenter Type
Alternatives (Alignment, Station, Facilities)	55	Individuals, Transportation Agencies, Governmental Agencies and Representatives, Public/Private Organizations
Cost/Funding	8	Individuals, Transportation Agencies
Environmental Impacts	40	Individuals, Transportation Agencies, Governmental Agencies and Representatives, Public/Private Organizations
Planning Process	35	Individuals, Transportation Agencies, Governmental Agencies and Representatives, Public/Private Organizations
Project Coordination	14	Individuals, Transportation Agencies, Governmental Agencies and Representatives
Support/Opposition	20	Individuals, Transportation Agencies, Governmental Agencies and Representatives
Other	3	Individuals, Transportation Agencies, Governmental Agencies and Representatives, Public/Private Organizations

**Table 4**, which that follows this section contains a summary of all comments submitted in writing (comment cards collected from the scoping meetings are included). Complete copies of comment forms, and mailed and e-mailed comment letters are in Appendix H. Table 4a summarizes the comments received by commenter. Table 4b summarizes the comments by the following general topics listed below.

**General comment topics:**

- Alternatives (Alignment, Station, and Facilities)
- Cost/Funding
- Environmental Impacts
- Planning Process
- Project Coordination
- Support/Opposition
- Other

<sup>1</sup> Scoping meeting attendees were also given the opportunity to mail in comment cards and route maps. One additional letter was received on December 15, 2009, and has been included.

### 3.2 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES MENTIONED IN SCOPING

The following is a summary of the alternatives, including alternative routes and station locations mentioned in scoping.

#### System Alternatives

Alternatives to the entire ACRP suggested in scoping include:

- Use the ACRP as the statewide high-speed rail alignment instead of the Pacheco route
- Upgrade traditional rail without providing for high-speed rail
- Select alternative to minimize impacts to wetlands and waters of the United States.
- Terminate ACRP at Livermore
- Terminate ACRP at Fremont/Union City
- Avoid use of UPRR lines entirely
- Extend BART to San Jose and San Joaquin Valley instead of ACRP

#### Alternatives outside the ACRP Study Area

Alternative suggested in scoping that are outside the study area include:

- Connect to Oakland via East Bay routes
- Cross San Francisco Bay near Dumbarton Bridge to connect to Redwood City
- Construct BART or other connection from Walnut Creek to Pleasanton or Livermore via I-680.
- Use alignment from Dublin west to Hayward using Lewelling and then across the Bay near the San Mateo bridge to connect near SFO to Caltrain corridor to San Francisco
- Include new transbay tube near Bay Bridge to connect San Francisco and Oakland
- Commence hourly service from Coliseum station to San Jose using existing stations, tracks and rolling stock and stopping at Hayward, Fremont, and Great America.
- Construct BART route from Antioch to Tracy
- Extend ACRP from Tracy to Patterson
- Extend ACRP to the south and east of Modesto
- Extend ACRP to Sacramento
- Extend ACRP to San Francisco
- Electrify Caltrain and Capitol Corridor

#### San Jose to Fremont

Alternative routes suggested in scoping between San Jose and Fremont included:

- Pass through San Jose International (SJO)
- Don't pass through SJO
- West of SJO (existing ACE line/Trimble)
- East of SJO (Guadalupe Parkway?)
- Use the existing (ACE/UPRR) alignment through the Baylands to Santa Clara.
- Use UP Warm Springs subdivision
- Use the existing ACE alignment in combination with the UP Warm Springs subdivision to allow two-way separated travel.
- Avoid the Don Edwards National Wildlife Refuge
- Parallel the BART alignment to San Jose
- I-880/ I-880 on the west side
- Use power line easement to cross east-west in Fremont.
- Connect from Warm Springs BART to ACE alignment then south through Baylands
- Use SR 237 to connect between I-880 and Great American
- Follow Trimble
- Don't use aerial section adjacent to College Park neighborhood in San Jose.

- Terminate ACRP in Fremont (e.g., Stockton to Fremont only) and use connections to BART and Capitol Corridor instead of extending to San Jose
- BART should follow the southern proposed rail alignment through the cities of Milpitas, San Jose, and Santa Clara.
- Extend BART to San Jose
- Extend both CALTRAIN and ACE on the east bay from San Jose to Livermore.
- Alternatives for fast improvements in the short term: Upgrade UP Warm Springs line to passenger standards for use as a second track in reverse commute direction (while using existing ACE line for opposite direction) and enable ACE and Capitol Corridor trains to stop in Santa Clara.

Alternative station locations suggested in scoping included:

- Diridon
- San Jose International Airport
- Santa Clara (Caltrain)
- Great Mall/Tasman (VTA connection)
- 1<sup>st</sup>/Trimble (VTA connection)
- Great America
- Shinn intermodal station with open architecture for possible future services

### **Fremont/Union City**

Alternative routes suggested in scoping in the Fremont/Union City Area included:

- Avoid Fremont entirely
- Follow the existing ACE alignment
- Avoid the Centerville area of Fremont
- Parallel the BART alignment (north-south)
- Niles Canyon to Union City and Newark via SR-84 and Decoto
- Warm Springs BART to ACE Line due west (east-west)
- Use utility line north of Auto Mall Parkway (east-west)
- Use Auto Mall Parkway (east-west) to connect from I-680 to existing ACE line
- Avoid high-price residential areas on east-side of Fremont and cut across west of Boyce Road to BART alignment
- Connect to Dumbarton rail

Alternative station locations suggested in scoping included:

- Shinn intermodal station
- Two BART connections in Fremont
- No Fremont stations
- Redwood City connection
- Union City BART
- Warm Springs BART
- Irvington BART
- ACE Centerville

### **Fremont/Union City to Pleasanton/Livermore (Niles/Sunol area)**

Alternative routes suggested in scoping between the Fremont/Union City and Pleasanton/Livermore areas included:

- Follow I-680
- Follow I-680 in a tunnel
- Use existing ACE alignment
- Use SP alignment

- Tunnel across Niles area
- Avoid Niles Canyon
- Follow SR-84 east of Pleasanton
- Tunnel from Sunol to east of Pleasanton in area south of town and north of SR-84
- Extend BART from Fremont to Livermore (direct)

Alternative station locations suggested in scoping included:

- No station locations were suggested in the Niles or Sunol areas

### **Pleasanton/Livermore**

Alternative routes suggested in scoping for the Pleasanton/Livermore area included:

- Follow I-680
- Follow I-580
- Follow ACE alignment
- Follow SP alignment
- Follow SR-84
- North-south through Quarry areas (El Charro Road, then due south)
- North of Livermore
- South of Livermore
- Avoid Pleasanton entirely
- Local service alternative that would divert from I-580 rail to serve downtown Livermore using existing UP or SP alignment
- Terminate ACRP in Livermore (e.g., Stockton to Livermore only) and use connections to BART (or as Phase 1 of project).

Alternative station locations suggested in scoping include:

- Dublin (at BART)
- Downtown Pleasanton Station
- Pleasanton at Alameda County Fairgrounds
- No Pleasanton Station
- SR-84/Stanley
- Downtown Livermore
- Vasco
- Greenville
- Isabel/I-580
- BART and HSR should share stations in Livermore.

### **Altamont Pass**

Alternative routes suggested in scoping for crossing Altamont Pass included:

- Use the SP route
- Use I-580 alignment.
- Use the SP route west of Tracy to I-580 and then follow I-580 to Livermore
- HSR tracks should go from Livermore to Tracy, and split into two directions north of Tracy: one towards Sacramento and the second to Modesto.
- Extend BART to San Joaquin Valley.

Alternative station locations suggested in scoping included:

- I-580/I-205 Junction

**Tracy to Stockton**

Alternative routes suggested in scoping for Tracy, from Tracy to Stockton, and in Stockton included:

- Follow the existing ACE line south of Tracy.
- Extend route through the middle of Tracy
- BART should be extended out to Manteca to connect to the proposed HSR.

Alternative station locations mentioned in scoping include:

- Downtown Tracy
- ACE Tracy (south Tracy)
- Avoid downtown Tracy
- Avoid southern Tracy due to poor access and sprawl concerns
- Mountain House
- I-580 near Mountain House (with park and ride)
- I-580 near Corral Hollow (with park and ride)
- I-5 near Kasson Road (with park and ride)
- Manteca
- Downtown Stockton
- Only one station in Tracy (not two)
- Only one station in Stockton (not two)

**Tracy/Stockton to Modesto**

Alternative routes suggested in scoping for the route from Tracy to Modesto and from Stockton to Modesto included:

- Follow SR-120, south of Manteca.
- Follow SR-99
- Extend through downtown Modesto because ROW for four lines already exists.

Alternative station locations suggested in scoping included:

- Downtown Modesto
- Only one station in Modesto (not two)

**Table 4a: Scoping Comments on the Altamont Corridor Rail Project EIS/EIR  
(Organized by Commenter)**

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
US Army Corps of Engineering (USACE)	1 - Federal Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Choose an alternative that would avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands or waters of the U.S. Comply with CWA Guidelines.
US Army Corps of Engineering (USACE)	1 - Federal Agency	Environmental Impacts	Prepare a preliminary wetland delineation in accordance with the Minimum Standards for Acceptance of Preliminary Wetland Delineations. The Army recommends that a preliminary jurisdictional determination for waters of the US within the proposed project site.
US Dept of the Interior, National Park Service (NPS)	1 - Federal Agency	Environmental Impacts	The NPS is concerned about potential impacts to Yosemite and Sequoia Kings Canyon National Parks.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
US Dept of the Interior, National Park Service (NPS)	1 - Federal Agency	Planning Process	The commenter is interested in reviewing the Draft EIR/EIS.
US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)	1 - Federal Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	The DEIR/EIS alternatives should consider the following: traditional rail services with a footprint that would not accommodate high speed rail and high speed rail.
US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)	1 - Federal Agency	Environmental Impacts	<p>The Draft EIR/EIS should also consider alternatives that would minimize impacts to aquatic resources, including wetlands, waters, and other resources. The EPA recommends the following: include maps and estimate of waters of the U.S. within the project area, provide specific description of proposed activities within waters of the U.S., identify waters and adjacent riparian area functions, include wildlife and plant species that could reasonably be expected to use waters or riparian habitats, analyze potential flood flow alteration, identify mitigation measures to reduce impacts to water quality, include compensation proposal for unavoidable impacts, and identify all protected resources within the project area. The proposed project should address potential movement impacts to wildlife. Include a description of endemic, unique habitat elements, and suitable habitat for native plant species. Recommends FRA and CHSRA to commit to the highest level of energy efficiency available for the proposed project, including a commitment to achieve LEED certification for the proposed stations and development of an Environmental Management System (EMS). Coordinate with local transportation agencies to minimize duplication of efforts and conflicting transit goals. Maintain or improve transit access for key rider groups. Quantify the potential noise and vibration impacts to residents, businesses, wildlife, and domestic livestock. Identify the amount of energy that would be required by the project and whether future supply is expected growth in demand. Reduce ozone precursors and particulate matter within the San Francisco Bay Area and San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. Demonstrate the GHG benefits and identify the cumulative contributions and reduction to GHG emissions that would result from the proposed project. The cumulative analysis should include past, present and foreseeable impacts. Growth inducement from implementation of the proposed project should be made transparent to the public and decision makers. The Draft EIR/EIS should analyze potential impacts to native plant species and environmental justice.</p>

