California High-Speed Rail Authority

Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section

Draft Project Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement

Appendix 2-H: Detailed Plan Consistency Analysis

February 2019

CALIFORNIA High-Speed Rail Authority

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being or have been carried out by the State of California pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated July 23, 2019, and executed by the Federal Railroad Administration and the State of California.

This page intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 2-H DETAILED PLAN CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

This appendix contains detailed tables in support of the plan consistency analyses described in Chapter 3, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures. Specifically, this appendix contains the following tables describing the consistency of the California High-Speed Rail Project Build Alternatives with the applicable local and regional plans:

- Table 2-H-1: Consistency with Regional and Local Policies—Air Quality and Global Climate Change (2 pages)
- Table 2-H-2: Summary of Local Plans, Policies, and Ordinances—Public Utilities and Energy (4 pages)
- Table 2-H-3: Urban Water Management Plans (1 page)
- Table 2-H-4: Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis—Public Utilities and Energy (38 pages)
- Table 2-H-5: Regional and Local Policy Analysis—Biological Resources and Wetlands (10 pages)
- Table 2-H-6: Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis—Hydrology and Water Quality (25 pages)
- Table 2-H-7: Summary of Local Plans, Policies, and Ordinances—Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources (3 pages)
- Table 2-H-8: Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis—Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources (30 pages)
- Table 2-H-9: Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis—Hazardous Materials and Wastes (2 pages)
- Table 2-H-10 Consistency with Regional Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies—Hazardous Materials and Wastes (1 page)
- Table 2-H-11: General Plans and Other Plans Considered—Safety and Security (6 pages)
- Table 2-H-12: Consistency with Local Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies—Socioeconomics and Communities (34 pages)
- Table 2-H-13: Consistency with Regional Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies—Socioeconomics and Communities (2 pages)
- Table 2-H-14: Consistency with Local Ordinances—Socioeconomics and Communities (1 page)
- Table 2-H-15: Consistency with Local Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies—Station Planning, Land Use, and Development (40 pages)
- Table 2-H-16: Consistency with Regional Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies—Station Planning, Land Use, and Development (2 pages)
- Table 2-H-17: Consistency with Local Ordinances—Station Planning, Land Use, and Development (1 page)
- Table 2-H-18: Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis—Agricultural Farmland and Forest Land (14 pages)
- Table 2-H-19: Consistency with Local Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies—Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (16 pages)
- Table 2-H-20: Consistency with Regional and Local Policies—Aesthetics and Visual Resources (1 page)

- Table 2-H-21: Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis—Aesthetics and Visual Resources (6 pages)
- Table 2-H-22: Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis—Cultural Resources (18 pages)
- Table 2-H-23: Consistency with Regional and Local Policies—Regional Growth (1 page)
- Table 2-H-24 Local General and Specific Plans—Regional Growth (3 pages)
- Table 2-H-25: Consistency with Regional Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies—Environmental Justice (1 page)
- Table 2-H-26: Consistency with Local Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies—Environmental Justice (2 pages)

Table 2-H-1 Consistency with Regional and Local Policies—Air Quality and Global Climate Change

Policy	Consistency
City of Bakersfield General Plan Conservation Element	
Bakersfield AQ Policy 1: Comply with and promote SJVAPCD control measures regarding ROGs.	**Consistent**
Bakersfield AQ Policy 3: Require dust abatement measures during significant grading and construction operations.	**Consistent**
Bakersfield AQ Policy 12: Encourage the use of mass transit, carpooling, and other transportation options to reduce vehicle miles traveled.	**Consistent**
Bakersfield AQ Policy 14: Establish park and ride facilities to encourage carpooling and the use of mass transit.	**Consistent**
Bakersfield AQ Policy 15: Promote the use of bicycles by providing attractive bicycle paths and requiring provision of storage facilities in commercial and industrial projects.	**Consistent**
Bakersfield AQ Policy 25: Require design of parking structures and ramps to provide adequate off-street storage for entering vehicles to minimize on-street congestion and avoid internal back-up and idling of vehicles.	**Consistent**
Bakersfield AQ Policy 26: Consider restriction or elimination of on-street parking for the purpose of providing increased road or intersection capacity during peak traffic hours.	**Consistent**
Bakersfield AQ Policy 27: Local governments should work with local transit authorities to increase the attractiveness of passenger staging areas through the provision of waiting shelters, landscaping and drinking fountains.	**Consistent**
City of Palmdale General Plan Environmental Resources Element	
Palmdale Policy ER5.1.1: Reduce the number of work-related trips through such means as promoting alternate work schedules, telecommuting, teleconferencing, company-sponsored ride share and alternative fuel vehicle programs developed under the County's Congestion Management Program, the use of Metro Link trains and other alternative modes of transportation to the workplace and the creation of additional park and ride facilities.	**Consistent**
Palmdale Policy ER5.1.2: Reduce vehicle non-work trips through merchant transportation incentives, distance learning, and transit system improvements.	**Consistent**
Palmdale Policy ER5.2.1: Reduce dust from unpaved roads and parking lots by requiring paving or vegetative stabilization of the unpaved areas; require that measures be taken at construction sites to prevent deposition of soil onto public rights-of-way.	**Consistent**
Palmdale Policy ER5.2.2: Encourage developers to maintain natural contours to the greatest degree possible, to eliminate the need for extensive land clearing, blasting, ground excavation, grading and cut and fill operations.	**Consistent**
Palmdale Policy ER5.2.3: Require erosion control measures on new development, including covering soil with straw mats or use of chemical soil and dust binders, followed by seeding and watering as soon as possible after grading to prevent fugitive dust.	**Consistent**
Palmdale Policy ER5.3.1: Promote the AVAQMD's efforts to eliminate emissions from such sources as excessive car dealership cold starts, excessive curb idling, emissions from advertising vehicles, and emissions from leaf blowers, among others, through assisting with implementation and enforcement of district programs once they are adopted.	**Consistent**

Policy	Consistency
Tehachapi General Plan Town Form Element	
Tehachapi Policy NR3: Reduce emissions for stationary point sources of air pollution (e.g., equipment at commercial and industrial facilities) and stationary area sources (e.g., wood-burning fireplaces & gas powered lawn mowers) which cumulatively, represent large quantities of emissions.	**Consistent**
Tehachapi Policy NR4b: Require that contractors include, in construction contracts, the following requirements, consistent with the East Kern District's Regulations: • Maintain construction equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer's specification for the duration of construction; • Minimize idling time of construction-related and/or, heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment; • Use alternative fuel construction equipment (i.e., compressed natural gas, liquid petroleum gas and unleaded gasoline); • Use 'add-on' control devices such as diesel oxidation, catalysts or particulate filters; • Use diesel equipment that meets the Air Quality Management District's certification standard for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines; • Limit construction hours/hours of operation of heavy-duty equipment.	**Consistent**
Tehachapi Policy NR4c: Locate new stationary sources of air pollutants, such as industrial facilities, at sufficient distances away from residential areas and facilities that serve sensitive receptors;	**Consistent**
Tehachapi Policy CH11: Maintain and improve Tehachapi's air quality through a variety of measures including greenhouse gas emissions reduction measures.	**Consistent**
Tehachapi Policy TF55. Pro-actively cooperate with the state to implement AB 32 to achieve the required greenhouse gas emissions reductions.	**Consistent**
Tehachapi Policy TF56. In cooperation with the state and Kern COG proactively promote implementation of SB 375.	**Consistent**
Tehachapi Policy TF57. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to climate change with efforts in the following areas: energy; land use; transportation; buildings; waste; ecology; government operations; and communications and programs.	**Consistent**

AB = Assembly Bill
AVAQMD = Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District
COG = Council of Governments
ROG = reactive organic gas
SB = Senate Bill
SJVAPCD = San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

Table 2-H-2 Summary of Local Plans, Policies, and Ordinances—Public Utilities and Energy

Policy Title	Summary
Kern County	
Kern County General Plan (2009), Land Use, Open Space and Conservation Element, Public Facilities and Services	The Kern County General Plan Public Facilities and Services Element provides goals and policies associated with the development of public service infrastructure; the distribution of facility costs for new development; the collection, treatment, and disposal of sewage and refuse; the maintenance of water supply and quality; and the provision of adequate landfill capacity and effective groundwater resource management.
Kern County Municipal Code, Title 14, Utilities	This section of the Kern County Municipal Code provides regulations for water supply and sewer systems, including wells, private sewer disposal and drainage systems, and stormwater.
Kern County Integrated Waste Management Plan (Kern County Public Works Department as amended in 2015)	The Kern County Integrated Waste Management Plan addresses issues pertaining to waste disposal and other waste facilities.
Kern County CSA-71 Sewer Master Plan 2010 Update	The CSA-71 Sewer Master Plan 2010 Update provides information with regard to new development, changes to the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan, and the expansion of the City of Bakersfield's corporate limits since the master plan was last updated in March 2004.
Los Angeles County	
Los Angeles County General Plan (2015), Conservation and Open Space Element	The county's role in the protection, conservation, and preservation of natural resources and open space areas is vital, as most of the natural resources and open space areas in Los Angeles County are located within the unincorporated areas. The County of Los Angeles must act as the steward for the county's natural resources and available open space areas, and must conserve and protect these lands and resources from inappropriate development patterns. The Conservation and Natural Resources Element guides the long-term conservation of natural resources and preservation of available open space areas. The Conservation and Natural Resources Element addresses the following conservation areas: open space resources; biological resources; local water resources; agricultural resources; mineral and energy resources; scenic resources; and historic, cultural and paleontological resources.
Los Angeles County General Plan (2015) Public Services and Facilities Element	As Los Angeles County continues to grow, the demand for public facilities and infrastructure will increase. This element provides a summary of some of the major public services and facilities that serve the unincorporated areas, and establishes policies that guide the provision of public services and facilities. The Public Services and Facilities Element promotes the orderly and efficient planning of public facilities and infrastructure in conjunction with land use development and growth. This element focuses on services and facilities that are affected the most by growth and development: drinking water; sanitary sewers; solid waste; utilities; early care and education; and libraries. The element also discusses the key role of collaboration among county agencies in efficient and effective service provision and facilities planning.
Los Angeles County Municipal Code, Title 20, Utilities	This section of the Los Angeles County Municipal Code provides regulations for water supply and sewer systems, including wells, private sewer disposal and drainage systems, and stormwater.
Los Angeles County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (as amended in 2014)	The Los Angeles County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan addresses issues pertaining to waste disposal and other waste facilities.

