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Many people may be thinking, High-Speed Rail (HSR) is the best thing to ever happen to rail. Why on Earth would rail advocates be suing to stop it? I’m going to spend the next few minutes explaining exactly that.
Without +$26B from Feds, HSR is dead

Because the route is so bad, no private capital will take on ridership risk

Without private capital, HSR is dead

Despite spending $8B, no HSR or statewide service is forthcoming

If the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) actually wanted HSR, their Business Plan would be totally different, as this one doesn’t lead to HSR. The Business Plan is based on the premise that no private money will be invested in HSR until the State generates profits running passengers between the Central Valley and LA. I’m confident that will never happen, because it depends on an unattainable $26 billion in Federal funds.
The Central Valley Project looks like bait and switch to me, which has nothing to do with HSR. Downtown Fresno landowners have wanted for decades to get rid of the freight tracks, preferably at public expense. The Central Valley Project is strikingly similar to their plan. Rail advocates need to know, supporting this project will not inevitably lead to HSR. It is just money thrown down a hole.
How Did We Get Here?

- The principal design criterion was politics
- Politics infects all route decisions
- Common sense was ignored
- Biased EIRs justify political choices
- Engineers Gone Wild: Over $450M spent designing a gold-plated system that can never be built, due to bad project economics

CHSRA has consistently chosen inferior routes, then lied about it in the EIRs. I will discuss each decision separately. Contrary to the Authority’s claims of profitability, the rail industry’s refusal to invest in the project is proof the CHSRA’s plans will not result in a viable business. On a party-line vote, the legislature handed them $8B, even after the most informed Senators advised withholding the funding.
What Would A Non-Politicized HSR Project Look Like?

- Led by experienced HSR operator
- Pursued in business-like manner
- Public-Private partnership, with State paying for environmental studies
- Cost-effective: avoids viaducts, costly freight structures & other frills
- SF to LA HSR operational much sooner

SNCF, the French National Railway, offered to build a funded SF-LA project, and asked the Authority to conduct a public bidding process where they could compete. SNCF knew it could make money on a route it chose, partnered with the State. CHSRA flatly rejected their offer. The fact that the CHSRA kept the SNCF proposal secret, and refused to put the project out to bid, says that building HSR is not the CHSRA’s primary goal. I won’t speculate what that goal is, but their secrecy indicates that whatever it is is not in the public interest. They were unhappy when I got this story in the press, because it totally undercut their avowed intent to build HSR. While their Business Plan hopes for HSR in 2029, it fails to identify any way to fund it.
Jim Costa, now a congressman, insisted that HSR go through Valley cities for political reasons. At least one operator was willing to build HSR using I-5 but none were willing to build the Valley cities route. The LA Times carried a story that the Central Valley HSR project was a payoff to Costa, in exchange for his vote on the Affordable Care Act. California Rail News reported that the project’s location changed when Costa’s district was redistricted. The SNCF proposal that was rejected sought to use I-5 as a shorter distance path for SF-LA trips.
Upgraded Amtrak for Central Valley cities:
HSR-compatible trains to SF, LA & SAC on HSR tracks,
without the neighborhood disruption of HSR

Notice how incredibly straight the I-5 route, displayed in grey, is. That is hugely important in having a profitable system. The red line is the High-Speed Rail Authority’s adopted route. It is much longer and disruptive. The faded grey line is the proposed upgraded Amtrak line for Central Valley cities, which would greatly improve their connection to the rest of the state, without the very high impacts and expense of running a 200 mph train through cities.
Interestingly, one of the few good things former CEO van Ark did was to get the CHSRA Board to study the Grapevine again. Apparently, costs had gotten so ridiculous on the Palmdale route that commonsense engineering asserted itself momentarily. CHSRA Board Chair Dan Richard killed the study, apparently because LA development interests were unhappy.
In the 1999 analysis, staff proposed tunnels to bypass the beach communities that the train currently runs through. This avoided major environmental impacts.
Altamont Corridor compared to Pacheco
(1999 Corridor Evaluation Final Report)

- Lower environmental impacts
- Higher ridership
- Much better connection to Sacramento
- Less tunneling. Therefore, less costly
- 58 miles shorter to join Central Valley line
- Discarded because of politics

Why the CHSRA’s 13 year insistence on Pacheco and all the biased EIRs? It appears the Authority has had goals other than HSR, ever since it was founded. This is why we sued. The only non-downtown station on the system was proposed for a dairy farm in Los Banos owned by former Assemblyman Rusty Areias. Very well-connected Democratic funders were buying up land in Los Banos, years before the 2008 EIR that selected the Pacheco route.
Lawsuit Coalition

- Town of Atherton
- City of Menlo Park
- City of Palo Alto
- TRANSDEF
- CA Rail Foundation
- Planning and Conservation League

Also, Community Coalition on HSR, Mid-Peninsula Residents for Civic Sanity and Pat Giorni
## Our Lawsuits

### Bay Area-Central Valley EIRs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>EIR Type</th>
<th>Lawsuits</th>
<th>HSRA Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Statewide Final Program EIR</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>BA-CV EIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Final Program EIR</td>
<td>Atherton I</td>
<td>Decertified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Revised Final Program EIR</td>
<td>Atherton II</td>
<td>Decertified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Revised Final Program EIR</td>
<td>Atherton II</td>
<td>On Appeal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Partially Revised Final Program EIR</td>
<td>Atherton III</td>
<td>Hearing Nov. 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We’ve been fighting this thing since 2004, when the Draft EIR claimed Altamont allegedly didn't meet the project’s Purpose and Need. We thought the 2008 EIR was heavily biased towards Pacheco. In 2010, Elizabeth Alexis of CARRD discovered the ridership model had been tampered with to reduce Altamont ridership projections. All the briefs are available on this website, at [http://transdef.org/HSR/HSR.html](http://transdef.org/HSR/HSR.html)
There’s a good chance the CHSRA’s wasteful ineffective approach to High-Speed Rail will fail. We think experienced rail operators need the opportunity to bid on HSR, choosing a route they are willing to invest in. For HSR to get built in our state, we need a State agency dedicated to affordable, effective HSR. We need a base of informed HSR advocates ready to take up the cause.
I would like to invite you to join with us. Knowing you’re out there, supporting us, would be very helpful.