<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Topics</b>	<b>Comments</b>
US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)	1 - Federal Agency	Project Coordination	The proposed project along with Pacheco Pass crossing may create doubling of impacts that may have permitting challenges under the CWA. The EPA recommends the CHSRA to confirm that the Pacheco Pass and proposed project would not provide duplicate services. The Bay Area to Central Valley PEIR should identify how the proposed project is practicable pursuant to CWA Section 404(b)(1).
US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	1 - Federal Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	The proposed project should avoid established preserves.
US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	1 - Federal Agency	Environmental Impacts	Recommends the proposed project partake in the San Joaquin Multi-Species Conservation Plan, where applicable.
CA Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	2 - State Agency	Environmental Impacts	Potential traffic and circulation impacts to state highway facilities and mitigation measures should be included in the Traffic Impact Study. Coordinate with Caltrans regarding all alternatives impacting the State ROW. The TIS should consider the extent to which the proposed project would provide convenient connections to the Bay Area airports. A Traffic Control Plan or TIS and Transportation Management Plan are required by Caltrans.
CA Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	2 - State Agency	Other	No comments regarding the proposed project.
CA Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	2 - State Agency	Project Coordination	Compliance with Caltrans Construction General Permit is required. Proposed construction or operation within Caltrans ROW will require discretionary review and approval by Caltrans.
CA Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	2 - State Agency	Project Coordination	Coordinate with Caltrans to minimize potential impacts from construction and operation near the State Highway System. Recommends coordination with regional and local partners. Consider future and currently planned transportation projects along State highway facilities.
CA Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	2 - State Agency	Project Coordination	Consider future and currently planned transportation projects along State highway facilities.
CA Dept of Conservation	2 - State Agency	Environmental Impacts	The NOP failed to specify the proximity of the proposed project to existing active, idle, plugged and abandoned gas wells. The Conservation suggests that no structure be built over or in proximity to an abandoned well. Presence of an abandoned well requires re-abandonment.
CA Dept of Conservation	2 - State Agency	Planning Process	The Conservation requests a map which depicts the gas wells within the proposed project area.

<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Topics</b>	<b>Comments</b>
CA Dept of Water Resources	2 - State Agency	Project Coordination	Early coordination with DWR regarding crossing design and placement is recommended.
CA Dept of Water Resources	2 - State Agency	Project Coordination	Crossing over State Water Project facilities or construction work within the DWR ROW will require an Encroachment Permit from the DWR.
CA Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	2 - State Agency	Environmental Impacts	Proposed project is subject to comply with the Commission's General Orders related to design, construction, and maintenance. The Commission recommends the consolidation and grade-separation of all existing at grade crossings along the adopted alignment and operation on an entirely dedicated and fully grade separated track. Installation of fencing or barrier along at grade tracks should be a requirement of the project. Identify all existing at-grade crossings along the adopted alignment is required. Also, include a discussion of the proposed location for electrical lines so existing utilities aren't impacted. Meeting should be arranged with the staff to discuss safety issues and conduct diagnostic reviews of any proposed and impacted crossing locations.
CA State Lands Commission (SLC)	2 - State Agency	Environmental Impacts	The Draft EIR/EIS should include GHG emissions and impacts to aquatic, riparian and terrestrial species.
CA State Lands Commission (SLC)	2 - State Agency	Planning Process	Provide a more detailed map of the proposed alignment.
CA State Lands Commission (SLC)	2 - State Agency	Project Coordination	The proposed project may be subject to a lease from the CSLC if the project traversed sovereign or school lands.
CA State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)	2 - State Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Avoid new tracks/infrastructure in Niles Canyon, this would avoid potential impacts to Alameda Creek. Propose post-construction stormwater management at new stations and parking lots.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
CA State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)	2 - State Agency	Environmental Impacts	Impacts to water of the State should be avoided and minimized. Include a full consideration and analysis of water quality impacts in all project alternatives. Identify wetlands that may be affected from the proposed project. Propose mitigation measure to reduce impacts to water quality. The proposed project should include "low impact development" practices to protect hydrology. The Draft EIR/EIS should analyze potential impacts to biological resources, including wildlife species and habitats. Inspection and monitoring to ensure environmental compliance and cumulative effects analysis should be included in the Draft EIR/EIS. The proposed project should make special efforts to avoid impacts to wetlands and waters of the State in areas of ecological integrity. Avoid new tracks/infrastructure in Niles Canyon, this would avoid potential impacts to Alameda Creek. Propose post-construction stormwater management at new stations and parking lots.
CA State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)	2 - State Agency	Project Coordination	CWA Section 401 permit will be issued by the State Water Resources Board, not the Regional Boards because the proposed project spans across the jurisdiction of two regional boards. The project may be subject to obtain a General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity.
CA Transportation Commission (CTC)	2 - State Agency	Environmental Impacts	If in the future funds or actions are required by the Commission as a Responsible Agency, the consideration of the environmental impacts of the project are required.
CA Transportation Commission (CTC)	2 - State Agency	Other	No comments related to the project's alternatives and purpose and need.
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACMA)	3 - Regional Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider alternatives that would provide most connectivity between the proposed project and existing and planned BART systems. The potential locations considered for the stations should provide multimodal access. Consider the impacts the proposed project would have on the ridership on existing and planned rail systems and transit services.
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACMA)	3 - Regional Agency	Cost/Funding	Discuss proposed funding sources of transportation mitigation measures and ensure that proposed mitigation measures comply with the three criteria set forth by the CMA Board for evaluating the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS.
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACMA)	3 - Regional Agency	Environmental Impacts	The Draft EIR/EIS should include potential impacts on the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS), including I-580, I-680, SR 84 and North Livermore Road. Discuss proposed funding sources of transportation mitigation measures and ensure that proposed mitigation measures comply with the three criteria set forth by the CMA Board for evaluating the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS.

<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Topics</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA)	3 - Regional Agency	Planning Process	Since obtaining funds for the proposed project would be difficult the Alameda County Congestion Agency recommends phasing the construction of the project.
East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD)	3 - Regional Agency	Environmental Impacts	The Draft EIR/EIS should evaluate and analyze potential impacts to the following regional parks: Brushy Peak Regional Preserve, Shadow Cliffs Regional Recreation Area, Pleasanton Ridge Regional Park, Vargas Plateau Regional Park and Quarry Lakes Regional Recreation Area. The Draft EIR/EIS should also consider potential impacts to the following regional trails: Shadow Cliffs to Morgan Territory Regional Trail, Shadow Cliffs to Del Valle Regional Trail, San Joaquin County to Shadow Cliffs Regional Trail, San Francisco Bay to San Joaquin River Regional Trail, San Francisco Bay Ridge Regional Trail, Alameda Creek Regional Trail, Iron Horse Regional Trail, and San Francisco Bay Trail and local connections.
Peninsula Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)	3 - Regional Agency	Planning Process	Encourage the utilization of Context Sensitive Solutions to preserve the cultural footprint of the existing communities.
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)	3 - Regional Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Suggests that an alternative from Stockton to Livermore that uses BART as the primary access be considered first.
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)	3 - Regional Agency	Planning Process	The Draft EIR/EIS should analyze all potential system capacity-related impacts on BART.
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)	3 - Regional Agency	Planning Process	Based on cost, implement the project incremental phases.
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)	3 - Regional Agency	Support/Opposition	Support an intermodal station in Livermore.
San Francisco Bay Trail Project (ABAG)	3 - Regional Agency	Environmental Impacts	Reference the San Francisco Bay Trail Plan in the Draft EIR/EIS. The following projects should be referenced in the Draft EIR/EIS: Newark/Fremont Bay Trail Alignment Study, South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project, and South San Francisco Bay Shoreline Study. The analysis should include potential impacts to safety and comfort of trail uses including views, noise, and crossings; ability to construct continuous trail, and development of non-motorized commute connections between rail stations.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission (SJRRCC)	3 - Regional Agency	Environmental Impacts	Suggests the following: utilize the current downtown Stockton ACE station, include a station in the Manteca/Lathrop area, analyze as an alternative Modesto connection on a corridor parallel to the Fresno Subdivision and along Highway 132; analyze alternatives through the Tracy area; avoid impacts to prime farmland; utilize alignments on the west side of I-880; and consider a station in Santa Clara as the first one.
San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)	3 - Regional Agency	Environmental Impacts	Design of the proposed project should incorporate design to maximize transit infrastructure investments and protect existing transit services to local communities. The Draft EIR/EIS should address the need for future local and regional access to the proposed High Speed Rail/Caltrain Station in San Jose's Diridon. SamTrans recommends the proposed project include a comprehensive multimodal access strategy to maximize Caltrain and High Speed Rail ridership. Incorporate policies of SB-375 into the concepts in the development of the project. Include Transit Oriented Development (TOD) and bus and shuttle services in the Draft EIR/EIS analysis. Identify transportation services that would be needed during project construction.
San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA)	3 - Regional Agency	Project Coordination	Coordinate closely with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) and Peninsula Rail Program, which has formed a partnership with the CA High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA). Coordinate with JPB to maximize past and current investments in areas where Caltrain and the proposed project would converge, and with all aspects of the Dumbarton Rail Project team through Caltrain to achieve leverage of benefits.
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (SCVTA)	3 - Regional Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider an alternative that terminates ACE service at the Union City or Fremont BART Station.
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (SCVTA)	3 - Regional Agency	Cost/Funding	The Draft EIR/EIS financial plan acknowledges the difficulty of local agencies increasing operating contributions for higher levels of ACE service operating funds. The proposed project should include a ridership standard that would be used to evaluate the level of capital investment.
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (SCVTA)	3 - Regional Agency	Cost/Funding	Include an economic analysis for each alternative for local agencies to evaluate the cost effectiveness of the proposed project.
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (SCVTA)	3 - Regional Agency	Project Coordination	Improvements to ACE should be coordinated with Dumbarton Rail Project.