Policy Title	Summary
City of Bakersfield	
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (2002) Public Services and Facilities Element	The Public Services and Facilities Element of the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan provides goals and policies associated with funding new services and facilities in areas of new development; the provision of adequate water service, sewer service, trunk sewer availability, storm drainage facilities, and solid waste disposal services; and the development of resource recovery and recycling systems.
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (2002) Conservation Element	The Conservation Element of the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan addresses biological resources, mineral resources, soils and agriculture, water resources, and air quality within the plan area.
Bakersfield Municipal Code, Title 14, Water and Sewers	This section of the Bakersfield Municipal Code provides regulations for water and sewer services.
Community of Edison	
There are no local planning documents associated with public utilities or energy for the community of Edison. Refer to the discussion of the Kern County General Plan (2009) above.	
Community of Keene	
Keene Ranch Specific Plan (1997), Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element	This section addresses Kern County's responsibility to provide adequate public facilities to its residents. Public facilities are defined as the basic physical structures and infrastructure, including roads, parks, water distribution and storage systems, sewage collection and treatment facilities, and flood control and storm drainage systems.
Community of Golden Hills	
Golden Hills Specific Plan (1986), Land Use Open Space and Conservation Element	This section is meant to provide adequate public facilities and community services throughout the Golden Hills area to meet the needs of property owners and residents in order to ensure development of essential and necessary public amenities.
City of Tehachapi	
Tehachapi General Plan (2012), Sustainable Infrastructure Element	The Sustainable Infrastructure Element informs and guides the supplying infrastructure of energy and resources and the manner in which the supporting infrastructure attaches the town to the natural built environment.
Greater Tehachapi Area Specific Plan (2010), Conservation Element	This element contains a discussion of existing open space and conservation land use conditions and identifies open space and conservation issues within the plan area. The identified issues provide direction for developing goals and policies to guide open space and conservation decisions in the subsequent implementation of the plan.
Greater Tehachapi Area Specific Plan (2010), Sustainability Element	This element contains a discussion of sustainability strategies that have been identified for the greater Tehachapi area, including measures related to infrastructure and utilities.
Tehachapi Municipal Code, Title 13, Public Services	This section of the Tehachapi Municipal Code provides regulations for water and sewer services.
City of Tehachapi Sewer System Management Plan (2012)	This plan provides the City of Tehachapi with a means to properly manage, operate, and maintain all portions of the city's wastewater collection system; provide adequate capacity to carry peak capacity flows; protect surface and groundwater supplies; protect public health by minimizing the frequency of sewer system overflows; mitigate the impacts associated with all overflows that may occur; comply with all applicable regulatory notification and reporting requirements; and educate the public on proper sewer practices.

Policy Title	Summary
Community of Rosamond	
Rosamond Specific Plan (2008), Land Use Element, Section V. Public Facilities, Goals 1-3, Policies 1, 3, and 7	This section addresses Kern County's responsibility to provide adequate public facilities to its residents. Public facilities are defined as the basic physical structures and infrastructure, including roads, parks, water distribution and storage systems, sewage collection and treatment facilities, and flood control and storm drainage systems.
City of Lancaster	
Lancaster General Plan (2009) 2030, Plan for Municipal Services and Facilities Element	The Plan for Municipal Services and Facilities Element of the City of Lancaster General Plan 2030 provides goals and policies to ensure the coordination of development activity with the provision of public services and facilities in order to eliminate gaps in service provision, provide economical public services, and achieve the equitable sharing of the cost of such facilities and services.
Lancaster Municipal Code, Title 13, Public Services	This section of the Lancaster Municipal Code provides regulations for water and sewer services.
Lancaster Master Drainage Plan (2005)	This plan addresses drainage changes as a result of the types of drainage facilities present and changes in runoff throughout the City of Lancaster.
City of Palmdale	
Palmdale General Plan (1993), Environmental Resources Element,	The Environmental Resources Element of the Palmdale General Plan addresses the related issues of resource conservation and open space, and provides a basis to evaluate existing resources and plan for their protection.
Palmdale General Plan (1993), Public Services Element	The Public Services Element of the Palmdale General Plan presents a plan for ensuring that public services and infrastructure are available to permit orderly growth and to promote public health, safety, and welfare.
Palmdale Energy Action Plan (2011)	This Energy Action Plan demonstrates the City of Palmdale's commitment to achieving energy efficiency and independence by reducing greenhouse gas emissions consistent with state legislation. The city will reduce energy demand and related emissions from city government operations and facilitate reductions in the community through the goals, measures, and actions identified in this plan. These efforts will sustain the economic, environmental, and physical health of the community and provide the highest quality of life possible. Specifically, this plan helps to ensure that Palmdale continues to thrive as a place to call home and a place where businesses can grow.
Palmdale Municipal Code, Title 13, Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste and Title 14, Environmental Management	These sections of the Palmdale Municipal Code provide regulations for water and sewer services.
Palmdale Utility Services Division Sewer System Management Plan (2009)	This SSMP was prepared in compliance with the SWRCB Order 2006-0003: Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, as revised by Order No. WQ 2013.0058.EXEC on September 9, 2013. The Waste Discharge Requirements prohibit sanitary sewer overflows and require reporting of sewer system overflows using the statewide electronic reporting system. The SSMP is updated as needed to reflect changes to the SSMP elements by city staff in conformance with Waste Discharge Requirements for biannual audits.

SSMP = Safety and Security Management Plan
SWRCB = State Water Resources Control Board

Urban Water Management Plans are prepared by California's urban water suppliers to support their long-term resource planning and ensure adequate water supplies are available to meet existing and future water demands. Every urban water supplier that either provides over 3,000 acre-feet of water annually or serves more than 3,000 urban connections is required to assess the reliability of its water sources over a 20-year planning horizon and report its progress on 20 percent reduction in per-capita urban water consumption by the year 2020, as required in the Water Conservation Bill of 2009 SB X7-7. Table 2-H-3 shows the applicable Urban Water Management Plans for this section of the HSR project.

Table 2-H-3 Urban Water Management Plans

Plan Title	Areas Served Within Study Area
Kern County	
City of Bakersfield 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (2014)	City of Bakersfield
California Water Service Company 2015 Urban Water Management Plan Bakersfield District (2016)	City of Bakersfield and parts of unincorporated Kern County adjacent to the City of Bakersfield
Arvin-Edison Water Storage District Water Management Plan Update (2015)	City of Bakersfield
Draft Greater Tehachapi Area – 2015 Regional Urban Water Management Plan (2016)	City of Tehachapi and Community of Golden Hills
Rosamond Community Services District Urban Water Management Plan (2010)	Community of Rosamond and unincorporated Kern County
Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency, California, 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (2016)	Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, and unincorporated Los Angeles County
California Water Service Company 2015 Urban Water Management Plan Antelope Valley District (2016)	Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, and unincorporated Los Angeles County
2010 Integrated Regional Urban Water Management Plan for the Antelope Valley, Los Angeles County, Department of Public Works Waterworks District No. 40 (2011)	Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, and unincorporated Los Angeles County
2015 Palmdale Water District Urban Water Management Plan (2016)	City of Palmdale and unincorporated Los Angeles County

Source: California High Speed Rail (2016)

Table 2-H-4 Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis—Public Utilities and Energy

