

APPENDIX G: COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER PUBLICATION OF THE FINAL EIR/EIS

APPENDIX G: COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER PUBLICATION OF THE FINAL EIR/EIS

When a comment letter is received after the close of the public comment period, neither a California Environmental Quality Act nor a National Environmental Policy Act lead agency has an obligation to respond (California Public Resources Code [Cal. Public Res. Code] § 21091, subd. (d)(1); Cal. Public Res. Code § 21092.5, subd. (c); 40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1503.4). However, a lead agency may, in its discretion, choose to respond. Consistent with that discretion, this appendix summarizes written comments received outside the comment period and the California High-Speed Rail Authority's (Authority) response.

This summary may be updated after Authority Board consideration of the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIR/EIS), if the document and the project section are approved. Any such update will be posted alongside final decision documents on the Authority's website.

This page intentionally left blank

#	First Name	Last Name	Business/Organization	Summary of Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Response/Status Update
01	Greg	Greenway	Peninsula Freight Rail Users	Commenter requested a single PDF for the entire Final EIR/EIS as well as specific Technical Reports.	The Authority explained that due to file size the Final EIR/EIS is not available as a single PDF. Regarding the feasibility of providing a single PDF document of the entire Final EIR/EIS, please refer to the response to submission 1211, comment 2692 in Volume 4, Chapter 24 of the Final EIR/EIS. The Authority provided the Final EIR/EIS and Technical Reports to the commenter via Dropbox links on June 13, 2022.
02	Robert	Ovadia	Town of Atherton	Commenter requested an electronic copy of the Final EIR/EIS.	The Authority provided the Final EIR/EIS to the commenter via a Dropbox link on June 20, 2022.
03	Tyrone	Moore-Perez	Individual	Commenter suggested including a station in Oakland because it is a growing city and is more accessible and less expensive than San Francisco.	The Authority acknowledges the commenter's recommendation. Please refer to Standard Response FJ-Response-ALT-1: Alternatives Selection and Evaluation Process in Volume 4, Chapter 17 of the Final EIR/EIS, which describes the tiered environmental review process conducted for the HSR system. The Authority analyzed a wide range of alternatives in the Tier 1 programmatic environmental documents, including alternatives going to Oakland. Those alternatives were found to be inferior to the preferred route to San Francisco via the San Francisco Peninsula. In addition, Proposition 1A mandates that the Northern California terminus of the HSR system must be in San Francisco. Accordingly, the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section Final EIR/EIS appropriately focuses its analysis of alternatives on the existing Caltrain corridor between San Francisco and San Jose with stations in downtown San Francisco, Millbrae, and San Jose.
04	Peggy	Nutz	Individual	Commenter requested a copy of the Final EIR/EIS.	The Authority provided the Final EIR/EIS to the commenter via a Dropbox link on June 20, 2022.
05	Adrianna	Galletta	Individual	Commenter requested a copy of the Final EIR/EIS.	The Authority provided the Final EIR/EIS to the commenter via a Dropbox link on June 20, 2022.

#	First Name	Last Name	Business/ Organization	Summary of Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Response/Status Update
06	Jay	Smith	San Carlos Library	Commenter from the San Carlos Library Repository Location requested a smaller version of the NOA Poster, which was 12"x18", due to limited space to display it.	The Authority provided a smaller 8.5"x11" version of the NOA Poster on June 15, 2022, for the commenter to print and display at the Repository Location.
07	Yvonne	Arroyo	Santa Clara Valley Water District	Commenter requested a copy of the San Francisco to San Jose Final EIR/EIS and the San Jose to Merced Final EIR/EIS.	The Authority provided both of the Final EIR/EISs to the commenter via a Dropbox link on June 21, 2022.
08	Carlin	Otto	Individual	<p>Commenter recognized the value of a statewide HSR system but suggested that the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section not be built because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are already fully functional transportation systems here 2. Construction in a densely populated area will be very expensive 3. It will be additional noise for millions of residents in an already noisy transportation corridor 4. The Oakland Airport could accommodate more traffic <p>Commenter suggested a station in Oakland instead.</p>	<p>The Authority acknowledges the commenter's opposition to the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section of the California HSR System. Please refer to Standard Response FJ-Response-GEN-1: General Opposition to the Project and the California High-Speed Rail System in Volume 4, Chapter 17 of the Final EIR/EIS.</p> <p>With respect to the commenter's suggestion for the Authority to consider a station in Oakland, please refer to Standard Response FJ-Response-ALT-1: Alternatives Selection and Evaluation Process in Volume 4, Chapter 17 of the Final EIR/EIS, which describes the tiered environmental review process conducted for the HSR system. The Authority analyzed a wide range of alternatives in the Tier 1 programmatic environmental documents, including alternatives going to Oakland. Those alternatives were found to be inferior to the preferred route to San Francisco via the San Francisco Peninsula. In addition, Proposition 1A mandates that the Northern California terminus of the HSR system must be in San Francisco. Accordingly, the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section Final EIR/EIS appropriately focuses its analysis of alternatives on the existing Caltrain corridor between San Francisco and San Jose with stations in downtown San Francisco, Millbrae, and San Jose.</p> <p>Construction and operational noise impacts of the project have been fully analyzed in the EIR/EIS. Refer to Section 3.4, Noise and Vibration, in the Final EIR/EIS.</p>