<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Topics</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD)	3 - Regional Agency	Environmental Impacts	Sea level rise should be considered in proposed planning areas and design of infrastructure that may be located in areas potentially affected from elevated sea levels. Recommends that the Altamont Corridor Partnership Working Group include representatives of the three Shoreline Study sponsor agencies.
San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG)	3 - Regional Agency	Environmental Impacts	Recommends the proposed project partake in the San Joaquin Multi-Species Conservation Plan, where applicable.
San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD)	3 - Regional Agency	Environmental Impacts	Proposed project may be subject to District Rule 9510 Indirect Source Review (ISR). Applicant must provide information that will allow the District the quantify emissions from construction and operation.
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)	3 - Regional Agency	Project Coordination	Coordinate closely with the San Francisco to San Jose proposed rail project.
City of Livermore	4 - Local Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider and analyze a potential for a multimodal station in Livermore at a future BART station. Analyze an alternative that proposes a rail that terminates in Livermore at a BART station and allows BART extension to San Jose, San Francisco, and Oakland.
City of Livermore	4 - Local Agency	Environmental Impacts	The environmental document should analyze potential noise and aesthetic impacts. Moreover, the Draft EIR/EIS should analyze land use compatibility and potential for the transition of land uses near station locations.
City of Milpitas	4 - Local Agency	Environmental Impacts	The City does not support a grade separated aerial structure along the I-880 corridor because it would block the visibility of the existing business signage. The environmental document should consider aesthetics and noise impacts on the surrounding land uses.
City of Milpitas	4 - Local Agency	Support/Opposition	The City does not support a grade separated aerial structure along the I-880 corridor because it would block the visibility of the existing business signage.
City of Modesto	4 - Local Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Extend the proposed project south and east of Modesto.
City of Modesto	4 - Local Agency	Planning Process	City of Modesto and Stanislaus County were not included in the 2008 meetings. Why were City of Modesto and Stanislaus County excluded? Include the City of Modesto and Stanislaus County in the planning meetings.
City of Pleasanton	4 - Local Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider one or more alternatives that do not include running the rail corridor through Pleasanton.

<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Topics</b>	<b>Comments</b>
City of Pleasanton	4 - Local Agency	Environmental Impacts	Analyze potential impacts to public health and safety, noise, vibration, odors, electric and magnetic fields, land uses and planning, air quality, aesthetics, transportation, socioeconomics, biological resources, cultural resources, parking, light/glare, and physical division of the community.
City of Pleasanton	4 - Local Agency	Planning Process	Involve the City of Pleasanton in land use planning and developments around the proposed/potential train stations within Pleasanton's Planning Area Boundary.
City of Pleasanton	4 - Local Agency	Support/Opposition	The City does not support a high speed rail running through Pleasanton.
Stanislaus County	4 - Local Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	The proposed project should include routes to Modesto and Stanislaus County.
Town of Atherton	4 - Local Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	The Draft EIR/EIS should consider all potential alternatives of the proposed project. The proposed project should be considered the primary route reaching San Francisco and San Jose from Central Valley.
Town of Atherton	4 - Local Agency	Planning Process	The Draft EIR/EIS should consider all potential alternatives of the proposed project. The proposed project should be considered the primary route reaching San Francisco and San Jose from Central Valley.
Bay Rail Alliance	5 - Organization	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	The proposed alignment should be designed to provide a direct connection to the Dumbarton Rail Corridor and for possible future addition of tracks. The Dumbarton Rail Bridge in the East Bay studied in the Bay Area to Central Valley EIR/EIS should be carried forward. Follow "ACE/Caltrain Metro East" alignment = Diridon north to SJO, then along Trimble to cross I-880 to Warm Springs subdivision then north to Fremont Central Park then east via tunnel/cross country through Sunol, cross I-680 south of Pleasanton through quarry area to Stanley at SR-84, then east on ACE alignment. Stations at Warm Springs BART, Tasman/Great Mall, 1st/Trimble, SJO, and Diridon. Possible alignment from Trimble then west of SJO to Santa Clara Caltrain station then along Caltrain corridor southeast.
Bay Rail Alliance	5 - Organization	Planning Process	Evaluate the Caltrain Metro East.
Bellarmino College Preparatory	5 - Organization	Environmental Impacts	Comments include questions: Will the proposed project require acquisition of school property? Approximately how much?