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Kern County General Plan (2009): Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element, Public Facilities and Services			
Goal 1: Kern County residents and business should receive adequate and cost effective public services and facilities. The County will compare new urban development proposals and land use changes to the required public services and facilities needed for the proposed project.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not preclude the provision of adequate public services or facilities available to development in Kern County because the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the HSR project.
Goal 5: Ensure that adequate supplies of quality (appropriate for intended use) water are available to residential, industrial, and agricultural users within Kern County.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not preclude the provision of adequate quality water supplies available to development in Kern County because the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the HSR project.
Goal 7: Facilitate the provision of reliable and cost effective utility services to residents of Kern County.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that construction and operation of the HSR project in Kern County would not preclude the provision of reliable and cost-effective utility services for county residents.
Goal 9: Serve the needs of industries and Kern County residents in a manner that does not degrade the water supply and the environment and protect the public health and safety by avoiding surface and subsurface nuisances resulting from the disposal of hazardous wastes, irrespective of the geographic origin of the waste.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would dispose of hazardous wastes in accordance with applicable requirements, including the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (Section 3.10, Hazardous Materials and Wastes). A certified hazardous waste collection company would deliver the waste to an authorized hazardous waste management facility for recycling or disposal.
Goal 10: Ensure landfill capacity for Kern County residents and industries.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** During operation, the HSR project would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of the HSR infrastructure. Operation of the Bakersfield Station would result in the generation of municipal solid waste. As discussed in Impact PUE&E#4, the HSR project would be required to comply with the 2010 CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated (CalRecycle 2012). The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills (Authority 2013). Therefore, the proposed HSR project would not result in inadequate landfill capacity for residents of Kern County.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy 1: New discretionary development will be required to pay its proportional share of the local costs of infrastructure improvements required to service such development.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not preclude the adequate provision of available public services or facilities to development in Kern County because the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project.
Policy 3: Individual projects will provide availability of public utility service as per approved guidelines of the serving utility.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that all public utility services affected as a result of the HSR project continue to provide adequate availability per approved guidelines of the serving utility.
Policy 13: The County will ensure landfill capacity for the residents and industry of Kern County.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** During operation, the HSR project would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of the HSR infrastructure. Operation of the Bakersfield Station would result in the generation of municipal solid waste. As discussed below in Impact PUE&E#4, the HSR project would be required to comply with the 2010 CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated (CalRecycle 2012). The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills (Authority 2013). Therefore, the proposed HSR project would not result in inadequate landfill capacity for residents or industries in Kern County.
Los Angeles County General Plan (2015):Conservation and Open Space Element			
Goal C/NR 5: Protected and useable local surface water resources.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with protection of local surface water resources.
Policy C/NR 5.1: Support the LID philosophy, which seeks to plan and design public and private development with hydrologic sensitivity, including limits to straightening and channelizing natural flow paths, removal of vegetative cover, compaction of soils, and distribution of naturalistic BMPs at regional, neighborhood, and parcel-level scales.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with LID standards.
Policy C/NR 5.2: Require compliance by all County departments with adopted Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), General Construction, and point source NPDES permits.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with required water quality permits.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy C/NR 5.5: Manage the placement and use of septic systems in order to protect nearby surface water bodies.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with water quality protection measures.
Policy C/NR 5.6: Minimize point and non-point source water pollution.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with minimizing water pollution.
Policy C/NR 5.7: Actively support the design of new and retrofit of existing infrastructure to accommodate watershed protection goals, such as roadway, railway, bridge, and other—particularly—tributary street and greenway interface points with channelized waterways.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with watershed protection.
Goal C/NR 6: Protected and usable local groundwater resources.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with protection of local groundwater resources.
Policy C/NR 6.1: Support the LID philosophy, which incorporates distributed, post-construction parcel-level storm water infiltration as part of new development.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with LID standards.
Policy C/NR 6.2: Protect natural groundwater recharge areas and regional spreading grounds.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with protection of groundwater recharge areas.
Policy C/NR 6.4: Manage the placement and use of septic systems in order to protect high groundwater.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with protection of groundwater.
Policy C/NR 6.5: Prevent storm water infiltration where inappropriate and unsafe, such as in areas with high seasonal groundwater, on hazardous slopes, within 100 feet of drinking water wells, and in contaminated soils.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with prevention of stormwater infiltration where appropriate.
Goal C/NR 7: Protected and healthy watersheds.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with protection of watersheds.
Policy C/NR 7.1: Support the LID philosophy, which mimics the natural hydrologic cycle using undeveloped conditions as a base, in public and private land use planning and development design.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with LID standards.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Goal C/NR 12: Sustainable management of renewable and non-renewable energy resources.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The project design incorporates elements that minimize electricity consumption (e.g., using regenerative breaking and energy-saving equipment and facilities). The project would be constructed and operated in an energy-efficient manner. For example, renewable energy would power the HSR system to the extent feasible. Therefore, the HSR project would reduce energy demand through energy conservation and efficiency. The HSR project system would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections for all planning, procurement, design, construction, operations, and maintenance of facilities. The goal for facilities is, where appropriate for the climate, to work toward potable water self-sufficiency through consumption reduction, recycling, and on-site capture and storage. Stormwater would be either managed on-site to supply the facility's internal water demands and landscaping, or released for management through acceptable natural time-scale surface flow, groundwater recharge, agricultural use, or adjacent building needs. The HSR plantings would be drought-resistant plants wherever reasonable.
Policy C/NR 12.1: Encourage the production and use of renewable energy resources.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** To enhance the benefits of the HSR system, the Authority has set a goal of procuring renewable electricity to provide power for HSR operations. The Authority accessed technical assistance from the Department of Energy's NREL through the USEPA as part of this partnership. The NREL developed a SEP (NREL 2011) that provides signatory agencies and the Authority with guidelines to meet the goals established in the MOU. The SEP recommended a net-zero approach to powering operations with 100% renewable energy.
Policy C/NR 12.2: Encourage the effective management of energy resources, such as ensuring adequate reserves to meet peak demands.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Operation of the HSR system would increase the demand for electricity in the study area but reduce the overall demand for energy as a result of the decreased number of road vehicle and airplane trips. Operation of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section of the HSR system would contribute approximately 14% to the increase in demand for electricity and to the overall reduction of energy consumption in California. The projected peak demand of the HSR system is not anticipated to exceed existing reserve amounts, energy providers have sufficient information to include the HSR in their demand forecasts. Therefore,