#	First Name	Last Name	Business/Organization	Summary of Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Response/Status Update
09	Ben	Woosley	Individual	Commenter requested to be removed from the mailing list.	Commenter removed from the mailing list on June 21, 2022.
10	Marty	Medina	San Bruno Councilmember	Commenter asked if there was a summary of impacts for each city and stations available, specifically requesting a summary for the impacts on San Bruno.	The Authority scheduled a follow-up meeting with Councilmember Medina on July 7, 2022, which included a presentation summarizing impacts in the City of San Bruno.
11	Herschell	Larrick	Transbay Joint Powers Authority	Commenter expressed appreciation for the collaborative approach taken by the Authority related to the Downtown Rail Extension. The commenter also acknowledged the changes made by the Authority in response to their comments on the Draft EIR/EIS and they look forward to continued collaboration.	The Authority acknowledges the comment and appreciates Transbay Joint Powers Authority's efforts and ongoing collaboration throughout the environmental review process for this project.

#	First Name	Last Name	Business/ Organization	Summary of Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Response/Status Update
12	Jennifer	Shader	San Francisco County Transportation Authority; San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency; San Francisco Planning Department	<p>Commenter expressed support for the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section and the California HSR program as a whole, especially the transportation, economic, and climate change benefits.</p> <p>The commenter disagrees with the Authority's conclusion that there is no feasible mitigation available for the impact on MUNI Route 22 as described in Impact TR#11 in Section 3.2, Transportation, of the Final EIR/EIS, and suggests that a grade separation accommodating blended service at the 16th Street and Mission Bay Drive crossings would reduce the impact to less than significant under CEQA. The commenter also asserts that gate-down time at the 16th Street grade crossing will delay emergency vehicles serving UCSF medical facilities in Mission Bay. The commenter hopes to work closely with the Authority on this grade separation and suggests a fair share contribution toward the 16th Street grade separation be incorporated into the project decisions in August 2022 or as part of any future set of project modifications and supplemental environmental review.</p> <p>The commenter also looks forward to future work with the Authority regarding the proposed light maintenance facility, which would support long-term needs of rail operations in the Bay Area.</p>	<p>The Authority acknowledges the comment and appreciates the City and County of San Francisco's support.</p> <p>With respect to project impacts and mitigation at 16th Street, please refer to the Authority's responses to submissions 1139-894, 1139-895, and 1139-921 in Volume 4, Chapter 20 of the Final EIR/EIS. With respect to project impacts on emergency vehicle access to UCSF medical facilities in Mission Bay, please refer to the Authority's responses to submissions 1103-364 and 1103-365 in Volume 4, Chapter 23 of the Final EIR/EIS. The Authority supports the efforts of the City to advance grade separations in its jurisdiction and is committed to consultation with the City of San Francisco, PCJPB, and other relevant parties throughout final design of the HSR system.</p> <p>With respect to the proposed LMF, the Authority is committed to continued consultation with agencies and local jurisdictions throughout final design.</p>

#	First Name	Last Name	Business/Organization	Summary of Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Response/Status Update
13	Jean	Prijatel	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Commenter expressed appreciation for the collaborative approach taken by the Authority throughout the EIR/EIS process. The commenter also acknowledged the changes made by the Authority in response to their comments on the Draft EIR/EIS and Revised/Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS and noted no further comments on the Final EIR/EIS.	The Authority acknowledges the comment and appreciates the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's efforts throughout the environmental review to provide input as part of the consultation process for this project.
14	Jennifer	Hernandez	Baylands Development, Inc.	Commenter expressed concerns about the project's potential environmental impacts on planned development at the Brisbane Baylands and its future residents and visitors. The commenter also noted that they anticipate submitting a more detailed comment letter on the Final EIR/EIS in advance of the Authority's August Board meeting.	The Authority acknowledges the comment, which does not raise any new issues not previously raised on the Draft EIR/EIS. The Final EIR/EIS includes responses to prior comments from Baylands Development, Inc. (Submission 1115 in Volume 4) and fully analyzes impacts to planned development in the Brisbane Baylands area.

Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority

CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act

Draft EIR/EIS = San Francisco to San Jose Project Section Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

Final EIR/EIS = San Francisco to San Jose Project Section Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

HSR = high-speed rail

LMF = light maintenance facility

NOA = Notice of Availability

PCJPB = Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

PDF = portable document format

Revised/Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS = San Francisco to San Jose Project Section Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement

UCSF = University of California, San Francisco