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
Bellarmine College Preparatory	5 - Organization	Environmental Impacts	Comments include questions: What will the noise and vibration levels of the trains adjacent to the school be and what mitigation measures are proposed? Will noise and vibration impacts from the proposed project impact educational and athletic activities? What impacts will the proposed project have on air quality, cultural resources, hydrology and shading? Will safety measures be implemented to prevent human and wildlife from crossing the tracks?
Bellarmine College Preparatory	5 - Organization	Planning Process	Comments include questions: Will the proposed project be constructed above, below or at grade adjacent to the school?
California Farm Bureau Federation	5 - Organization	Environmental Impacts	Consider indirect and direct impacts to agriculture. Agricultural resources must be considered part of the physical environment. Accurately depict the existing agricultural lands surrounding the project area. Impacts to agricultural lands outside existing Important Farmland Map boundaries be based on agricultural land definition. Impacts to agricultural resources should be mitigated and a full range of alternatives should be considered. The proposed project's most environmentally favorable alternative must maximize the use of property already owned by the government. The Draft EIR/EIS should analyze impacts to water quality and resources and social and economic impacts.
California Farm Bureau Federation	5 - Organization	Planning Process	Include a map that depicts the location of agricultural preserves and Williamson Act contracted land within each preserve.
Californians for High Speed Rail	5 - Organization	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	The proposed project should include two endpoints one at San Francisco and the other one in Oakland. Consider a Bay Bridge corridor alignment, if not consider potential routes to Oakland via East Bay routes. Propose stations in areas accessible by walking and within close proximity to Transit Oriented Development. There should only be one station in Stockton, Modesto and Tracy. Consider a three branch system rail to San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose. Consider an alternative that would go from Niles Canyon to Newark via Centerville. Another alternative would consider the construction of an alignment from Livermore Valley area via I-680 to Newark. Consider as an alternative an alignment from Niles Canyon to Union City and Newark via route 84/Decoto. Another alternative that should be considered is Warm Springs BART to Newark via Auto Mall Parkway.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
Planning and Conservation League, California Rail Foundation, TRANSDEF (Stuart M. Flashman)	5 - Organization	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider alternatives in the Draft EIR/EIS that might have greater feasibility. The proposed project should consider an alternative that covers the proposed alignment in the Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Rail Project. Conversion of the BART gauge to standard gauge would minimize travel time and cost of building the proposed project through the Tri-Valley area. This alternative would take advantage of the proposed BART Livermore Extension Project. Consider an alternative route that would allow ACE and High Speed Rail trains access the Caltrain corridor to San Francisco. Include a low cost Local Service Alternative in Livermore that would divert from I-580 rail to join the current ACE alignment or SPRR ROW. Moreover, consider an alternative that would provide direct service to Oakland. Consider new Trans-Bay tube to connect San Francisco and Oakland for HSR. Consider alignment west from Dublin BART to Hayward that uses Lewelling toward San Mateo Bridge then across Bay to Caltrain corridor heading north to San Francisco.
Planning and Conservation League, California Rail Foundation, TRANSDEF (Stuart M. Flashman)	5 - Organization	Cost/Funding	How is this project funded?
Planning and Conservation League, California Rail Foundation, TRANSDEF (Stuart M. Flashman)	5 - Organization	Environmental Impacts	Analyze cumulative impacts from the proposed project, involving GHG and Bay Area transit service.
Station Host Association of California (Pirie, Grieg)	5 - Organization	Planning Process	Interested in learning more about the project. The commenter would like to have a guest speaker from HSRA to speak at Station Host event.
TRANSDEF (David Schonbrunn)	5 - Organization	Planning Process	Meeting was flawed, need graphics showing existing right of ways/options.
Union Pacific	5 - Organization	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	The proposed project may impact the Niles Subdivision main line from Fremont to Newark, Warm Springs from Fremont to San Jose, Coast Subdivision main line from Fremont to San Jose, Tracy Subdivision main line from Lathrop to Tracy, Oakland Subdivision main line from Fremont to Stockton and Fresno Subdivision main line from Stockton to Lathrop.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
Union Pacific	5 - Organization	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	High speed rail alignment within the UP right of way is not in their best interest. The UP will not make any segments or any parts of the subdivisions available for the proposed project.
Allen, Robert	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Extend BART to Livermore because it would have less environmental impacts. Use BART alignment from Fremont to San Jose and Santa Clara. Extend BART to San Joaquin County. Altamont to follow existing ACE route.
Allen, Robert	6 - Individual	Cost/Funding	Extend BART to Livermore because it would be less costly.
Allen, Robert	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Opposes the proposed project from BART to Livermore.
Alspaugh, Woody	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Defined "Locomotive."
Alspaugh, Woody	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Will email comments.
Anonymous	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	From Mission at I-880, follow I-880 to SR 237, then either west on 237 to Great American or south on I-880 to Trimble, then southwest to link with VTA.
Borges, Maria	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider an alternative that would extend from the Tracy to Patterson Station.
Boryer, Corey	6 - Individual	Other	Request faster rail service.
Brandt, Adrian	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Include Dumbarton rail corridor in project.
Brandt, Adrian	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Analyze potential operational, ridership and travel time benefits from connecting the proposed project with the Peninsula Caltrain at Redwood Junction.
Bridge, Steven	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Indicate project a huge benefit to California, looking forward to seeing rail built in next 10 years.
Cameron, Charlie	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Spelling correction to scoping meeting materials. Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board, not Capital. Additional comments not related to the project and/or alignments were made (related to the scoping meeting facility and refreshments provided); however this letter was difficult to read).
Cameron, Charlie	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Recommend alternate mapping for scoping meetings. Note that letter was difficult to read.
Cauthen, Jerry	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Alignment should extend to Sacramento and southward, San Francisco, and San Jose.
Charpontier, Lisa	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	Noise levels in the Newhall neighborhood may increase as a result of the proposed project. Consider the construction of underground tracks in the neighborhood.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
Chevron	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	There are existing active crude oil transportation pipelines located within San Joaquin County.
Childs, George	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Follow I-680 across Sunol Pass between Pleasanton and Fremont, avoid ROW through Niles Canyon due to unstable earth subject to frequent mud and rock slides.
Childs, George	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	Niles Cyn route includes historic central pacific railroad from Sacramento the East Bay.
Clint	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider an alternative route that uses the ROW of I-580 to cross the Diablo Range at the Altamont Pass and the ROW for I-680 to cross the Sunol Grade at Mission Pass. This alternative is more cost effective because it would avoid tunneling and serving Mountain House community.
Clint	6 - Individual	Cost/Funding	This alternative is more cost effective because it would avoid tunneling and serving Mountain House community.
Craggs, M	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	Elevated tracks through San Jose would have tremendous impacts on aesthetics, noise, and safety. Underground tracks should be considered for the segment of the alignment that would traverse San Jose. How many stationary lights will there be? Where? How far above current ground level will they be and will they be in every location? How often will the trains be running? During what times? What light output will they generate? How much noise will each train generate? Please provide sound maps that show the increase dB of noise. How much vibration will the trains generate? During operation, what operations/maintenance activities will occur at Newhall Yard? How will the train operation impact safety at the San Jose Airport?
Curme, Joanne	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	The proposed project would generate excessive noise levels in the Newhall neighborhood.
Curme, Joanne	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Opposes a raised track north of the I-880/De La Cruz interchange next to the current Caltrain rail yard and the San Jose Airport.
Dewor, Dr.	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	In support of project.
Dim, Chimere	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Mountain House should be the main station in the Brentwood and Tracy area.
Doolittle, Fred	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Place a 3 mile tunnel under the Sunol grade as oppose to a 7 mile tunnel in the Niles Canyon. At grade run from Pleasanton near the ACE tracks, then south to Sunol golf course into tunnel portal near Sunol golf course. Exit tunnel near Mission Blvd and 680. Above grade structure to Warm Springs BART station. Continue south along 880 to Silicon Valley. Consider a Great America station. Or use power line easement to cross east-west through Fremont and then use existing ACE route across Bay.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
Dubinsky, P. Michael	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Several questions and comments, including recommendation to avoid the Centerville area of Fremont and impacts Fremont neighborhoods
Dubinsky, P. Michael	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	Several questions and comments, including foreseeable environmental impacts in Niles Canyon
Dubinsky, P. Michael	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Requests responses to the following questions and comments regarding: 1)purpose and need 2) disadvantages of ACE 3) working group reports and meeting minutes 4) what will happen to ACE upon project completion 5)foreseeable environmental impacts in Niles Canyon 6) proposed alignment 7) impacts to Alameda Creek and Niles Canyon 8) coordinate with other bay Area transit projects (Union City Intermodal Station, Capitol Corridor, Dumbarton Rail Corridor and High Speed Rail Project) and 9) avoid the Centerville area of Fremont and impacts Fremont neighborhoods
Dubinsky, P. Michael	6 - Individual	Project Coordination	Several questions and comments, including recommended coordination with other Bay Area Transit Projects
Fischer, Clarence	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	BART Connection Potential at Shinn in Fremont. Altamont Pass and east - Use either I-580 or I-5 but have an exit constructed with a big park and ride lot. Parks and Rides suggested at I-580 crossings or I-5 crossing.
Frank, Alan	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Use I-680 between Pleasanton and Fremont. OR use 680 between Sunol and Fremont, SR 84 east of Sunol, and then pass south of Livermore to Greenville.
Fuentes, Luis	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Improve ticketing procedure between transit modes.
Fuentes, Luis	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Construct in median of I-580 or adjacent over Altamont and an intermodal station at Greenville with/in conjunction with BART. Create second station at Isabel/I-580 Interchange, moving south after Livermore Airport connecting to the UPRR ROW westbound to the Pleasanton Station, possibly a larger station on the vacant property adjacent to the Alameda County Fairgrounds, across Bernal Street on UPRR ROW, with bus service onto N-I-680 to Walnut Creek, San Ramon, Danville, etc. sharing two stations, then tunnel to Fremont.  Follow I-580 over Altamont Pass then use existing rail line to central Tracy Alignment and downtown Tracy station and then branch east to Stockton and Modesto.
Gamino, Larry	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Follow route through downtown Tracy and then follow SP route west to I-580 and then I-580 to Livermore.
Gray, Sarah	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Opposes the construction of above ground tracks for the San Francisco to San Jose alignment.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
Hage, Glen	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Curious about using Budd DSU trains mid-day on ACE.
Howell, Norman	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Concern about impact on housing of route south from Niles Junction to parallel BART. Recommend following ACE route west across Fremont and then south through Newark.
Jacobson, Scott	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Provide a station in Tracy instead of Stockton, improve connections to BART. Don't run alignment through downtown multi-use terminal. This will create traffic in Tracy worse.
Johnson, Dean	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Analyze construction of roads where they cross the Hayward Fault.
Johnson, Edith	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	Where will electric power come from?
Johnson, Edith	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	Concerned about effect to the Town of Tracy. Also, how will project affect existing commuters during the construction process?
Kailing, Karl	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Opposes the preferred approach.
Kane, Robert	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	This proposed alignment would generate excessive noise levels in their neighborhood.
Kane, Robert	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Opposes a raised track that would traverse the Newhall neighborhood.
Kiowa Last	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Connect the project with BART and ACE.
Kruger, Paul R.	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Supports the proposed project.
Kuduk, Daniel J.	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Proposed project should improve ride quality and trip duration from Tracy to Great America.
LaRiviere, Virginia	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Recommends construction of an underground tunnel for the Peninsula route (likely comment on San Jose to San Francisco HSR project).
Lopez, Brian	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	BART to Livermore with Downtown, Vasco and Greenville stations. Altamont to have stations at Greenville OR Vasco, downtown Livermore, and either SR84/Stanley OR downtown Pleasanton. Chose SR-84 or downtown Pleasanton route, and then follow I-680 to Fremont.
Marsh, Garrad	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Alignment needs to go to downtown Modesto. UP right of way can accommodate 4 tracks. HSR connection should be in City Center. Alignment should follow the existing rail line south of Tracy.
Marsh, Garrad	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	City is currently undergoing zoning changes to match master plan.
Marsh, Garrad	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Why aren't Modesto, Stanislaus County, or StanCOG representatives in the planning group?

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
Martinez, Teodoro	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Electrify Caltrain. Electrify ACE and Capitol Corridor. Run trains in commute direction on existing ACE alignment (Fremont to San Jose); Upgrade Warm Springs line to passenger standards and operate trains in reverse commute direction (San Jose to Fremont); enable ACE and Capitol Corridor to stop in Santa Clara; Shinn Intermodal station; Passenger platform on UP tracks at Union city BART station; hourly service from Coliseum to SJ using existing tracks and stops at Hayward, Fremont, and Great America.
Martinez, Teodoro	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Extend ACE and Capitol Corridor service to Santa Clara (construction two platforms, tunnels, etc.). Construct platform on the UP tracks behind the Union City BART station, construct intermodal station in Shinn neighborhood of Fremont, limit parking, but make accessible to bicycles. Upgrade Warm Springs line of UP to passenger standards, upgrade transit to enable higher mph.
Martinez, Teodoro	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Take an incremental approach to construction. Recommendations on specific service between Oakland and SJC.
McClintock, Lisa	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Who will lead improvements in local jurisdictions for grade separations/access to stations.
McClintock, Lisa	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Will improvements to local jurisdictions run on same schedule or be in advance of rail corridor?
McDowell, Judy	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Opposes elevated tracks through San Jose.
Mitracos, Peter	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Follow line through downtown Tracy
Moore, Raiyn and Ed	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider a Modesto line.
Morrison, Irene	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	HSR in Tracy should be south of downtown.
Morrison, Irene	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	How will commuters be affected during construction?
Morrison, Irene	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	How will the project be supplied with power?
Mullen, Jarrett	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Add stations in Santa Clara (Caltrain), San Jose (Diridon), Great America/VTA), N. San Jose (Trimble/VTA), Milpitas (Tasman/Great Mall), Warm Springs BART, Irvington BART. Welcome electrical equipment and alignments with minimum curves. Route from Warm Springs BART southwest to existing ACE route across Baylands, Great America and San Jose. Tunnel through Niles area, use existing ACE alignment through Pleasanton/Livermore with stops in Pleasanton, 1st St Livermore, and Vasco.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
Oehnle, Gary	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Coordinate with BART, including extension to Stockton, Modesto, and the HSR (SF to LA). BART has existing infrastructure.
Oehnle, Gary	6 - Individual	Cost/Funding	Project parallels BART. Is the cost justified?
Omodt, Mike	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Opposes elevated tracks through San Jose.
Padsen, J.R	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Extend BART to Manteca and have Altamont extend to SR99 and then south to Modesto with station north of town. Use I-580 in Livermore then cross to existing ACE line west of quarries, then tunnel through Niles.
Peterson, Russ	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Combine with statewide HSR to serve more commuters and save money.
Peterson, Russ	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Looks like a great project and use of HST technology. Serve more commuters and save money while doing HSR.
Pierson, Jim	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Route from Niles junction south to parallel BART to Mission Blvd to 880 to east of Airport to Caltrain to Diridon
Moore, Raiyn and Ed	6 - Individual	Project Coordination	Include direct connection with BART somewhere in Livermore Valley.
Moore, Raiyn and Ed	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Very much in favor of project.
Ranchod, Mahesh	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Supports the proposed project, especially if the alignment passes through Stockton ACE Station.
Rasmussen, Pete	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Serve SJ Airport, not via people mover from Santa Clara. Put stations in established downtowns not freeway stations like Dublin/Pleasanton BART. Route from Diridon to SJO, then on Trimble to the RR line east of I-880 to WARM Springs BART, then north to Niles Junction.
Ribalaygua Batalla, Cecilia	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider intermodal stations.
Ribalaygua Batalla, Cecilia	6 - Individual	Project Coordination	Coordinate with cities.
Rover, Vin	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider alignment between Pleasanton ACE and Walnut Creek BART (via the I-680 corridor). Consider alignment between Tracy ACE and Antioch/Hillcrest BART (Byron Highway/Brentwood corridor). This will establish something in those areas at a reasonable cost.
Rover, Vin	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Support of project.
Sanchez, Raul	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Altamont corridor is priority over HSR 152 corridor.