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
			the intensity of impacts associated with the increased demand for electricity would be negligible within the regional and statewide contexts. The reduction of energy demands associated with reduced vehicle miles traveled and airplane travel would have a statewide beneficial impact.
Policy C/NR12.3: Encourage distributed systems that use existing infrastructure and reduce environmental impacts.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would avoid impacts to existing utility facilities where feasible, and would either protect-in-place or relocate infrastructure through a means that reduces environmental impacts.
Los Angeles County General Plan (2015): Public Services and Facilities Element			
Goal PS/F 1: A coordinated, reliable, and equitable network of public facilities that preserves resources, ensures public health and safety, and keeps pace with planned development.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would either protect in place or relocate public facilities affected by the HSR project in a way that preserves resources, ensures public health and safety, and keeps pace with planned development.
Policy PS/F 1.2: Ensure that adequate services and facilities are provided in conjunction with development through phasing or other mechanisms.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would coordinate with local utility providers during construction and operation of the HSR project to ensure that adequate services and facilities are maintained. Examples of coordination activities include issuance of underground service alerts and public notices advertising anticipated disruption in utility services during construction of the HSR project.
Policy PS/F 1.3: Ensure coordinated service provision through collaboration between County departments and service providers.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would coordinate with local utility providers during construction and operation of the HSR project to ensure that adequate services and facilities are maintained. Examples of coordination activities include issuance of underground service alerts and public notices advertising anticipated disruption in utility services during construction of the HSR project.
Goal PS/F 2: Increased water conservation efforts.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** During construction and operation, the HSR system would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections. Where appropriate, the HSR system would work toward potable water self-sufficiency.
Policy PS/F 2.1: Support water conservation measures.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** During construction and operation, the HSR system would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections. Where appropriate, the HSR system would work toward potable water self-sufficiency.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Goal PS/F 4: Reliable sewer and urban runoff conveyance treatment systems.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with reliable sewer and runoff conveyance treatment systems.
Goal PS/F 5: Adequate disposal capacity and minimal waste and pollution.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would comply with the adopted county solid waste management plan. During operation, the HSR project would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of the HSR infrastructure. As discussed below in Impact PUE&E#4, the HSR project would be required to comply with the 2010 CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated (CalRecycle 2012). The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills (Authority 2013). Furthermore, adequate landfill disposal capacity exists for accommodation of wastes generated by the HSR project in Los Angeles County.
Policy PS/F 5.1: Maintain an efficient, safe and responsive waste management system that reduces waste while protecting the health and safety of the public.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** During operation, the HSR project would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of the HSR infrastructure. As discussed below in Impact PUE&E#4, the HSR project would be required to comply with the 2010 CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated (CalRecycle 2012). The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills (Authority 2013). Therefore, the HSR project would not interfere with the maintenance of an efficient, safe, and responsive waste management system.
Policy PS/F 5.5: Reduce the County's waste stream by minimizing waste generation and enhancing diversion.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** During operation, the HSR project would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of the HSR infrastructure. Operation of the Palmdale Station would result in the generation of municipal solid waste. As discussed below in Impact PUE&E#4, the HSR project would be required to comply with the 2010 CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated (CalRecycle 2012). The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
			recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills (Authority 2013).
Policy PS/F 5.7: Encourage the recycling of construction and demolition debris generated by public and private projects.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would comply with the adopted county solid waste management plan. During operation, the HSR project would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of the HSR infrastructure. As discussed below in Impact PUE&E#4, the HSR project would be required to comply with the 2010 CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated (CalRecycle 2012). The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills (Authority 2013).
Policy PS/F 5.8: Ensure adequate and regular waste and recycling collection services.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** During operation, the HSR project would not generate municipal waste, with the exception of waste from routine maintenance. During construction, the Authority would ensure that waste and recyclable are adequately and regularly collected.
Policy PS/F 5.9: Encourage the availability of trash and recyclables containers in new developments, public streets, and large venues.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** During construction, the Authority would ensure the availability of trash and recyclable containers for appropriate disposal of construction and demolition waste. During operation, there are no facilities that are anticipated to generate waste within unincorporated Los Angeles County. Therefore, the availability of trash and recyclable containers would not be necessary.
Goal PS/F 6: A County with adequate public utilities.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not preclude the adequate provision of available public services or facilities to development in Los Angeles County because the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project.
Policy PS/F 6.1: Ensure efficient and cost-effective utilities that serve existing and future needs.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not preclude the adequate provision of available public services or facilities to development in Los Angeles County because the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy PS/F 6.4: Protect and enhance utility facilities to maintain the safety, reliability, integrity and security of utility services.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that all communication service providers' facilities are either protected in place or relocated if they would be in conflict with any of the proposed HSR project improvements. If facilities must be relocated, the Authority would ensure that relocation of the utilities would not result in adverse impacts to the safety, reliability, integrity, or security of utility services.
Policy PS/F 6.6: Encourage the construction of utilities underground, where feasible.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** If utilities must be relocated as a result of a conflict with the HSR project in unincorporated Los Angeles County, the Authority would relocate the utilities underground where feasible.
Policy PS/F 6.7: Discourage aboveground electrical distribution and transmission lines in hazard areas.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** If utilities must be relocated as a result of a conflict with the HSR project in unincorporated Los Angeles County, the Authority would ensure that any aboveground electrical distribution and transmissions lines are not relocated in hazard areas.
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (2002) : Public Services and Facilities Element			
General Utility Services Goal 1: Maintain a coordinated planning and implementation program for the provision of public utilities to the planning area.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** During construction of the HSR project in the Bakersfield metropolitan area, the Authority would ensure coordinated provision of utilities services, including prior notification of utilities customers for any planned disruptions in service. During operation, the HSR project would not interfere with the provision of public utilities as all utility facilities would be upgraded or relocated, as applicable, to ensure continued service within the planning area.
General Utility Services Goal 2: Coordinate the planning and implementation of planning area municipal-type utility facilities and services.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** During construction of the HSR project in the Bakersfield metropolitan area, the Authority would ensure coordinated provision of utilities services, including prior notification of utilities customers for any planned disruptions in service. During operation, the HSR project would not interfere with the provision of public utilities as all utility facilities would be upgraded or relocated, as applicable, to ensure continued service within the planning area.
General Utility Services Policy 3: Municipal-type utility services within the City's sphere of influence (or designated urban area) should be provided.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** During construction of the HSR project in the Bakersfield metropolitan area, the Authority would ensure coordinated provision of utilities services, including prior notification of utilities customers for any planned disruptions in service. During operation, the HSR project would not interfere with the provision of public utilities as all utility facilities would be upgraded or relocated, as applicable, to ensure continued service within the city's sphere of influence.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
General Utility Services Policy 5: Require all new development to pay its pro rata share of the cost of necessary expansion in municipal utilities, facilities, and infrastructure for which it generates demand and upon which it is dependent.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** The HSR project in the Bakersfield metropolitan area would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project.
Water Distribution Goal 1: Ensure the provision of adequate water service to all developed and developing portions of the planning area.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** The HSR project in the Bakersfield metropolitan area would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project, including utility services associated with the adequate provision of water services.
Water Distribution Policy 2: Continue to provide domestic water facilities which are contributed directly be developers, through development and/or availability fees.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** The HSR project in the Bakersfield metropolitan area would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project, including utility services associated with the adequate provision of water services.
Water Distribution Policy 3: Require that all new development proposals have an adequate water supply available.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** The Authority would coordinate with local water districts and water suppliers to ensure that the HSR project would have adequate water supplies available during both construction and operation.
Sewer Service Goal 1: Ensure the provision of adequate sewer service to serve the needs of existing and planned development in the planning area.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** The HSR project in the Bakersfield metropolitan area would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project, including utility services associated with the adequate provision of sewer services.
Sewer Service Goal 2: Provide trunk sewer availability to and treatment/disposal capacity for all metropolitan urban areas, to enable cessation or prevention of the use of septic tanks where such usage creates potential public health hazards or may impair groundwater quality, and to assist in the consolidation of sewerage systems. Provide sewer service for urban development regardless of jurisdiction.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that adequate trunk sewer capacity is available as a result of the increased wastewater demand generated by the HSR project. During operation, the HSR system itself is not anticipated to generate wastewater. Wastewater generation at maintenance facilities and stations would be provided adequate trunk sewer capacity through sewer system improvements, if necessary.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Sewer Service Policy 1: Effect the consolidated collection, treatment, and disposal of wastewater from all urban development within the metropolitan area, discouraging the creation or expansion of separate systems and encouraging the consolidation and interconnection of existing separate systems.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** The HSR project would consolidate wastewater services wherever possible where sewer relocation or upgrades are necessitated as a result of the HSR project in the Bakersfield metropolitan area.
Storm Drainage Goal 1: Ensure the provision of adequate storm drainage facilities to protect planning area residents from flooding resulting from storm water excess.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with provision of adequate drainage and stormwater facilities.
Storm Drainage Goal 2: Maintain a comprehensive storm drainage system which serves all urban development within the planning area.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with storm drainage systems.
Solid Waste Goal 1: Ensure the provision of adequate solid waste disposal services to meet the demand for these services in the planning area.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** During operation, the HSR project would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of the HSR infrastructure. Through compliance with AB 341 and AB 939, waste generated by the operation of the Bakersfield Station is not anticipated to be substantial. As discussed below in Impact PUE&E#4, the HSR project would be required to comply with the 2010 CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated (CalRecycle 2012). The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills (Authority 2013).Therefore, the HSR project would not interfere with the implementation of the City of Palmdale's adopted SWMP.
Solid Waste Policy 1: Comply with, and update as required, the adopted county solid waste management plan.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** During operation, the HSR project would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of the HSR infrastructure. Through compliance with AB 341 and AB 939, waste generated by the operation of the Bakersfield Station is not anticipated to be substantial. As discussed below in Impact PUE&E#4, the HSR project would be required to comply with the 2010 CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated (CalRecycle

