

Ms. Cynthia Brown
Chief, Section of Administration
Office of Proceedings Surface Transportation Board (STB)
395 E Street, S.W. Washington, D C. 20423-0111
Re: California High Speed Rail Project, Your Reference Number- FD-35724-0

ENTERED
Office of Proceedings
May 08, 2013
Part of
Public Record

Dear Ms. Brown

My name is Nick Garzilli. I live in West Hollywood, CA. I am a sustainable transport entrepreneur working at bringing breakthrough technologies that will solve our traffic and energy problems to reality. I request that the Surface Transportation Board (STB) deny the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) request for exemption of STB certification because if there is one project that needs oversight in this country it is this one.

Back in the historic election of 2008 I voted for high-speed rail (HSR), but what I voted for back then looks nothing like the project as it is now. In all current polling data Californians are now firmly AGAINST the project. Our governor is well liked, but his lowest numbers are associated with his unwavering support for CHSRA. This project has some huge question marks that are only getting bigger.

I grew up loving trains. Who doesn't like trains? Growing up in Los Angeles, the center of a car centric society, it is well known that there used to be trains everywhere in LA until the tracks were ripped up and buses and cars took over. Now, decades later and billions spent, a couple of Light Rail lines are built in LA and it is sold to the general public as a huge success in the future of green transport. It seems as though we make progress by going backwards in time. The same is true for the CHSRA project. Electric trains were going 180+mph in Maryland in 1889. Are we going to bring the future of transport to California by going back in time?

My change in support for the CHSRA project goes deeper than the current project being slower, more expensive, and not as green as sold to voters in 2008. In 2011 I learned about Evacuated Tube Transport Technologies (ET3) and other Personal Rapid Transit (PRT) technologies such as JPods and Skytran that are poised to make High Speed Rail (HSR) and Light Rail look like rotary telephones in the near future.

ET3 is where car sized capsules accelerated by electric power coast on maglev in an automated tube network without air friction. ET3 is faster than jets yet can accomplish 50 times more transportation per kWh than electric cars or trains at 1/10th the cost of HSR. At 350mph ET3 costs less than roads and will eventually be designed for international speeds of up to 4,000mph, all with proven technologies.

ET3 is designed to carry people AND cargo. CHSRA wants to tear up some of the most prime farmland in the nation, and to add insult to injury the "high speed" trains will not transport any produce. Without any clear agricultural benefits CHSRA is clearly going to be in violation of the California Williamson Act Program meant to protect farmland as well.

If you go to the CHSRA's website under the sustainability section you'll see the slogan "Planning for California's Green Future". Actually, part of the CHSRA's original plan was to raid the billions in carbon credit revenue sold under the cap-and-trade law to help pay for the train. That wouldn't work because the train isn't scheduled to open for service until 2022, two years after the 2020 goal of cutting Green House Gasses (GHG) to 1990 levels. The whole idea of HSR being green is a myth to begin with, especially compared to ET3.

In an April, 18th 2012 Los Angeles Times article by Ralph Vartabedian titled, "*Report urges delay in bullet train funding decisions*" one thing really stood out to me. In talking about the The California Legislative Analyst's Office report he says:

In addition, construction of the train will emit so much carbon dioxide that it could take 30 years before the system would actually achieve a net reduction.

So it will take 30 years of operating between Los Angeles and San Francisco, under CHSRA's most optimistic forecasts, to start to reduce GHG. I can just imagine the massive celebration in the year 2052 that marks this occasion. ET3 uses 1/20th the amount of materials to build than HSR and is at least 50 times more energy efficient. If ET3 were built instead of HSR it would literally be a couple of months before we experienced a dramatic reduction in GHG emissions.

In my view in order for green transport technologies to be successful they must be environmentally AND economically sustainable. HSR is neither. ET3 is both. I look forward to the days when the STB is certifying ET3 projects by the dozens. It should be fairly easy to certify ET3 compared to HSR, because many of the problems associated with trains just do not apply to ET3. ET3 is virtually silent, and it is impossible for the capsules to hit other people, cars, or animals because they travel in a completely closed network of tubes. Rain can't even hit the capsules. The capsules float on maglev so ET3 is virtually vibration free as well. Put solar panels on top of the tubes and it can all be powered by the sun.

I am curious what the future holds for the CHSRA project because within a couple of years ET3 will have a 3 mile demo built that will break the maglev speed record of 363mph. The demo will then be opened up as a ride so everyone can experience the true future of green transport. How do I know this? Because I am the ET3 licensee that is close to making it happen. CHSRA already has enough problems, but it may be ET3 that puts the nail in the coffin.

Respectfully submitted,

Nick Garzilli

nickgarzilli@gmail.com
310-729-6905