<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Topics</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Sloan, Lansing	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Put stations close enough to I-680/205 junction so station can be reached from 205 from the east, from 580 from the east, and from 580 west of the junction to accommodate cars and to save fuel.
Sloan, Lansing	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Coordination with other HSR projects, consider implementation of Altamont Corridor Rail project station in Livermore and BART in Pleasanton. Locate Livermore station in north Livermore, head northwest, then southwest through Dublin to Dublin-Pleasanton BART. Terminate at Dublin/Pleasanton BART station, b/c centrally located between I-580 and I-680.
Sloan, Lansing	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	Address potential noise impacts related to elevated tracks/curves, existing residential development in the hillsides, and proximity to tunnels, such as those that occur in northeast Berkeley, northern Daly City and far-southern San Francisco.
Smallie, Dennis	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Preference for HSR station in downtown Stockton at the ACE station.
Smallie, Dennis	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Support connection through the Altamont.
Smith, Timothy	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Available for involvement in educational programming/transportation outreach.
Soper, Scott	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	Consider a train stop within the University Grounds. How will the project affect cumulative noise impacts? Quantify the economic costs/impacts to the project on the College Park neighborhood. Include known foreseeable projects in the cumulative impact analysis. Describe mitigation measures to alleviate traffic during construction.
Stewart, Jerry	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Opposed to BART station at Isabel/Highway 84 and Stanley Blvd intersection. Oppose bullet train service included in plans due to cost, timing, and demand (and earthquakes).
Taylor, Darcy	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Great presentations, looking forward to design and construction.
Weiss, Ken	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Scoping meeting is informative.
Weiss, Ken	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Request guest speaker.
White, Cate	6 - Individual	Cost/Funding	Funding issues unresolved.
White, Cate	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Well presented with knowledgeable explainers.
Williams, Jeff	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Preference for Livermore Intermodal BART/ACE (or HSR) connection at Greenville/I-580 to discourage San Joaquin Commuters.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
Wolffe, Vaughn	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Connect to BART in Fremont (@Shinn) not BART in Livermore. Include Dumbarton Rail Bridge. Split trains in Redwood city one north and one south. Use viaduct in wetlands Fremont Alviso 3 tracks.
Wolffe, Vaughn	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Plan in incremental segments, all segments built to 110 mph standard regardless of others will be built.

**Table 4b: Scoping Comments on the Altamont Corridor Rail Project EIS/EIR (Organized by Topic)**

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
US Army Corps of Engineering (USACE)	1 - Federal Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Choose an alternative that would avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands or waters of the U.S. Comply with CWA Guidelines.
US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)	1 - Federal Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	The DEIR/EIS alternatives should consider the following: traditional rail services with a footprint that would not accommodate high speed rail and high speed rail.
US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	1 - Federal Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	The proposed project should avoid established preserves.
CA State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)	2 - State Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Avoid new tracks/infrastructure in Niles Canyon, this would avoid potential impacts to Alameda Creek. Propose post-construction stormwater management at new stations and parking lots.
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA)	3 - Regional Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider alternatives that would provide most connectivity between the proposed project and existing and planned BART systems. The potential locations considered for the stations should provide multimodal access. Consider the impacts the proposed project would have on the ridership on existing and planned rail systems and transit services.
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)	3 - Regional Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Suggests that an alternative from Stockton to Livermore that uses BART as the primary access be considered first.
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (SCVTA)	3 - Regional Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider an alternative that terminates ACE service at the Union City or Fremont BART Station.
City of Livermore	4 - Local Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider and analyze a potential for a multimodal station in Livermore at a future BART station. Analyze an alternative that proposes a rail that terminates in Livermore at a BART station and allows BART extension to San Jose, San Francisco, and Oakland.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
City of Modesto	4 - Local Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Extend the proposed project south and east of Modesto.
City of Pleasanton	4 - Local Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider one or more alternatives that does not include running the rail corridor through Pleasanton.
Stanislaus County	4 - Local Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	The proposed project should include routes to Modesto and Stanislaus County.
Town of Atherton	4 - Local Agency	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	The Draft EIR/EIS should consider all potential alternatives of the proposed project. The proposed project should be considered the primary route reaching San Francisco and San Jose from Central Valley.
Bay Rail Alliance	5 - Organization	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	The proposed alignment should be designed to provide a direct connection to the Dumbarton Rail Corridor and for possible future addition of tracks. The Dumbarton Rail Bridge in the East Bay studied in the Bay Area to Central Valley EIR/EIS should be carried forward. Follow "ACE/Caltrain Metro East" alignment = Diridon north to SJO, then along Trimble to cross I-880 to Warm Springs subdivision then north to Fremont Central Park then east via tunnel/cross country through Sunol, cross I-680 south of Pleasanton through quarry area to Stanley at SR-84, then east on ACE alignment. Stations at Warm Springs BART, Tasman/Great Mall, 1st/Trimble, SJO, and Diridon. Possible alignment from Trimble then west of SJO to Santa Clara Caltrain station then along Caltrain corridor southeast.
Californians for High Speed Rail	5 - Organization	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	The proposed project should include two endpoints one at San Francisco and the other one in Oakland. Consider a Bay Bridge corridor alignment, if not consider potential routes to Oakland via East Bay routes. Propose stations in areas accessible by walking and within close proximity to Transit Oriented Development. There should only be one station in Stockton, Modesto and Tracy. Consider a three branch system rail to San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose. Consider an alternative that would go from Niles Canyon to Newark via Centerville. Another alternative would consider the construction of an alignment from Livermore Valley area via I-680 to Newark. Consider as an alternative an alignment from Niles Canyon to Union City and Newark via route 84/Decoto. Another alternative that should be considered is Warm Springs BART to Newark via Auto Mall Parkway.
Planning and Conservation League, California Rail Foundation, TRANSDEF (Stuart M.	5 - Organization	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider alternatives in the Draft EIR/EIS that might have greater feasibility. The proposed project should consider an alternative that covers the proposed alignment in the Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Rail Project. Conversion of the BART gauge to standard gauge would minimize travel time and cost of building the proposed project through the