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
			2012). The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills (Authority 2013).Therefore, the HSR project would not interfere with the implementation of the City of Palmdale's adopted SWMP.
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (2002): Conservation Element			
Water Resources Goal 1: Conserve and augment the available water resources of the planning area.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** During construction and operation, the HSR system would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections. Where appropriate, the HSR system would work towards potable water self-sufficiency.
Water Resources Goal 2: Assure that adequate groundwater resources remain available to the planning area.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** During construction and operation, the HSR system would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections. Where appropriate, the HSR system would work towards potable water self-sufficiency. Therefore, the HSR project would minimize impacts to groundwater supplies and would not interfere with maintaining their availability in the planning area.
Water Resources Goal 3: Assure that adequate surface water supplies remain available to the planning area.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** During construction and operation, the HSR system would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections. Where appropriate, the HSR system would work towards potable water self-sufficiency. Therefore, the HSR project would minimize impacts to surface water supplies and would not interfere with maintaining their availability in the planning area.
Water Resources Goal 5: Achieve a continuing balance between competing demands for water resource usage.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** During construction and operation, the HSR system would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections. Where appropriate, the HSR system would work towards potable water self-sufficiency. Therefore, the increase in water demand associated with the HSR project is not anticipated to be substantial.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Water Resources Policy 2: Minimize the loss of water which could otherwise be utilized for groundwater recharge purposes and benefit planning are groundwater aquifers from diversion to locations outside the area.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate appropriate design measures to ensure that stormwater is either managed on-site to supply the facility's internal water demands and landscaping, or released for management through acceptable natural time-scale surface flow, groundwater recharge, agricultural use, or adjacent building needs. Therefore, the HSR project would minimize the loss of water that could otherwise be utilized for groundwater recharge purposes.
Water Resources Policy 6: Protect planning area groundwater resources from further quality degradation.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with prevention of groundwater quality deterioration.
Water Resources Implementation 6: Support the provision of adequate wastewater collection systems and treatment reclamation and disposal facilities which will prevent groundwater degradation by on-site wastewater systems.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with prevention of groundwater quality deterioration through adequate wastewater collection and treatment systems.
Water Resources Implementation 10: Support additional water conservation measures and programs of benefit to the planning area.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** During construction and operation, the HSR system would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections. Where appropriate, the HSR system would work towards potable water self-sufficiency.
Keene Ranch Specific Plan (1997): Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element, Section 2.2, Public Facilities			
Goal: To provide adequate public services and facilities to meet projected community need.	Keene	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project in Keene would not preclude the adequate provision of available public services or facilities to development in Keene as the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project.
Policy 1: All infrastructure (e.g., streets and roads, sewers, and water distribution facilities) for the project will be constructed or funded privately by the applicant or developers of individual tracts, or funded through Mello-Roos or special assessment districts or comparable funding mechanisms. All required public service facilities (e.g., schools and fire stations), will be constructed or funded privately by the applicant or developers of	Keene	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project in Keene would not preclude the adequate provision of available public services or facilities to development in Keene as the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the HSR project.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
individual tracts, or funded through Mel-Roos or special assessment districts, or comparable funding mechanisms (excepting storm drains) , or public funds. The provisions of this Specific Plan regarding particular types of public facilities, such as fire stations, will establish the applicable policies and implementation measures.			
Policy 25: The storm drain system will be designed to accommodate stormflows from present and future development within the Plan area.	Keene	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with provision of adequate storm drain facilities.
Policy 29: The applicant will comply with all utility company guidelines with regard to easement restriction, construction, protection of pipeline easement and amendments to existing utility rights of way.	Keene	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure compliance with all applicable utility company guidelines required as a result of construction of new utility facilities or relocation of existing facilities.
Policy 31: Solid waste collection services (curbside pickup) will be provided to the project area by the local licensed franchise hauler.	Keene	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project in Keene would not conflict with the provision of curbside waste collection services by the local waste hauler.
Golden Hills Specific Plan (1986): Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element, Section 1, Public Facilities and Services			
Objective 1: Provide adequate public facilities and community services throughout the Golden Hills area to meet the needs of property owners and residents.	Golden Hills	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not conflict with the provision of adequate public facilities and community services to property owners and residents because all utilities would either be protected in place or relocated if they are in conflict with the HSR project.
Policy 14: Discretionary development projects will be submitted to and reviewed by the Golden Hills Community Services District to determine the long-range and short-term effects of the community service system stemming from the development of the propose project. Recommendations from the Community Services District will be considered by the County before recommendations and actions are taken on the proposed project.	Golden Hills	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has and would continue to include the Golden Hills Community Services District in reviewing the long-range and short-term effects to the community service system stemming from development of the HSR project.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy 17: All other essential utility services, such as gas, telephone, and electricity, will meet the requirements of the appropriate utility service companies.	Golden Hills	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not conflict with the provision of adequate public facilities and community services to property owners and residents because all utilities would either be protected in place or relocated if they are in conflict with the HSR project.
Tehachapi General Plan (2012): Sustainable Infrastructure Element			
Objective 1: Protect the overall health of the watershed.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with overall protection of the watershed.
Policy SI 1: Improve quality of urban storm water runoff before discharging to water body or infiltration into aquifer.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with improving the quality of runoff.
Policy S1 4: Incorporate low impact design storm water best management practices (BMPs).	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with incorporation of BMPs.
Objective 2: Reduce Discharge Volumes.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with reducing discharge volumes.
Policy SI 6: Where soils allow for infiltration, promote infiltration into the groundwater basin.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with allowing infiltration into the groundwater basin.
Policy SI 7: Increase perviousness.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with increasing perviousness.
Policy SI 8: Slow storm water runoff through low impact design BMPs.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with slowing stormwater runoff through LID BMPs.
Policy SI 10. Discourage large scale retention basins in favor of a decentralized approach, accommodating as much runoff on site as possible to minimize standing water, maximize infiltration, and improve aesthetics. Vegetated BMPs should be landscaped with native, drought tolerant plantings which conserve water and are cost effective.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with accommodating stormwater to minimize runoff.
Objective 3: Protect and conserve groundwater resources.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with protecting and conserving groundwater resources.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Objective 1: Ensure adequate infrastructure capacity.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project in Keene would not preclude the provision of adequate infrastructure capacity available to the City of Tehachapi because the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project.
Policy SI 23A: Provide adequate domestic water distribution capacity per the following intervals: a. Minimum 12-inch lines at section lines; b. Minimum 10-inch lines at quarter section lines; c. Minimum 8-inch lines within quarter sections.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would maintain adequate domestic water distribution capacity per the intervals specified in Policy SI 23A if any section lines are in conflict and require relocation with respect to the proposed HSR alignment.
Policy SI 23B: Provide adequate sanitary sewer capacity per the following: a. Minimum 8-inch lines; b. Minimum 4- inch laterals.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would maintain adequate sanitary sewer capacity per the intervals specified in Policy SI 23B if any section lines are in conflict and require relocation with respect to the proposed HSR alignment.
Objective 2: Incorporate Low Impact Development BMPs at all scales of the community.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with incorporating LID BMPs at all scales.
Policy IS 24: Use low impact development BMPs such as the following to address storm water and improve water quality: a. Decentralize storm water basins, accommodating as much runoff on-site as possible; b. Improve surface water quality through increased use of bioretention basins and infiltration measures where possible; c. Require that 5% of all impervious surfaces function as on-site bio-retention or infiltration; d. Convey storm water through natural courses wherever possible rather than through pipes; e. Encourage disconnection of downspouts from storm drain system; f. Encourage storm water reuse; g. Combine open space areas with storm water management where possible.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with using LID wherever possible to address stormwater and improve water quality.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Objective 1: Promote energy conservation and the development of renewable energy sources.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The project design incorporates elements that minimize electricity consumption (e.g., regenerative breaking and energy-saving equipment and facilities). The project would be constructed and operated in an energy-efficient manner. For example, renewable energy would power the HSR system to the extent feasible. Therefore, the HSR project would reduce energy demand through energy conservation and efficiency.
Objective 2: Promote transportation efficiency and reduce peak demand.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The project design incorporates elements that minimize electricity consumption (e.g., regenerative breaking and energy-saving equipment) that promote transportation efficiency. Although the HSR project would increase peak demand, the projected peak demand of the HSR system is not anticipated to exceed these existing reserve amounts.
Objective 3: Increase use of renewable energy.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** To enhance the benefits of the HSR system, the Authority has set a goal of procuring renewable electricity to provide power for HSR operations. The Authority accessed technical assistance from the Department of Energy's NREL through the USEPA as part of this partnership. The NREL developed a Strategic Energy Plan (NREL 2011) that provides signatory agencies and the Authority with guidelines to meet the goals established in the MOU. The Strategic Energy Plan recommended a net-zero approach to powering operations with 100% renewable energy.
Greater Tehachapi Area Specific Plan (2010): Conservation & Open Space Element			
Goal COS.1: Ensure that the GTA can accommodate projected future growth and development while maintaining a safe and healthful environment and prosperous economy by guiding development away from hazardous areas, and assuring the provision of adequate public services and infrastructure.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not preclude the adequate provision of available public services or facilities because the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project. The Authority would avoid development near hazardous areas to the greatest extent possible. Refer to Section 3.10, Hazardous Materials and Wastes, for a discussion of any hazardous areas associated with the HSR project in the greater Tehachapi area.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Goal COS 2: Encourage water conservation to reduce demand for limited water resources and maintain a balance between water supply and water consumption.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** During construction, the HSR system would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections. During operation, the HSR project is anticipated to generate negligible water demand in the greater Tehachapi area as no stations are proposed for this segment.
Policy COS.2: Ensure that water quality standards are maintained for existing users and future development and that water-related infrastructure is provided in an efficient and cost effective manner.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with ensuring water quality standards are maintained.
Policy COS.4: Encourage the use of low-impact landscaping development techniques, such as the installation of permeable surfaces for hardscape applications. Impervious surfaces such as driveways, streets, and parking lots should be minimized so that land is available to absorb storm water and reduce polluted urban runoff.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with low-impact landscaping that absorbs stormwater and reduces runoff.
Policy COS.7: Encourage effective groundwater resource management while promoting water conservation and water recycling/reuse in all new development and building design.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with encouraging effective groundwater resource management.
Policy COS.8: Require the use of feasible and practical best management practices (BMPs) to protect surface water and groundwater from the adverse effects of construction activities and post-construction runoff, including storm water runoff.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with requiring BMPs.
Policy COS.11: Discretionary projects will analyze watershed impacts and reduce impacts from construction-related and urban pollutants, as well as alterations of flow patterns and introduction of impervious surfaces to prevent the degradation of the watershed to the extent such measures are practical.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with analyzing and addressing watershed impacts.
Policy COS.12: Encourage drainage designs which retain or detain storm water runoff to minimize volume and pollutant concentrations.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with drainage designs that retain runoff and minimize pollutants.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy COS.13: Minimize the alteration of natural drainage areas. Require development plans to include necessary mitigation to stabilize runoff and silt deposition through utilization of grading and flood-protection ordinances. Conserve areas along rivers and streams to enhance drainage, flood control, recreational, and other beneficial uses while acknowledging existing land use patterns.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with minimizing the alteration of natural drainage areas.
Implementation 3: Throughout the development process, the County will ensure that all new development incorporates construction standards which protect groundwater quality by incorporating comprehensive well construction standards and groundwater protection strategies for any affected watersheds.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with incorporating standards that protect groundwater quality.
Implementation 6: All development proposals will be reviewed to ensure that landscaping is designed to reduce water demand, retain water runoff, decrease flooding, and recharge groundwater. Drought and fire-tolerant plant materials will be incorporated in all new development.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections. Storm water would be either managed on-site to supply the facility's internal water demands and landscaping, or released for management through acceptable natural time-scale surface flow, groundwater recharge, agricultural use, or adjacent building needs. The HSR plantings would be consistent with native and prevalent local species and drought-resistant plants would be selected wherever reasonable.
Implementation 7: All development proposals will be reviewed to ensure that the plans incorporate permeable surfaces in outdoor landscaping and pedestrian areas unless technical studies and/or engineering studies indicate they are infeasible. Permeable surfaces may include porous asphalt, decomposed granite or other aggregate, landscape materials, or other paving materials that are porous.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with incorporation of permeable surfaces for new development.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Implementation 8: All discretionary development proposals will include the submittal of erosion and sediment control plans. The project will be designed according to the recommendations of the plan and to prevent increased discharge of sediment at all stages of grading and development.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with requiring erosion and sediment control plans for all new development.
Implementation 9: All development proposals will incorporate the use of bioswale landscape elements or other natural features to reduce runoff, trap sediment, and increase on-site infiltration, whenever feasible.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with incorporation of bioswales or other natural features to reduce runoff.
Implementation 13: New discretionary development will require consultation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the California Department of Fish and Game if potential waters of the U.S. and/or waters of the State, including wetlands, are present on site. Preservation of wetlands will be the primary consideration; otherwise, mitigation measures pursuant to CEQA will be implemented.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with all necessary waters/wetlands permits.
Implementation 14: Require a flood hazard study for new discretionary development within floodplain areas as designated by Map Code 2.5 and require the floodplain constraints with all zone changes. New construction located within the flood hazard zones will conform to the Kern County Flood Hazard Protection Ordinance.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with the requirement for flood hazards studies.
Implementation 15: Require preparation of a drainage plan to retain drainage on site in accordance with the County Drainage Ordinance as a condition of approval of any land division, conditional use permit (CUP), or site plan review. The drainage plan will be Greater Tehachapi Area Specific and Community Plan 3-28 October 2010 prepared by the applicant and submitted to the Kern	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with the county drainage ordinance.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
County Floodplain Management Section of the Engineering, Surveying and Permit Services Department for review and approval prior to development. Drainage will conform to the Kern County Development Standards and the County Grading Ordinance.			
Implementation 17: Any project which disturbs more than 1 gross acres of land, land disposes of waste (including mining waste), utilizes recycled water, proposes to potentially alter a streambed, or discharges fill material to a surface water will consult with the Regional Water Quality Control Board to assess the need for permits from that Agency. These permits may include, but are not limited to: Clean Water Act (CWA) permits; a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction storm water Permit, an individual storm water permit, compliance with Title 27, Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR), Water Reclamation Requirements (WRRs), Water Quality Certification (WQC), etc.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with the requirement to consult with the Regional Water Quality Control Board on necessary permits for water quality.
Goal COS 11: Encourage development which conserves and reduces energy consumption.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The project design incorporates elements that minimize electricity consumption (e.g., regenerative breaking and energy-saving equipment and facilities). The project would be constructed and operated in an energy-efficient manner. If feasible, renewable energy would power the HSR system. Therefore, the HSR project would reduce energy demand through energy conservation and efficiency.
Policy COS.50: The County will coordinate with the California Public Utilities Commission to review all proposed transmission lines and their alignments for conformity with this Plan.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that any relocated transmissions lines conform to the California Public Utilities Commission's requirements.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Greater Tehachapi Area Specific Plan (2010): Sustainability Element			
Goal SUS.2: Encourage development to use alternative renewable energy sources and energy conservation and efficient measures.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** To enhance the benefits of the HSR system, the Authority has set a goal of procuring renewable electricity to provide power for HSR operations. The Authority accessed technical assistance from the Department of Energy's NREL through the USEPA as part of this partnership. The NREL developed a Strategic Energy Plan (NREL 2011) that provides signatory agencies and the Authority with guidelines to meet the goals established in the MOU. The Strategic Energy Plan recommended a net-zero approach to powering operations with 100% renewable energy.
Policy SUS.4: Promote energy-efficient design features, including site orientation, use of lighter color roofing and building materials, and use of deciduous shade trees and windbreak trees to reduce fuel consumption for heating and cooling	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The project design incorporates elements that minimize electricity consumption (e.g., regenerative breaking and energy-saving equipment and facilities) pursuant to the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections. The project would be constructed and operated in an energy-efficient manner. If feasible, renewable energy would power the HSR to the extent feasible. Therefore, the HSR project would reduce energy demand through energy conservation and efficiency.
Implementation 7: The County will support the implementation of water conservation strategies as identified through Urban Water Management Plans, County/ Community Services District policies and State and federal regulations.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** During construction, the HSR system would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections. During operation, the HSR project is anticipated to generate negligible water demand in the greater Tehachapi area, as no stations are proposed for this segment.
Implementation 17: The applicants for future projects will reduce construction waste transported to landfills by recycling solid waste Greater Tehachapi Area Specific and Community Plan 7-14 October 2010 construction materials to the greatest extent feasible, such as taking materials to recycling and reuse locations listed in the brochure on recycling construction and demolition materials available on the Kern County Waste Management Department website.	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed below in Impact PUE&E#4, the HSR project would be required to comply with the 2010 CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated (CalRecycle 2012). The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills (Authority 2013).

