

Lesson Nine: Is the California High-Speed Rail A Viable Solution to Environmental Pollution?

Document A: Introduction to the California High Speed Rail Project

Directions: Read the excerpt below, adapted from information published about the project, much of it from the California High Speed Rail Authority, to understand the context of the California high speed rail project.



The California High Speed Rail Project is a high-speed rail system currently under construction in the state of California. The project is managed by the California High Speed Rail Authority, a state agency run by a board of governors. It is responsible for planning, designing, building and operating the first high-speed rail system in the nation. By 2029, the system is intended to run from San Francisco to the Los Angeles basin and will eventually extend to Sacramento and San Diego, totaling 800 miles with up to 24 stations. The California project is part of a proposed nationwide high speed rail system, which would be a huge infrastructure project, one of the largest in the history of the United States.



By the end of Phase 1, the route will connect Los Angeles with San Francisco at speeds up to 220 miles per hour (350 km/h), making the trip in 2 hours and 40 minutes (it takes approximately six hours to drive that distance in a car). The system is required by law to operate without a subsidy (a payment from the government), and to eventually connect the state's major cities in the San Francisco Bay Area, Central Valley, and Southern California.

Construction on the initial section from Merced to Bakersfield, in the Central Valley, began in 2015 and is expected to end in 2019. That track will be used for local service. High-speed rail service is expected to begin in 2022 after the rails are extended south to Burbank. Phase 1 is planned to be completed in 2029. In Phase 2 (no timetable yet), the system will be extended to the north (through the Central Valley to Sacramento) and to the south (to San Diego), reaching all the major population centers in the state.



Construction is only fully funded through 2019, although the project is now automatically getting cap-and-trade funding (payments to the government on the part of companies for the right to pollute) amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars annually. With an anticipated construction and planning cost of \$68.4 billion for Phase 1, the project is the most expensive public works project in United States history. The project has had to contend with a number of lawsuits seeking to stop it, but thus far they have only delayed it. A lawsuit that succeeds before 2019 is not likely to stop various projects already underway, but might delay or even halt a dedicated High Speed Rail service in the state.

One reason the California high speed rail project has been suggested is that it will reduce environmental pollution by reducing the volume of cars traveling through California. There are frequent travelers between the Bay Area and the Los Angeles area. The California High Speed Rail Association (CHSRA) projects that as many as 100 million people or more a year will ride the high speed trains, although other estimates cite ridership as low as 20 million people a year. These numbers are projected values only. There is not hard data to support either estimate. The construction of the project would create noise, air, and water pollution from associated work, and the final railroad would emit air pollution in addition to noise pollution.

Directions: Think about the questions below:

1. What are your initial reactions to the California high speed rail project?
2. What questions do you have about the California high speed rail project?

Directions: Read the documents below that describe the environmental impact of the California high speed rail system. Annotate the documents by highlighting, underlining, and taking notes about the environmental impact of the California high speed rail system. The impact could be positive or negative.

Document B

Source: From an article by Jacqueline Lee published in the *San Jose Mercury News*, a newspaper based in the San Francisco Bay Area serving cities through which the high speed rail would travel. Published 16 October 2015.

The California High Speed Rail Authority held four community meetings last month to initiate its environmental analysis of the 51-mile Peninsula portion of the line [from San Jose to San Francisco].

Councilman Pat Burt said the state agency’s goal to certify a final environmental report by summer 2017 is unrealistic.

“I think that what they are planning to do is a prescription for failure,” Burt said. “It is the sort of process that resulted in the horrendous backlash [for the project] previously.”

Burt, who previously served on the city’s Rail Committee, said Palo Alto should again rally other Bay Area cities to ask the rail authority and Caltrain [the local train service] to take a “context sensitive solutions” approach in evaluating high-speed rail on the Peninsula.

To do that, more time would be needed for a proper environmental review, the council agreed. Councilman Marc Berman said the state agency’s accelerated environmental review process is unreasonable and unnecessary.

“We should push back as forcefully as we can,” Berman said.

In a 7-0 vote, the council directed the mayor and city staff to convey its stance to the rail authority and Caltrain, asked the mayor to reappoint the Rail Committee and requested staff to plan a citywide context sensitive solutions approach to the future of rail in Palo Alto and the mid-Peninsula.

1. Does the author of this article seem to argue that the rail project is a viable solution to environmental pollution?
2. What evidence supports her argument?
3. What bias may impact the author’s opinion?
4. How does that bias impact your interpretation of her opinion?

Document C

Source: The projected benefits of the California high speed rail project identified by the California High Speed Rail Authority, the organization responsible for building the infrastructure project. Published 2010.

Transportation	Employment	Environmental Quality	Urban Vitality
Congestion relief on freeways and at airports	Up to 100,000 construction-related jobs	Improved air quality; Reduced greenhouse gas emissions by 12 billion pounds per year	Revitalized communities, economic development around stations
Faster travel between major metropolitan areas	Up to 450,000 permanent new jobs over 25 years created by HSR economic growth	Improved energy efficiency: 1/3 energy use of planes, 1/5 that of cars	Transit- and pedestrian-oriented infill development
Improved movement of people, goods and services		Reduced dependence on foreign oil: 12.7 million barrels less per year	Enhanced public safety due to separation of tracks and highways

1. Does the author of this article seem to argue that the rail project is a viable solution to environmental pollution?
2. What evidence supports their argument?
3. What bias may impact the author's opinion?
4. How does that bias impact your interpretation of their opinion?