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
Flashman)			Tri-Valley area. This alternative would take advantage of the proposed BART Livermore Extension Project. Consider an alternative route that would allow ACE and High Speed Rail trains access the Caltrain corridor to San Francisco. Include a low cost Local Service Alternative in Livermore that would divert from I-580 rail to join the current ACE alignment or SPRR ROW. Moreover, consider an alternative that would provide direct service to Oakland. Consider new Trans-Bay tube to connect San Francisco and Oakland for HSR. Consider alignment west from Dublin BART to Hayward that uses Lewelling toward San Mateo Bridge then cross Bay to Caltrain corridor heading north to San Francisco.
Union Pacific	5 - Organization	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	The proposed project may impact the Niles Subdivision main line from Fremont to Newark, Warm Springs from Fremont to San Jose, Coast Subdivision main line from Fremont to San Jose, Tracy Subdivision main line from Lathrop to Tracy, Oakland Subdivision main line from Fremont to Stockton and Fresno Subdivision main line from Stockton to Lathrop.
Union Pacific	5 - Organization	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	High speed rail alignment within the UP right of way is not in their best interest. The UP will not make any segments or any parts of the subdivisions available for the proposed project.
Allen, Robert	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Extend BART to Livermore because it would have less environmental impacts. Use BART alignment from Fremont to San Jose and Santa Clara. Extend BART to San Joaquin County. Altamont to follow existing ACE route.
Anonymous	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	From Mission at I-880, follow I-880 to SR 237, then either west on 237 to Great American or south on I-880 to Trimble, then southwest to link with VTA.
Borges, Maria	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider an alternative that would extend from the Tracy to Patterson Station.
Brandt, Adrian	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Include Dumbarton rail corridor in project.
Cauthen, Jerry	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Alignment should extend to Sacramento and southward, San Francisco, and San Jose.
Childs, George	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Follow I-680 across Sunol Pass between Pleasanton and Fremont, avoid ROW through Niles Canyon due to unstable earth subject to frequent mud and rock slides.
Clint	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider an alternative route that uses the ROW of I-580 to cross the Diablo Range at the Altamont Pass and the ROW for I-680 to cross the Sunol Grade at Mission Pass. This alternative is more cost effective because it would avoid tunneling and serving Mountain House community.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
Dim, Chimere	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Mountain House should be the main station in the Brentwood and Tracy area.
Doolittle, Fred	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Place a 3 mile tunnel under the Sunol grade as oppose to a 7 mile tunnel in the Niles Canyon. At grade run from Pleasanton near the ACE tracks, then south to Sunol golf course into tunnel portal near Sunol golf course. Exit tunnel near Mission Blvd and 680. Above grade structure to Warm Springs BART station. Continue south along 880 to Silicon Valley. Consider a Great America station. Or use power line easement to cross east-west through Fremont and then use existing ACE route across Bay.
Dubinsky, P. Michael	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Several questions and comments, including recommendation to avoid the Centerville area of Fremont and impacts Fremont neighborhoods
Fischer, Clarence	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	BART Connection Potential at Shinn in Fremont. Altamont Pass and east - Use either I-580 or I-5 but have an exit constructed with a big park and ride lot. Parks and Rides suggested at I-580 crossings or I-5 crossing.
Frank, Alan	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Use I-680 between Pleasanton and Fremont. OR use 680 between Sunol and Fremont, SR 84 east of Sunol, and then pass south of Livermore to Greenville.
Fuentes, Luis	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Improve ticketing procedure between transit modes.
Fuentes, Luis	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Construct in median of I-580 or adjacent over Altamont and an intermodal station at Greenville with/in conjunction with BART. Create second station at Isabel/I-580 Interchange, moving south after Livermore Airport connecting to the UPRR ROW westbound to the Pleasanton Station, possibly a larger station on the vacant property adjacent to the Alameda County Fairgrounds, across Bernal Street on UPRR ROW, with bus service onto N-I-680 to Walnut Creek, San Ramon, Danville, etc. sharing two stations, then tunnel to Fremont.  Follow I-580 over Altamont Pass then use existing rail line to central Tracy Alignment and downtown Tracy station and then branch east to Stockton and Modesto.
Gamino, Larry	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Follow route through downtown Tracy and then follow SP route west to I-580 and then I-580 to Livermore.
Howell, Norman	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Concern about impact on housing of route south from Niles Junction to parallel BART. Recommend following ACE route west across Fremont and then south through Newark.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
Jacobson, Scott	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Provide a station in Tracy instead of Stockton, improve connections to BART. Don't run alignment through downtown multi-use terminal. This will create traffic in Tracy worse.
Kiowa Last	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Connect the project with BART and ACE.
LaRiviere, Virginia	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Recommends construction of an underground tunnel for the Peninsula route (likely comment on San Jose to San Francisco HSR project).
Lopez, Brian	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	BART to Livermore with Downtown, Vasco and Greenville stations. Altamont to have stations at Greenville OR Vasco, downtown Livermore, and either SR84/Stanley OR downtown Pleasanton. Chose SR-84 or downtown Pleasanton route, and then follow I-680 to Fremont.
Marsh, Garrad	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Alignment needs to go to downtown Modesto. UP right of way can accommodate 4 tracks. HSR connection should be in City Center. Alignment should follow the existing rail line south of Tracy.
Martinez, Teodoro	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Electrify Caltrain. Electrify ACE and Capitol Corridor. Run trains in commute direction on existing ACE alignment (Fremont to San Jose); Upgrade Warm Springs line to passenger standards and operate trains in reverse commute direction (San Jose to Fremont); enable ACE and Capitol Corridor to stop in Santa Clara; Shinn Intermodal station; Passenger platform on UP tracks at Union city BART station; hourly service from Coliseum to SJ using existing tracks and stops at Hayward, Fremont, and Great America.
Mitracos, Peter	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Follow line through downtown Tracy
Moore, Raiyn and Ed	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider a Modesto line.
Morrison, Irene	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	HSR in Tracy should be south of downtown.
Mullen, Jarrett	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Add stations in Santa Clara (Caltrain), San Jose (Diridon), Great America/VTA), N. San Jose (Trimble/VTA), Milpitas (Tasman/Great Mall), Warm Springs BART, Irvington BART. Welcome electrical equipment and alignments with minimum curves. Route from Warm Springs BART southwest to existing ACE route across Baylands, Great America and San Jose. Tunnel through Niles area, use existing ACE alignment through Pleasanton/Livermore with stops in Pleasanton, 1st St Livermore, and Vasco.
Oehnle, Gary	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Coordinate with BART, including extension to Stockton, Modesto, and the HSR (SF to LA). BART has existing infrastructure.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
Padsen, J.R (sp?)	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Extend BART to Manteca and have Altamont extend to SR99 and then south to Modesto with station north of town. Use I-580 in Livermore then cross to existing ACE line west of quarries, then tunnel through Niles.
Peterson, Russ	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Combine with statewide HSR to serve more commuters and save money.
Pierson, Jim	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Route from Niles junction south to parallel BART to Mission Blvd to 880 to east of Airport to Caltrain to Diridon
Rasmussen, Pete	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Serve SJ Airport, not via people mover from Santa Clara. Put stations in established downtowns not freeway stations like Dublin/Pleasanton BART. Route from Diridon to SJO, then on Trimble to the RR line east of I-880 to WARM Springs BART, then north to Niles Junction.
Ribalaygua Batalla, Cecilia	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider intermodal stations.
Rover, Vin	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Consider alignment between Pleasanton ACE and Walnut Creek BART (via the I-680 corridor). Consider alignment between Tracy ACE and Antioch/Hillcrest BART (Byron Highway/Brentwood corridor). This will establish something in those areas at a reasonable cost.
Sloan, Lansing	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Put stations close enough to I-680/205 junction so station can be reached from 205 from the east, from 580 from the east, and from 580 west of the junction to accommodate cars and to save fuel.
Sloan, Lansing	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Coordination with other HSR projects, consider implementation of Altamont Corridor Rail project station in Livermore and BART in Pleasanton. Locate Livermore station in north Livermore, head northwest, then southwest through Dublin to Dublin-Pleasanton BART. Terminate at Dublin/Pleasanton BART station, b/c centrally located between I-580 and I-680.
Smallie, Dennis	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Preference for HSR station in downtown Stockton at the ACE station.
Williams, Jeff	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Preference for Livermore Intermodal BART/ACE (or HSR) connection at Greenville/I-580 to discourage San Joaquin Commuters.
Wolffe, Vaughn	6 - Individual	Alternatives (Alignments, Stations, Facilities)	Connect to BART in Fremont (@Shinn) not BART in Livermore. Include Dumbarton Rail Bridge. Split trains in Redwood city one north and one south. Use viaduct in wetlands Fremont Alviso 3 tracks.

<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Topics</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACOMA)	3 - Regional Agency	Cost/Funding	Discuss proposed funding sources of transportation mitigation measures and ensure that proposed mitigation measures comply with the three criteria set forth by the CMA Board for evaluating the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS.
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (SCVTA)	3 - Regional Agency	Cost/Funding	The Draft EIR/EIS financial plan acknowledges the difficulty of local agencies increasing operating contributions for higher levels of ACE service operating funds. The proposed project should include a ridership standard that would be used to evaluate the level of capital investment.
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (SCVTA)	3 - Regional Agency	Cost/Funding	Include an economic analysis for each alternative for local agencies to evaluate the cost effectiveness of the proposed project.
Planning and Conservation League, California Rail Foundation, TRANSDEF (Stuart M. Flashman)	5 - Organization	Cost/Funding	How is this project funded?
Allen, Robert	6 - Individual	Cost/Funding	Extend BART to Livermore because it would be less costly.
Clint	6 - Individual	Cost/Funding	This alternative is more cost effective because it would avoid tunneling and serving Mountain House community.
Oehnle, Gary	6 - Individual	Cost/Funding	Project parallels BART. Is the cost justified?
White, Cate	6 - Individual	Cost/Funding	Funding issues unresolved.
US Army Corps of Engineering (USACE)	1 - Federal Agency	Environmental Impacts	Prepare a preliminary wetland delineation in accordance with the Minimum Standards for Acceptance of Preliminary Wetland Delineations. The Army recommends that a preliminary jurisdictional determination for waters of the US within the proposed project site.
US Dept of the Interior, National Park Service (NPS)	1 - Federal Agency	Environmental Impacts	The NPS is concerned about potential impacts to Yosemite and Sequoia Kings Canyon National Parks.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)	1 - Federal Agency	Environmental Impacts	<p>The Draft EIR/EIS should also consider alternatives that would minimize impacts to aquatic resources, including wetlands, waters, and other resources. The EPA recommends the following: include maps and estimate of waters of the U.S. within the project area, provide specific description of proposed activities within waters of the U.S., identify waters and adjacent riparian area functions, include wildlife an plant species that could reasonable be expected to use waters or riparian habitats, analyze potential flood flow alteration, identify mitigation measures to reduce impacts to water quality, include compensation proposal for unavoidable impacts, and identify all protected resources within the project area. The proposed project should address potential movement impacts to wildlife. Include a description of endemic, unique habitat elements, and suitable habitat for native plant species. Recommends FRA and CHSRA to commit to the highest level of energy efficiency available for the proposed project, including a commitment to achieve LEED certification for the proposed stations and development of an Environmental Management System (EMS). Coordinate with local transportation agencies to minimize duplication of efforts and conflicting transit goals. Maintain or improve transit access for key rider groups. Quantify the potential noise and vibration impacts to residents, businesses, wildlife, and domestic livestock. Identify the amount of energy that would be required by the project and whether future supply is expected growth in demand. Reduce ozone precursors and particulate matter within the San Francisco Bay Area and San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. Demonstrate the GHG benefits and identify the cumulative contributions and reduction to GHG emissions that would result from the proposed project. The cumulative analysis should include past, present and foreseeable impacts. Growth inducement from implementation of the proposed project should be made transparent to the public and decision makers. The Draft EIR/EIS should analyze potential impacts to native plant species and environmental justice.</p>
US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	1 - Federal Agency	Environmental Impacts	<p>Recommends the proposed project partake in the San Joaquin Multi-Species Conservation Plan, where applicable.</p>
CA Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	2 - State Agency	Environmental Impacts	<p>Potential traffic and circulation impacts to state highway facilities and mitigation measures should be included in the Traffic Impact Study. Coordinate with Caltrans regarding all alternatives impacting the State ROW. The TIS should consider the extent to which the proposed project would provide convenient connections to the Bay Area airports. A Traffic Control Plan or TIS and Transportation Management Plan is required by Caltrans.</p>