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Rosamond Specific Plan (2008): Land Use Element, Section V Public Facilities			
Goal 1: To provide adequate waste disposal systems within the plan area in order to safeguard the public health and public and private investments.	Community of Rosamond	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** During operation, the HSR project would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of the HSR infrastructure. As discussed below in Impact PUE&E#4, adequate landfill capacity exists within the study area for the disposal of construction waste.
Goal 3: To feasibly restrict, if possible, any further and/or unnecessary drawdown of the water table within the plan area.	Community of Rosamond	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would incorporate water conservation measures consistent with CALGreen Code standards. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in a substantial impact on local water supplies that would result in further and/or unnecessary drawdown of the water table within the plan area.
Policy 3: New development will be required to pay its proportional share of the local costs of infrastructure improvements required to service such development as well as ongoing operating and maintenance costs.	Community of Rosamond	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would pay its proportional share for all necessary infrastructure associated with construction of the HSR project in Rosamond.
Policy 7: Development will pay its proportional share for all necessary infrastructures.	Community of Rosamond	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would pay its proportional share for all necessary infrastructure associated with construction of the HSR project in Rosamond.
Implementation Measure 7: Developers will prepare master drainage plans which take surrounding projects into consideration.	Community of Rosamond	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would implement drainage measures pursuant to Chapter 8 of the *California High Speed Train Project Design Criteria* (Authority, January 2014) to ensure that drainage impacts and their effects on projects in the surrounding area are taken into consideration.
Lancaster General Plan 2030 (2009): Plan for Municipal Services and Facilities Element			
Goal 15: A full range of municipal facilities at desired levels for urban and rural areas, as appropriate.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not preclude the adequate provision of available public services or facilities to development in Lancaster because the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project.
Objective 15.1: Achieve and maintain the following levels of service: Sanitary Sewers: Restricted flow only during peak day, peak hour conditions. Sewage Treatment: Remain within the rated capacity of the treatment facility.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The HSR project would ensure that levels of service for sanitary sewers, sewage treatment, and water systems are either maintained or improved through appropriate infrastructure upgrades to accommodate the HSR project in Lancaster.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Water Systems: Adequate fire flow as established by the County Fire Department; sufficient storage for emergency situations.			
Policy 15.1.2: Cooperate with local water agencies to provide an adequate water supply system to meet the standards for domestic and emergency needs.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The HSR project would coordinate with local water agencies to ensure provision of an adequate water supply system during construction, including any planned interruptions of water service. The HSR project would incorporate water conservation measures, consistent with CALGreen Code standards. Therefore, the HSR project is not anticipated to result in a substantial impact on local water supplies.
Policy 15.1.3: Ensure that adequate flood control facilities are provided which maintain the integrity of significant riparian and other environmental habitats in accordance with Biological Resources policies.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with provision of adequate flood control facilities.
Policy 15.1.4: Ensure that mitigation is provided for all development in recognized flood prone areas. Any mitigation of flood hazard in one area will not exacerbate flooding problems in other areas.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with mitigation for flood-prone areas.
Specific Action 15.1.4(a): As part of the development review process, require individual developments to install sufficient drainage facilities to provide all-weather access and protection as per FEMA requirements.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with the requirement to provide sufficient drainage facilities.
Objective 15.2: Minimize the negative impacts of solid waste disposal using a variety of methods including mitigation and disposal of waste from outside the Antelope Valley.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** As discussed below in Impact PUE&E#4, the HSR project would be required to comply with the 2010 CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated (CalRecycle 2012). The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills (Authority 2013). Through these waste management requirements, the HSR project would reduce waste generation during construction and operation in compliance with the SWMP.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy 15.2.2: Minimize the generation of solid wastes as required by State law (AB 939) through an integrated program of public education, source reduction, and recycling.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** As discussed below in Impact PUE&E#4, the HSR project would be required to comply with the 2010 CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated (CalRecycle 2012). The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills (Authority 2013). Through these waste management requirements, the HSR project would reduce waste generation during construction and operation in compliance with the SWMP.
Objective 15.3: Ensure the coordination of development activity with the provision of public services and facilities in order to eliminate gaps in service provision, provide economical public services, and achieve the equitable sharing of the cost of such facilities and services.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure the coordination of development activity associated with the HSR project with the provision of public services and facilities. The HSR project could result in scheduled and accidental interruptions of utility services. Notices by phone, email, mail, newspaper, or other means would inform utility customers of scheduled outages. Probing for existing underground utilities prior to the start of construction would reduce the risk of accidental service interruptions. During operation, the HSR project would contribute to utility improvements to ensure that the performance of these services and facilities does not fall below designated performance objectives specified by the City of Lancaster.
Specific Action 15.3.1(c): As part of the development and environmental review process, ensure that all public services and facilities needed to support development as outlined in Objective 15.1 will be available.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure the coordination of development activity associated with the HSR project with the provision of public services and facilities. The HSR project could result in scheduled and accidental interruptions of utility services. Notices by phone, email, mail, newspaper, or other means would inform utility customers of scheduled outages. Probing for existing underground utilities prior to the start of construction would reduce the risk of accidental service interruptions. During operation, the HSR project would contribute to utility improvements to ensure that the performance of these services and facilities does not fall below designated performance objectives specified by the City of Lancaster.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Specific Action 15.3.1(d): As a condition of approval for new development, require that improvements be made as necessary to ensure that the performance of services and facilities to existing development will not fall below the performance objective identified in Objective 15.1	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The HSR project would contribute to utility improvements to ensure that the performance of these services and facilities does not fall below designated performance objectives specified by the City of Lancaster.
Specific Action 15.3.1(f): Unless otherwise approved by the City, require that public water, sewer, drainage and other basic infrastructure needed for a project phase be constructed prior to or concurrent with initial development within that phase at a level sufficient to meet the needs of the entire project.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that all basic infrastructure needs are constructed or relocated prior to, or concurrent with, development of the HSR project.
Policy 15.3.2: Ensure that the City is proactive in addressing the infrastructure and service needs of the wireless communications industry.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that all communication service providers' facilities would be either protected in place or relocated if they would be in conflict with any of the proposed HSR project improvements. If facilities must be relocated, the Authority would ensure that relocation of the utilities would not result in adverse impacts to health, land use, environmental resources, signal strength, or aesthetics.
Palmdale General Plan (1993): Environmental Resources Element			
Goal ER 4: Protect the quantity and quality of local water resources.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with protection of water resources. The HSR project system would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections for all planning, procurement, design, construction, operations, and maintenance of facilities. The goal for facilities is, where appropriate for the climate, to work toward potable water self-sufficiency through consumption reduction, recycling, and on-site capture and storage. Stormwater would be either managed on-site to supply the facility's internal water demands and landscaping, or released for management through acceptable natural time-scale surface flow, groundwater recharge, agricultural use, or adjacent building needs. The HSR plantings would be drought-resistant plants wherever reasonable.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Objective ER 4.1: Ensure that groundwater supplies are recharged and remain free of contamination.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with ensuring groundwater supplies are recharged and free of contamination.
Policy ER 4.1.1: Incorporate the use of flood control measures which maximize groundwater recharge and the use of floodways as native habitat.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with flood control measures that maximize groundwater recharge and native habitat.
Policy ER 4.1.2: Protect from pollutants or other materials which might degrade groundwater supplies, and enhance natural recharge areas such as the Little Rock and Big Rock Washes, and Armargosa and Anaverde Creeks, and ensure that no mineral resources recovery activates extend below the groundwater table.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with protection of groundwater supplies from pollutants that might degrade groundwater.
Policy ER 4.1.4: Require that all new commercial, industrial, and residential development connect to sanitary sewers as required by Policy PS 2.2.4 of the Public Services Element.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would require that all new development associated with the HSR project would connect to sanitary sewers.
Objective ER 4.2: Minimize the impacts of urban development on groundwater supplies.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with minimizing the effects of urban development on groundwater supplies.
Policy ER 4.2.1: Promote water conserving landscape techniques through the use of native and drought tolerant plant species and landscape design standards.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Landscaping may be used to soften the presence of HSR structures in urban and rural environments and reduce the apparent scale of elevated structures. Plantings selected would be consistent with native and prevalent local species. Landscaping may be utilized to create visual interest for pedestrians and bicyclists. Drought-resistant plants would be selected wherever reasonable.
Policy ER 4.2.2: Utilize native plants or drought resistant planting materials and drip irrigation systems where feasible within the Landscape Assessment District areas.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Landscaping may be used to soften the presence of HSR structures in urban and rural environments and reduce the apparent scale of elevated structures. Plantings selected would be consistent with native and prevalent local species. Drought-resistant plants would be selected wherever reasonable.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy ER 4.2.3: Require the use of water conserving appliances and plumbing fixtures in all new construction.	City of Palmdale	Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The LMF would be designed in accordance with the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary measures, at a minimum. The goal for facilities is, where appropriate for the climate, to work toward potable water self-sufficiency through consumption reduction, recycling, and on-site capture and storage.
