

1 [Resolution in Support of the Pacheco Pass Alternative for the High-Speed Train System.]

2  
3 **Resolution urging the California High Speed Rail Authority to adopt the Preferred**  
4 **Network Alternative, Pacheco Pass to San Francisco (via San Jose), for the Central**  
5 **Valley to Bay Area portion of the High-Speed Train system including pursuit of**  
6 **Regional Rail commuter service via the Altamont Pass between Sacramento/Northern**  
7 **San Joaquin Valley and Oakland/San Jose in partnership with local and regional**  
8 **agencies and transit providers.**  
9

10 WHEREAS, the California High Speed Rail Authority was created in 1996 for the  
11 purpose of constructing a high-speed train capable of traveling up to 220 mph from San  
12 Francisco in the north, with stations in key cities in the Central Valley, to Los Angeles and  
13 Anaheim in the south, with an express trip taking less than 2 1/2 hours; and,

14 WHEREAS, the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) has completed the Final  
15 Program Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Bay  
16 Area to Central Valley portion of the High-Speed Train (HST) System, which included eight  
17 recent public meetings in August and September of 2007 in San Francisco, San Jose,  
18 Livermore, Oakland, Gilroy, Merced, Stockton and Sacramento; and,

19 WHEREAS, the CHSRA staff recommended a route through Pacheco Pass via San  
20 Jose to San Francisco as the Preferred Network Alternative; and,

21 WHEREAS, in addition, the CHSRA has also recommended pursuit of a "Regional  
22 Rail" commuter and HST service via the Altamont Pass between Sacramento/Northern San  
23 Joaquin Valley and Oakland/San Jose in partnership with local and regional agencies and  
24 transit providers; and,  
25

1           WHEREAS, the EIR/EIS concluded that “the Pacheco Pass alternative best meets the  
2 purpose and need for the proposed HST system and it minimizes impacts on wetlands, water  
3 bodies, and the environment” – in particular by avoiding construction of a new bay crossing -  
4 as well as “minimizing construction issues, which can lead to delay and cost escalation”; and,

5           WHEREAS, the EIR/EIS concluded that the HST system, when compared to building  
6 more highways and airports to meet the projected growth in intercity travel in California,  
7 would: reduce CO2 emissions by up to 17.6 billion pounds/year, reduce NOX emissions by up  
8 to 15.3 million pounds/year, reduce total organic gases by 10.2 million pounds/year, and  
9 would reduce California’s oil consumption by up to 22 million barrels/year even with future  
10 improvements to auto fuel efficiency; and,

11           WHEREAS the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has passed several prior  
12 resolutions since 1996 supporting the establishment of the California High Speed Rail system,  
13 and the San Francisco Mayor’s Office has worked with the High Speed Rail Authority in  
14 myriad ways to bring High Speed Rail to San Francisco’s future Transbay Terminal; now,  
15 therefore, be it

16           RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges the California High  
17 Speed Rail Authority, at their December 19, 2007 meeting, to adopt the proposed Preferred  
18 Network Alternative – Pacheco Pass to San Francisco (via San Jose), for the Central Valley to  
19 Bay Area portion of the California High-Speed Train system.