

April 10, 2022

Dear California High-Speed Rail Authority:

This letter is a comment to the Authority's Draft 2022 Business Plan. I support California High-Speed Rail and the current "building block" plan considering the current funding to build the Bakersfield-Merced segment and then eventually to full Phase 1 San Francisco-Los Angeles project later adding Phase 2 connections to San Diego and Sacramento. I am disappointed that the Authority did not ask for more money outside of Proposition 1A bond and cap-and-trade funds from the State especially with the large surplus. Though to a certain extent, I understand that we have a misinformed Assembly speaker who thinks we can spend those Proposition 1A bond funds on non-high-speed rail projects and that high-speed hydrogen trains make sense. With that in mind, I will spend some time adding critiques to the Business Plan.

In the letter from the CEO on page v, Brian P. Kelly's signature has some speckle artifacts and looks low resolution. Please use a higher resolution image of his signature or consider recreating the signature using vector graphics, so it looks clean and professional.

The chapter markers seem to be broken, and it looks like incorrect heading markers are used. Please fix.

While the Authority has made good progress in delivering parcels, it appears that the Authority still struggles with utility relocations. What is the Authority's plan to remediate slow-as-snail utility relocations? I do not think it is enough to just summon a task force, and it is rather the utility owners that are slow. Consider asking the Legislature for more power to summon utility owners to design or relocate themselves their utilities or for the power to fine utility owners for delays. The pace right now is unacceptably slow.

I believe the Authority is not trying hard enough to procure private financing when it describes its plan on page 53. While it's true that financing such a large project with private money is difficult, I do not think it is as impossible as the Authority makes it to be. There is already private financing for high-speed passenger rail with Brightline West and Texas Central. While these projects have a smaller geographic footprint compared to the Phase 1 system, I do not see why private money cannot be procured for segments of the project. Private development of high-speed rail is also going to be cheaper as private companies do not have to follow "Buy America", Davis-Bacon, or "skilled-and-trained" provisions. The fact that the Authority does not have any timetable for private financing shows that it is not trying hard enough.

One missing part of this Business Plan is marketing and outreach. I talk to people who think that the project is cancelled. I see people who think that hyperloop is a good idea. Obviously, it would be nice not having to do outreach, but it's something the Authority must commit to do more. To that end, why has the Authority been slow and infrequent with updating the progress of construction on buildhsr.com? Also, I find it hard to believe that an east-coast newspaper writes a more balanced piece about the High-Speed Rail project than an in-state

newspaper. If you do not know which newspapers I am talking about, then you have not been following closely enough. Communicate more even to hostile newspapers.

To the approximately zero people who are not affiliated with the Authority reading this letter, please note that there are very likely fossil fuel industry sock puppets who lie about high-speed rail in California and in general. If you do not know who they are, you will see them, and it will become evident. Do not believe them.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Marcell Fulop". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large, prominent 'M' and 'F'.

Marcell Fulop