Objective ER 4.3: Maintain and further the City's commitment to long-term water management within the Antelope Valley by promoting and encouraging planning for the conservation and managed use of water resource, including groundwater, imported water, and reclaimed water.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The HSR project would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections for all planning, procurement, design, construction, operations, and maintenance of facilities. The goal for facilities is, where appropriate for the climate, to work toward potable water self-sufficiency through consumption reduction, recycling, and on-site capture and storage. Storm water would be either managed on-site to supply the facility's internal water demands and landscaping, or released for management through acceptable natural time-scale surface flow, groundwater recharge, agricultural use, or adjacent building needs.
Palmdale General Plan (1993): Public Services Element			
Goal PS 1: Ensure that adequate public services and facilities are available to support development in an efficient and orderly manner.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not preclude the adequate provision of available public services or facilities to development in Palmdale as the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project.
Objective PS 1.1: Ensure that all new development in Palmdale provides for the infrastructure and public services needed to support it.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not preclude the adequate provision of available public services or facilities to development in Palmdale because the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project.
Policy PS 1.1.1: Require all new development, including major modifications to existing development, to construct required on-site infrastructure improvements pursuant to City standards.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that all on-site infrastructure required for all new HSR developments is constructed pursuant to city standards.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy PS 1.1.2: Require all new development, including major modifications to existing development, to construct or provide a fair share contribution towards construction of required off-site improvements needed to support the project.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that development of the HSR project and Palmdale Station in the City of Palmdale contributes its fair share contribution toward construction of required off-site improvements needed to support the project.
Policy PS 1.1.3: Require that on- and off-site improvements are constructed prior to occupancy of a new development project, or phase thereof, unless otherwise approved by the City.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that all basic infrastructure needs are constructed or relocated prior to, or concurrent with, development of the HSR project.
Policy PS 1.1.5: When new development is proposed in vacant, rural areas which have not yet been master-planned for provision of infrastructure, require that development proponents provide for or contribute a fair share towards development of regional master facility plans for roads, sewer, water, drainage, schools, libraries, parks, fire and other community facilities, prior to granting conditional approval of development applications.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would contribute its fair share toward infrastructure development planning in vacant or rural areas in Palmdale.
Objective PS 1.2: Ensure that new development is coordinated with provision of backbone infrastructure within the site and with adjacent properties, to promote cost-efficient construction and maintenance, and ease of access to facilities.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that all development associated with the HSR project is coordinated with the provision of backbone infrastructure to reduce costs and facilitate accessibility.
Policy PS 1.2.1: Require that provision of streets, sewer, water, drainage and other needed infrastructure be coordinated in a logical manner between adjacent developments, so as to reduce cost of design, construction and maintenance.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would coordinate relocation or improvement of drainage or sewer facilities in a logical manner to reduce costs where possible.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy PS 1.2.2: Require that individual development projects integrate with adjacent development with respect to backbone infrastructure (streets, sewer, water and drainage) If adjacent property is undeveloped, a conceptual plan should be prepared to show that the pending development will allow for future integration and development of adjacent properties in a manner which is reasonable from a design, construction and cost standpoint.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would coordinate infrastructure with adjacent development or anticipated development on adjacent property to allow for the future integration of backbone infrastructure.
Policy PS 1.2.3: Require that the proposed infrastructure design within a development project permit economical and efficient development of land, both on the subject property and on adjacent properties.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would require that the proposed infrastructure design for the Palmdale Station not interfere with the economical and efficient development of land on the subject property or adjacent properties.
Policy PS 1.2.8: Distribute the costs of extending infrastructure equitably among those benefiting from the improvements.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not preclude the adequate provision of available public services or facilities to development in Palmdale because the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project.
Objective PS 1.6: Ensure that utilities are provided to serve development in Palmdale in an efficient and aesthetic manner.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not preclude the adequate provision of available public services or facilities to development in Palmdale because the Authority would pay its fair share of any costs associated with increased utility demand from construction and/or operation of the proposed project.
Policy PS 1.6.2: Coordinate installation of utility line placement with street construction where possible to minimize cost.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would coordinate the installation of relocated utility lines with any street improvements associated with the HSR project where feasible.
Policy PS 1.6.3: Through the development review process, protect existing utility easements and require dedication of additional easements where needed.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would coordinate with the city during the development review process to protect or provide utility easements as required by the HSR project.
Goal PS 2: Ensure that all development in Palmdale is served by adequate water distribution and sewage facilities.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The LMF would be designed to ensure adequate water distribution and sewage facilities to serve the project without detracting from the City of Palmdale's ability to serve other residences and businesses in the city.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Objective PS 2.1: Require that all development be serviced by water supply systems meeting minimum standards for domestic and emergency supply and quality.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The LMF would be designed as to ensure that adequate water supply systems meeting minimum standards for domestic and emergency supply and quality without detracting from the City of Palmdale to serve residences and businesses in the city.
Policy PS 2.1.1: Require new development to obtain adequate water service to meet the increased service needs generated by that development.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Avenue M LMF Zone would be designed to ensure that adequate water supply systems meeting minimum standards for domestic and emergency supply and quality without detracting from the City of Palmdale's ability to serve other residences and businesses in the city.
Policy PS 2.1.2: Protect groundwater quality, through policies and implementation measures contained in the Environmental Resources Element.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with protecting groundwater quality.
Policy PS 2.1.3: Promote water conservation and long-term water management in all phases of development planning and construction, through policies and implementation measures contained in the Environmental Resources Element.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The HSR project system would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections for all planning, procurement, design, construction, operations, and maintenance of facilities. The goal for facilities is, where appropriate for the climate, to work toward potable water self-sufficiency through consumption reduction, recycling, and on-site capture and storage. Stormwater would be either managed on-site to supply the facility's internal water demands and landscaping or released for management through acceptable natural time-scale surface flow, groundwater recharge, agricultural use, or adjacent building needs. The HSR plantings would be drought-resistant plants wherever reasonable.
Objective PS 2.2: Require that all development be served by sewage disposal systems, which are adequately sized to handle expected wastewater flows and designed and maintained to protect the health of residents.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that all development associated with the HSR project is served by adequately sized sewage disposal systems.
Policy PS 2.2.2: Require new development to pay necessary fees for expansion of the sewage disposal system to the appropriate agencies, to handle the increased load which it will generate.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would pay its fair share of necessary fees for expansion of the sewage disposal system to accommodate wastewater treatment demand generated by the HSR project in the City of Palmdale.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Goal PS 3: Develop and maintain adequate storm drainage and flood control facilities.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with maintaining adequate storm drainage and flood control facilities.
Objective PS 3.1: Maintain and implement the City's adopted Master Drainage Plan.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with the city's adopted master drainage plan.
Policy PS 3.1.2: Evaluate the impact of all new development and expansion of existing facilities on storm runoff and ensure that the cost of upgrading existing drainage facilities to handle the additional runoff is paid for by the development that generates it.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with evaluating the expansion of stormwater runoff facilities based on those uses that generate the increase in runoff.
Policy PS 3.1.5: Require and provide for on-going maintenance of drainage and detention facilities, to ensure their continued effectiveness in controlling runoff.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with continued maintenance of drainage and detention facilities.
Objective PS 3.2: Coordinate drainage master planning with environmental resource management.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with coordinating drainage master planning with environmental resource management.
Policy PS 3.2.1: Where feasible, plan for detention or retention facilities in areas where groundwater recharge can be accomplished.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.8 for a discussion of the HSR project's consistency with allowing for groundwater recharge where feasible from detention or retention facilities.
Goal PS 6: Ensure provision of adequate facilities and programs to accommodate solid waste and hazardous waste collection, handling, and disposal.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Operation of the HSR project in Palmdale would not result in the generation of hazardous wastes. Construction would generate hazardous waste. Demolition of older buildings could also generate hazardous waste. The Authority would handle, store, and dispose of all hazardous waste in accordance with applicable requirements, including the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (Section 3.10, Hazardous Materials and Wastes). A certified hazardous waste collection company would deliver the waste to an authorized hazardous waste management facility for recycling or disposal. During operation, the HSR project would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of the HSR infrastructure. Operation of the Palmdale Station would result in the generation of municipal solid waste. Through compliance with AB 34 and AB 939, waste generated by the operation of the