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
CA Dept of Conservation	2 - State Agency	Environmental Impacts	The NOP failed to specify the proximity of the proposed to project to existing active, idle, plugged and abandoned gas wells. The Conservation suggests that no structure be built over or in proximity to an abandoned well. Presence of an abandoned well requires re-abandonment.
CA Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	2 - State Agency	Environmental Impacts	Proposed project is subject to comply with the Commission's General Orders related to design, construction, and maintenance. The Commission recommends the consolidation and grade-separation of all existing at grade crossings along the adopted alignment and operation on an entirely dedicated and fully grade separated track. Installation of fencing or barrier along at grade tracks should be a requirement of the project. Identify all existing at-grade crossings along the adopted alignment is required. Also, include a discussion of the proposed location for electrical lines so existing utilities aren't impacted. Meeting should be arranged with the staff to discuss safety issues and conduct diagnostic reviews of any proposed and impacted crossing locations.
CA State Lands Commission (SLC)	2 - State Agency	Environmental Impacts	The Draft EIR/EIS should include GHG emissions and impacts to aquatic, riparian and terrestrial species.
CA State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)	2 - State Agency	Environmental Impacts	Impacts to water of the State should be avoided and minimized. Include a full consideration and analysis of water quality impacts in all project alternatives. Identify wetlands that may be affected from the proposed project. Propose mitigation measure to reduce impacts to water quality. The proposed project should include "low impact development" practices to protect hydrology. The Draft EIR/EIS should analyze potential impacts to biological resources, including wildlife species and habitats. Inspection and monitoring to ensure environmental compliance and cumulative effects analysis should be included in the Draft EIR/EIS. The proposed project should make special efforts to avoid impacts to wetlands and waters of the State in areas of ecological integrity. Avoid new tracks/infrastructure in Niles Canyon, this would avoid potential impacts to Alameda Creek. Propose post-construction stormwater management at new stations and parking lots.
CA Transportation Commission (CTC)	2 - State Agency	Environmental Impacts	If in the future funds or actions are required by the Commission as a Responsible Agency, the consideration of the environmental impacts of the project are required.
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACMA)	3 - Regional Agency	Environmental Impacts	The Draft EIR/EIS should include potential impacts on the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS), including I-580, I-680, SR 84 and North Livermore Road. Discuss proposed funding sources of transportation mitigation measures and ensure that proposed mitigation measures comply with the three criteria set forth by the CMA Board for evaluating the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD)	3 - Regional Agency	Environmental Impacts	The Draft EIR/EIS should evaluate and analyze potential impacts to the following regional parks: Brushy Peak Regional Preserve, Shadow Cliffs Regional Recreation Area, Pleasanton Ridge Regional Park, Vargas Plateau Regional Park and Quarry Lakes Regional Recreation Area. The Draft EIR/EIS should also consider potential impacts to the following regional trails: Shadow Cliffs to Morgan Territory Regional Trail, Shadow Cliffs to Del Valle Regional Trail, San Joaquin County to Shadow Cliffs Regional Trail, San Francisco Bay to San Joaquin River Regional Trail, San Francisco Bay Ridge Regional Trail, Alameda Creek Regional Trail, Iron Horse Regional Trail, and San Francisco Bay Trail and local connections.
San Francisco Bay Trail Project (ABAG)	3 - Regional Agency	Environmental Impacts	Reference the San Francisco Bay Trail Plan in the Draft EIR/EIS. The following projects should be referenced in the Draft EIR/EIS: Newark/Fremont Bay Trail Alignment Study, South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project, and South San Francisco Bay Shoreline Study. The analysis should include potential impacts to safety and comfort of trail uses including views, noise, and crossings; ability to construct continuous trail, and development of non-motorized commute connections between rail stations.
San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG)	3 - Regional Agency	Environmental Impacts	Recommends the proposed project partake in the San Joaquin Multi-Species Conservation Plan, where applicable.
San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD)	3 - Regional Agency	Environmental Impacts	The environmental review should include the following: 1) description of the regulatory environment and existing air quality conditions 2) project description that includes emissions from short term activities, emission reductions from mitigation and VMT 3) consider 10 tons per year of ROG and NOX Or 15 tons per year of PM10 4) cumulative impacts and 5) GHG discussion. Furthermore, the Draft EIR/EIS should include an analysis of potential health impacts of TACs to near-by receptors, determine whether it will be necessary to conduct a Health Risk Assessment (HRA), and conduct a HRA, if necessary. The Draft EIR/EIS should address the potential for nuisance odors, methodology used to determine the proposed project's impacts, and feasible measures to minimize air quality impacts. The proposed project may be subject to comply with the District's Authority to Construct (ATC) permit.
San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD)	3 - Regional Agency	Environmental Impacts	Proposed project may be subject to District Rule 9510 Indirect Source Review (ISR). Applicant must provide information that will allow the District to quantify emissions from construction and operation.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission (SJRRCC)	3 - Regional Agency	Environmental Impacts	Suggests the following: utilize the current downtown Stockton ACE station, include a station in the Manteca/Lathrop area, analyze as an alternative Modesto connection on a corridor parallel to the Fresno Subdivision and along Highway 132; analyze alternatives through the Tracy area; avoid impacts to prime farmland; utilize alignments on the west side of I-880; and consider a station in Santa Clara as the first one.
San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)	3 - Regional Agency	Environmental Impacts	Design of the proposed project should incorporate design to maximize transit infrastructure investments and protect existing transit services to local communities. The Draft EIR/EIS should address the need for future local and regional access to the proposed High Speed Rail/Caltrain Station in San Jose's Diridon. SamTrans recommends the proposed project include a comprehensive multimodal access strategy to maximize Caltrain and High Speed Rail ridership. Incorporate policies of SB-375 into the concepts in the development of the project. Include Transit Oriented Development (TOD) and bus and shuttle services in the Draft EIR/EIS analysis. Identify transportation services that would be needed during project construction.
Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD)	3 - Regional Agency	Environmental Impacts	Sea level rise should be considered in proposed planning areas and design of infrastructure that may be located in areas potentially affected from elevated sea levels. Recommends that the Altamont Corridor Partnership Working Group include representatives of the three Shoreline Study sponsor agencies.
City of Livermore	4 - Local Agency	Environmental Impacts	The environmental document should analyze potential noise and aesthetic impacts. Moreover, the Draft EIR/EIS should analyze land use compatibility and potential for the transition of land uses near station locations.
City of Milpitas	4 - Local Agency	Environmental Impacts	The City does not support a grade separated aerial structure along the I-880 corridor because it would block the visibility of the existing business signage. The environmental document should consider aesthetics and noise impacts on the surrounding land uses.
City of Pleasanton	4 - Local Agency	Environmental Impacts	Analyze potential impacts to public health and safety, noise, vibration, odors, electric and magnetic fields, land uses and planning, air quality, aesthetics, transportation, socioeconomics, biological resources, cultural resources, parking, light/glare, and physical division of the community.
Bellarmine College Preparatory	5 - Organization	Environmental Impacts	Comments include questions: Will the proposed project require acquisition of school property? Approximately how much?

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
Bellarmine College Preparatory	5 - Organization	Environmental Impacts	Comments include questions: What will the noise and vibration levels of the trains adjacent to the school be and what mitigation measures are proposed? Will noise and vibration impacts from the proposed project impact educational and athletic activities? What impacts will the proposed project have on air quality, cultural resources, hydrology and shading? Will safety measures be implemented to prevent human and wildlife from crossing the tracks?
California Farm Bureau Federation	5 - Organization	Environmental Impacts	Consider indirect and direct impacts to agriculture. Agricultural resources must be considered part of the physical environment. Accurately depict the existing agricultural lands surrounding the project area. Impacts to agricultural lands outside existing Important Farmland Map boundaries be based on agricultural land definition. Impacts to agricultural resources should be mitigated and a full range of alternatives should be considered. The proposed project's most environmentally favorable alternative must maximize the use of property already owned by the government. The Draft EIR/EIS should analyze impacts to water quality and resources and social and economic impacts.
Planning and Conservation League, California Rail Foundation, TRANSDEF (Stuart M. Flashman)	5 - Organization	Environmental Impacts	Analyze cumulative impacts from the proposed project, involving GHG and Bay Area transit service.
Charpontier, Lisa	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	Noise levels in the Newhall neighborhood may increase as a result of the proposed project. Consider the construction of underground tracks in the neighborhood.
Chevron	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	There are existing active crude oil transportation pipelines located within San Joaquin County.
Childs, George	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	Niles Cyn route includes historic central pacific railroad from Sacramento the East Bay.
Craggs, M	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	Elevated tracks through San Jose would have tremendous impacts on aesthetics, noise, and safety. Underground tracks should be considered for the segment of the alignment that would traverse San Jose. How many stationary lights will there be? Where? How far above current ground level will they be and will they be in every location? How often will the trains be running? During what times? What light output will they generate? How much noise will each train generate? Please provide sound maps that show the increase dB of noise. How much vibration will the trains generate? During operation, what operations/maintenance activities will occur at Newhall Yard? How will the train operation impact safety at the San Jose Airport?

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
Curme, Joanne	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	The proposed project would generate excessive noise levels in the Newhall neighborhood.
Dubinsky, P. Michael	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	Several questions and comments, including foreseeable environmental impacts in Niles Canyon
Johnson, Edith	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	Where will electric power come from?
Johnson, Edith	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	Concerned about effect to the Town of Tracy. Also, how will project affect existing commuters during the construction process?
Kane, Robert	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	This proposed alignment would generate excessive noise levels in their neighborhood.
Marsh, Garrad	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	City is currently undergoing zoning changes to match master plan.
Morrison, Irene	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	How will commuters be affected during construction?
Morrison, Irene	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	How will the project be supplied with power?
Sloan, Lansing	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	Address potential noise impacts related to elevated tracks/curves, existing residential development in the hillsides, and proximity to tunnels, such as those that occur in northeast Berkeley, northern Daly City and far-southern San Francisco.
Soper, Scott	6 - Individual	Environmental Impacts	Consider a train stop within the University Grounds. How will the project affect cumulative noise impacts? Quantify the economic costs/impacts to the project on the College Park neighborhood. Include known foreseeable projects in the cumulative impact analysis. Describe mitigation measures to alleviate traffic during construction.
CA Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	2 - State Agency	Other	No comments regarding the proposed project.
CA Transportation Commission (CTC)	2 - State Agency	Other	No comments related to the project's alternatives and purpose and need.
Boryer, Corey	6 - Individual	Other	Request faster rail service.
US Dept of the Interior, National Park Service (NPS)	1 - Federal Agency	Planning Process	The commenter is interested in reviewing the Draft EIR/EIS.
CA Dept of Conservation	2 - State Agency	Planning Process	The Conservation requests a map with the depicts the gas wells within the proposed project area.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
CA State Lands Commission (SLC)	2 - State Agency	Planning Process	Provide the a more detailed map of the proposed alignment.
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMMA)	3 - Regional Agency	Planning Process	Since obtaining funds for the proposed project would be difficult the Alameda County Congestion Agency recommends phasing the construction of the project.
Peninsula Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)	3 - Regional Agency	Planning Process	Encourage the utilization of Context Sensitive Solutions to preserve the cultural footprint of the existing communities.
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)	3 - Regional Agency	Planning Process	The Draft EIR/EIS should analyze all potential system capacity-related impacts on BART.
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)	3 - Regional Agency	Planning Process	Based on cost, implement the project incremental phases.
City of Modesto	4 - Local Agency	Planning Process	City of Modesto and Stanislaus County were not included in the 2008 meetings. Why were City of Modesto and Stanislaus County excluded? Include the City of Modesto and Stanislaus County in the planning meetings.
City of Pleasanton	4 - Local Agency	Planning Process	Involve the City of Pleasanton in land use planning and developments around the proposed/potential train stations within Pleasanton's Planning Area Boundary.
Town of Atherton	4 - Local Agency	Planning Process	The Draft EIR/EIS should consider all potential alternatives of the proposed project. The proposed project should be considered the primary route reaching San Francisco and San Jose from Central Valley.
Bay Rail Alliance	5 - Organization	Planning Process	Evaluate the Caltrain Metro East.
Bellarmine College Preparatory	5 - Organization	Planning Process	Comments include questions: Will the proposed project be constructed above, below or at grade adjacent to the school?
California Farm Bureau Federation	5 - Organization	Planning Process	Include a map that depicts the location of agricultural preserves and Williamson Act contracted land within each preserve.
Station Host Association of California (Pirie, Grieg)	5 - Organization	Planning Process	Interested in learning more about the project. The commenter would like to have a guest speaker from HSRA to speak at Station Host event.
TRANSDEF (David Schonbrunn)	5 - Organization	Planning Process	Meeting was flawed, need graphics showing existing right of ways/options.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
Alspaugh, Woody	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Defined "Locomotive."
Alspaugh, Woody	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Will email comments.
Brandt, Adrian	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Analyze potential operational, ridership and travel time benefits from connecting the proposed project with the Peninsula Caltrain at Redwood Junction.
Cameron, Charlie	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Spelling correction to scoping meeting materials. Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board, not Capital. Additional comments not related to the project and/or alignments were made (related to the scoping meeting facility and refreshments provided); however this letter was difficult to read).
Cameron, Charlie	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Recommend alternate mapping for scoping meetings. Note that letter was difficult to read.
Dubinsky, P. Michael	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Requests responses to the following questions and comments regarding: 1)purpose and need 2) disadvantages of ACE 3) working group reports and meeting minutes 4) what will happen to ACE upon project completion 5)foreseeable environmental impacts in Niles Canyon 6) proposed alignment 7) impacts to Alameda Creek and Niles Canyon 8) coordinate with other bay Area transit projects (Union City Intermodal Station, Capitol Corridor, Dumbarton Rail Corridor and High Speed Rail Project) and 9) avoid the Centerville area of Fremont and impacts Fremont neighborhoods
Hage, Glen	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Curious about using Budd DSU trains mid-day on ACE.
Johnson, Dean	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Analyze construction of roads where they cross the Hayward Fault.
Kuduk, Daniel J.	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Proposed project should improve ride quality and trip duration from Tracy to Great America.
Marsh, Garrad	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Why aren't Modesto, Stanislaus County, or StanCOG representatives in the planning group?
Martinez, Teodoro	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Extend ACE and Capitol Corridor service to Santa Clara (construction two platforms, tunnels, etc.). Construct platform on the UP tracks behind the Union City BART station, construct intermodal station in Shinn neighborhood of Fremont, limit parking, but make accessible to bicycles. Upgrade Warm Springs line of UP to passenger standards, upgrade transit to enable higher mph.
Martinez, Teodoro	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Take an incremental approach to construction. Recommendations on specific service between Oakland and SJC.
McClintock, Lisa	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Who will lead improvements in local jurisdictions for grade separations/access to stations.
McClintock, Lisa	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Will improvements to local jurisdictions run on same schedule or be in advance of rail corridor?