Document D

Source: A letter from Enrique Manzanilla, Director of the Communities and Ecosystems Division of the Environmental Protection Agency, a federal organization responsible for environmental policy, to Mark Yachmetz, Associate Administrator of Railroad Development at the Federal Railroad Administration, summarizing the Environmental Protection Agency's review of the plan for the California high speed rail project. Published 24 October 2005.

EPA supports the concept of a high speed train system in California that can facilitate the movement of people, while minimizing environmental impacts.

While EPA has continuing concerns regarding the Final PEIS, our primary focus is to provide CHSRA with solid guidance in the development of future environmental analyses. We have included several recommendations to make the rail project more environmentally friendly.

Recommendation #1:

There are certainly impacts on the immediate landscape where the railroad is proposed that will have regional impacts. The final PEIS does not provide an explanation of the cumulative impact of the railroad on the resources across the state. EPA encourages CHSRA to improve the methodology used so that a more thorough cumulative impact assessment can contribute to project design.

Recommendation #2:

There are several proposed routes for this project. A coalition of the EPA and CHSRA will ensure that the final plan contains the least environmentally damaging route. EPA has identified potential impacts to aquatic resources of national importance, wetlands and water quality, wildlife habitats, and endangered species that would result from some proposed routes, through the construction of the project or the final route and implied pollution from the trains.

Recommendation #3:

EPA recommends that CHSRA follow through with commitments for analysis to avoid minimizing aquatic resources, negatively impacting Soledad Canyon and the Santa Clara River, and disrupting wildlife movement corridors with measures to maintain wildlife movement.

EPA continues to be supportive of the proposed project, and we look forward to maintaining our working relationship with CHSRA in the development of an environmentally protective high speed train system.

1. Does the author of this article seem to argue that the rail project is a viable solution to environmental pollution?
2. What evidence supports his argument?
3. What bias may impact the author's opinion?
4. How does that bias impact your interpretation of his opinion?

Document E

Source: The environmental benefits of the California high speed rail project, as outlined by the California High Speed Rail Authority. Published 2015.

The California High Speed Rail Authority is developing a high speed rail system that will deliver fast, direct travel between the state's major regions while providing environmental benefits. Simply expanding the state's existing transportation corridors could not deliver the same quality and level of benefits.

The high speed rail system will take cars off the road and reduce daily flights between major urban regions in California, thus boosting the state's economic productivity as more travelers and commuters take the train to get around the state, resulting in less congestion for drivers, less delay for air passengers, and reduced air pollution.

By 2040, the system will reduce vehicle miles of travel in the state by almost 10 million miles of travel every day. From the start of operations in 2022 through 2080, the system will reduce auto travel on the state's highways by over 400 billion miles of travel. Starting in 2030, the state will see a reduction of 93 to 171 flights daily. By 2040, the state will see a reduction of 97 to 180 flights daily. Air travel contributes significantly to carbon dioxide emissions.

Fewer cars on the road means improved air quality in the State. California has some of the most congested urban areas with the poorest air quality in the nation. Particularly in the summer months, residents of the Central Valley endure air quality linked to increased rates of asthma and other respiratory ailments. Fewer cars and a train that uses clean energy means cleaner air.

In 2010 alone, United States greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions totaled 6,821.8 million metric tons of carbon dioxide. California leads the nation in working to reduce the level of GHG emissions. In 2022, when the initial operating section of the rail system from Merced to the San Fernando Valley is running, the resulting GHG reductions will be between 100,000 to 300,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide in the first year. That is the equivalent of taking 17,700 to 53,000 personal vehicles off the road. Between 2022 and 2040, the cumulative reduction of carbon dioxide is estimated to be between 5 and 10 million metric tons.

1. Does the author of this article seem to argue that the rail project is a viable solution to environmental pollution?
2. What evidence supports their argument?
3. What bias may impact the author's opinion?
4. How does that bias impact your interpretation of their opinion?

Document F

Source: An article in the *San Jose Mercury News* by Juliet Williams, summarizing a lawsuit contesting the CHSRA's environmental claims about the California high speed rail project. Published 24 June 2014.

A San Rafael-based group filed a lawsuit against the California High Speed Rail Authority, arguing that the building the \$68 billion bullet train would create more pollution than it would reduce for at least a decade. The suit alleges that the board downplayed the harmful effects on the environment caused by the construction and existence of the train and exaggerated the potential environmental benefits of high-speed rail in its scoping plan, allowing the state to claim the bullet train will reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The lawsuit says the California High Speed Rail Authority conducted an “inadequate” environmental analysis “without doing its own independent analysis and evaluation of those impacts and their significance.” It says the board also failed to consider the pollution associated with “manufacturing the many thousands of tons of cement that would be needed for the project’s construction.”

1. Does the author of this article seem to argue that the rail project is a viable solution to environmental pollution?
2. What evidence supports her argument?
3. What bias may impact the author’s opinion?
4. How does that bias impact your interpretation of her opinion?

Developing an Argument

Directions: Answer the following questions. Use data from the documents to support your answers.

1. What are the possible environmental impacts of the high speed rail project? Are these impacts positive or negative? Think about the many subtopics of environmental impacts, such as the possible disruption of animal migration patterns, air pollution, runoff causing water pollution, and many more.
2. Do you think the projected values for ridership are accurate? Why or why not? What may impact ridership?
3. Do you think the projected values for costs are accurate? Why or why not? What could impact costs?
4. Do you think the projected values for the environmental benefits are accurate? Why or why not? What unintended consequences or externalities may occur?
5. Do you think a significant number of patrons will ride the high speed rail? Or will people continue to drive?
6. Will pollution occur during the production of the rail and during its existence?
7. Will the existence of the rail line counteract any pollution created during the production and existence of the rail line?
8. Is the high speed rail project a viable solution to environmental pollution in California? Why or why not?