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
Smith, Timothy	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Available for involvement in educational programming/transportation outreach.
Taylor, Darcy	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Great presentations, looking forward to design and construction.
Weiss, Ken	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Scoping meeting is informative.
Weiss, Ken	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Request guest speaker.
White, Cate	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Well presented with knowledgeable explainers.
Wolffe, Vaughn	6 - Individual	Planning Process	Plan in incremental segments, all segments built to 110 mph standard regardless of others will be built.
US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)	1 - Federal Agency	Project Coordination	The proposed project along with Pacheco Pass crossing may create doubling of impacts that may have permitting challenges under the CWA. The EPA recommends the CHSRA to confirm that the Pacheco Pass and proposed project would not provide duplicate services. The Bay Area to Central Valley PEIR should identify how the proposed project is practicable pursuant to CWA Section 404(b)(1).
CA Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	2 - State Agency	Project Coordination	Compliance with Caltrans Construction General Permit is required. Proposed construction or operation within Caltrans ROW will require discretionary review and approval by Caltrans.
CA Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	2 - State Agency	Project Coordination	Coordinate with Caltrans to minimize potential impacts from construction and operation near the State Highway System. Recommends coordination with regional and local partners. Consider future and currently planned transportation projects along State highway facilities.
CA Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	2 - State Agency	Project Coordination	Consider future and currently planned transportation projects along State highway facilities.
CA Dept of Water Resources (DWR)	2 - State Agency	Project Coordination	Early coordination with DWR regarding crossing design and placement is recommended.
CA Dept of Water Resources (DWR)	2 - State Agency	Project Coordination	Crossing over State Water Project facilities or construction work within the DWR ROW will require an Encroachment Permit from the DWR.
CA State Lands Commission (SLC)	2 - State Agency	Project Coordination	The proposed project may be subject to a lease from the CSLC if the project traversed sovereign or school lands.

Commenter	Type	Topics	Comments
CA State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)	2 - State Agency	Project Coordination	CWA Section 401 permit will be issued by the State Water Resources Board, not the Regional Boards because the proposed project spans across the jurisdiction of two regional boards. The project may be subject to obtain a General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity.
San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA)	3 - Regional Agency	Project Coordination	Coordinate closely with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) and Peninsula Rail Program, which has formed a partnership with the CA High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA). Coordinate with JPB to maximize past and current investments in areas where Caltrain and the proposed project would converge, and with all aspects of the Dumbarton Rail Project team through Caltrain to achieve leverage of benefits.
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (SCVTA)	3 - Regional Agency	Project Coordination	Improvements to ACE should be coordinated with Dumbarton Rail Project.
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)	3 - Regional Agency	Project Coordination	Coordinate closely with the San Francisco to San Jose proposed rail project.
Dubinsky, P. Michael	6 - Individual	Project Coordination	Several questions and comments, including recommended coordination with other Bay Area Transit Projects
Moore, Raiyn and Ed	6 - Individual	Project Coordination	Include direct connection with BART somewhere in Livermore Valley.
Ribalaygua Batalla, Cecilia	6 - Individual	Project Coordination	Coordinate with cities.
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)	3 - Regional Agency	Support/Opposition	Support an intermodal station in Livermore.
City of Milpitas	4 - Local Agency	Support/Opposition	The City does not support a grade separated aerial structure along the I-880 corridor because it would block the visibility of the existing business signage.
City of Pleasanton	4 - Local Agency	Support/Opposition	The City does not support a high speed rail running through Pleasanton.
Allen, Robert	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Opposes the proposed project from BART to Livermore.
Bridge, Steven	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Indicate project a huge benefit to California, looking forward to seeing rail built in next 10 years.
Curme, Joanne	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Opposes a raised track north of the I-880/De La Cruz interchange next to the current Caltrain rail yard and the San Jose Airport.
Dewor, Dr.	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	In support of project.

<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Topics</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Gray, Sarah	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Opposes the construction of above ground tracks for the San Francisco to San Jose alignment.
Kailing, Karl	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Opposes the preferred approach.
Kane, Robert	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Opposes a raised track that would traverse the Newhall neighborhood.
Kruger, Paul R.	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Supports the proposed project.
McDowell, Judy	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Opposes elevated tracks through San Jose.
Moore, Raiyn and Ed	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Very much in favor of project.
Omodt, Mike	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Opposes elevated tracks through San Jose.
Peterson, Russ	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Looks like a great project and use of HST technology. Serve more commuters and save money while doing HSR.
Ranchod, Mahesh	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Supports the proposed project, especially if the alignment passes through Stockton ACE Station.
Rover, Vin	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Support of project.
Sanchez, Raul	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Altamont corridor is priority over HSR 152 corridor.
Smallie, Dennis	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Support connection through the Altamont.
Stewart, Jerry	6 - Individual	Support/Opposition	Opposed to BART station at Isabel/Highway 84 and Stanley Blvd intersection. Oppose bullet train service included in plans due to cost, timing, and demand (and earthquakes).

## 4.0 NEXT STEPS IN THE EIS/EIR PROCESS

The information obtained during scoping from public agencies, organizations, and individuals will be used in the subsequent phases of preparing the environmental documentation. Specifically, the Authority, SJRRC, and FRA will:

- *Review the suggestions for alignment alternatives and station options* – the Authority, SJRRC, and FRA will conduct an alternatives analysis to evaluate the list of alternatives that have been identified through scoping and determine which alternatives should be fully evaluated in the project EIS/EIR. This effort will consider the Purpose and Need for the project, engineering feasibility, support of community land use plans and policies, and environmental considerations in determining the number of alternatives to be fully investigated in the project EIS/EIR. There will be several opportunities for public involvement in the alternatives review process.
- *Implement a comprehensive public involvement process* – the Authority, SJRRC, and the FRA are sensitive to the communities' desire for an open, transparent public process that allows for an increased level of sharing information and progress on the environmental documentation. Toward that end, the Authority, SJRRC, and the FRA are preparing an Outreach Plan that will be used to identify junctures in the process and methods for public involvement.
- *Refine project description* – following the alternatives analysis, the Authority and the FRA will update the project description, identify design options, and begin to formulate more detailed engineering drawings that can be used for environmental analysis. The project description will describe the proposed route, the vertical profile alternatives (i.e., above grade, at grade, or below grade), the operating plan (e.g., the hours of operations, the number of station stops, the frequency of service), the systems and facilities needed to support the ACRP (e.g., safety and security measures, communications, maintenance, electrical propulsion), and the techniques and length of time required to construct the ACRP.
- *Commence technical studies* – the alternatives analysis and updated project description will define the focus of the environmental analyses. Technical studies that will encompass the physical and socioeconomic environment will be initiated to document the existing environmental setting and then assess how the alternatives would change this setting. Suggestions of the issues and topics to be evaluated that were received during the scoping process will be used in identifying the impacts of the project alternatives.

The tasks described above will occur during 2010. It is expected that in 2012, a Draft EIS/EIR will be distributed to the public for review and comment. The Draft EIS/EIR will be a compilation of the technical studies, and will describe the environmental consequences if the ACRP project were to be approved, but also the mitigation measures that could be taken to avoid or reduce significant impacts identified in the Draft EIS/EIR. Substantive comments on the Draft EIS/EIR will be responded to in a Final EIS/EIR. Circulation of the Final EIS/EIR is anticipated in 2013. Authority and FRA approval of the Final EIS/EIR is also anticipated in 2013.

## 5.0 PREPARERS

### AECOM

Brent Ogden, Project Manager  
Kim Christiansen, Outreach Lead

### ICF

Rich Walter, Environmental Lead  
Seema Sairam, Deputy Environmental Lead  
Christine Fukasawa, Deputy Environmental Lead  
Jasmin Mejia, Environmental Coordinator