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
			Palmdale Station is not anticipated to be substantial. As discussed below in Impact PUE&E#4, the HSR project would be required to comply with the 2010 CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated (CalRecycle 2012). The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills (Authority 2013). Therefore, the HSR project would not interfere with the provision of adequate facilities and programs to accommodate solid and hazardous waste collection, handling, and disposal.
Objective PS 6.1: Implement the City's adopted Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) (adopted on November 14, 1991 by Resolution 91-236).	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** During operation, the HSR system would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of the HSR infrastructure. Operation of the Palmdale Station would result in the generation of municipal solid waste. Through compliance with AB 34 and AB 939, waste generated by the operation of the Palmdale Station is not anticipated to be substantial. As discussed below in Impact PUE&E#4, the HSR project would be required to comply with the 2010 CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated (CalRecycle 2012). The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills (Authority 2013). Through these waste management requirements, the HSR project would reduce waste generation during construction and operation in compliance with the SWMP.
Policy PS 6.1.1: Review proposed development with respect to the SWMP to ensure consistency.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that all development associated with the HSR project is consistent with the SWMP.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy PS 6.1.3: Continue to implement the City's adopted waste reduction and recycling programs in compliance with the SWMP.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** During operation, the HSR system would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of the HSR infrastructure. Operation of the Palmdale Station would result in the generation of municipal solid waste. Through compliance with AB 341 and AB 939, waste generated by the operation of the Palmdale Station is not anticipated to be substantial. As discussed below in Impact PUE&E#4, the HSR project would be required to comply with the 2010 CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated (CalRecycle 2012). The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills (Authority 2013).
Objective PS 6.2: Adopt and implement the City's Hazardous Waste Management Plan (HWMP).	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Operation of the HSR project in Palmdale would not result in the generation of hazardous wastes. Construction would generate hazardous waste. Demolition of older buildings could also generate hazardous waste. The Authority would handle, store, and dispose of all hazardous waste in accordance with applicable requirements, including the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (Section 3.10, Hazardous Materials and Wastes). A certified hazardous waste collection company would deliver the waste to an authorized hazardous waste management facility for recycling or disposal.
Policy PS 6.2.1: Identify hazardous waste generators and their waste streams by type and quantity, and facilitate the use of appropriate hazardous waste management technology by generators, placing the greatest emphasis on those technologies that achieve source reduction and waste minimization.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Operation of the HSR project in Palmdale would not result in the generation of hazardous wastes. Construction would generate hazardous waste. Demolition of older buildings could also generate hazardous waste. The Authority would handle, store, and dispose of all hazardous waste in accordance with applicable requirements, including the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (Section 3.10, Hazardous Materials and Wastes). A certified hazardous waste collection company would deliver the waste to an authorized hazardous waste management facility for recycling or disposal so as to include underground storage tanks, contaminated sites, etc.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy PS 6.2.6: Support the regulation and enforcement of hazardous waste laws governing the generation, handling, storage, transport, treatment and disposal of hazardous waste.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** Operation of the HSR project in Palmdale would not result in the generation of hazardous wastes. Construction would generate hazardous waste. Demolition of older buildings could also generate hazardous waste. The Authority would handle, store, and dispose of all hazardous waste in accordance with applicable requirements, including the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (Section 3.10, Hazardous Materials and Wastes). A certified hazardous waste collection company would deliver the waste to an authorized hazardous waste management facility for recycling or disposal.
Policy PS 6.2.7: Require disclosure of the presence of hazardous materials on property proposed for development.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority has disclosed the presence of any hazardous materials on properties proposed for development of the HSR project in Section 3.10, Hazardous Materials and Wastes.
Goal PS 8: Encourage and facilitate a wide variety of communicating services and providers to serve businesses and citizens within the City, while avoiding adverse impacts to health, land use, environmental resource, or aesthetics which may result from unregulated proliferation of communication facilities.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that all communication service providers' facilities are either protected in place or relocated if they would be in conflict with any of the proposed HSR project improvements. If facilities must be relocated, the Authority would ensure that relocation of the utilities would not result in adverse impacts to health, land use, environmental resources, or aesthetics.
Objective PS 8.2: Ensure that communication facilities are installed and operated so as to avoid adverse health impacts on residents of the community from electromagnetic radiation, improperly installed or located facilities, or other health and safety hazards.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** If facilities must be relocated as a result of the HSR project, the Authority would ensure that relocation of the utilities would not result in adverse impacts to health, land use, environmental resources, or aesthetics.
Policy PS 8.2.1: Incorporate applicable Federal Communications Commission standards into the review and approval process for communication facilities.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would follow all Federal Communications Commission standards when either protecting in place or relocating communication facilities.
Policy PS 8.2.2: Ensure that the location, design, and construction of communication facilities provide an acceptable level of safety to the public.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that the location, design, and construction of communication facilities provide an acceptable level of safety to the public if communication facilities must be relocated as a result of the HSR project.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Objective PS 8.3: Ensure that the installation and operation of communication facilities throughout the City are compatible with existing and planned land uses, and will not cause adverse environmental impacts.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that the installation and operation of any relocated communication facilities in Palmdale is consistent with existing and planned land uses, and would not cause adverse environmental impacts.
Palmdale Energy Action Plan (2011)			
Goal 1: Reduce energy demand through energy conservation and efficiency,	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The project design incorporates elements that minimize electricity consumption (e.g., regenerative breaking and energy-saving equipment and facilities). All HSR facilities, including the LMF, would qualify for LEED certification. To the extent feasible, renewable energy would power the HSR project. Therefore, the HSR project would reduce energy demand through energy conservation and efficiency.
Measure 1.3: Energy efficiency in new development. Encourage new development to exceed Title 24 energy use requirements by 15%.	City of Palmdale	Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The HSR facilities, including the LMF, would qualify for LEED certification and would be required to meet and/or exceed energy efficiency targets, including Title 24, with the goal of zero net energy use for facilities.
Action 1.3.1: Implement the minimum Title 24 standards for energy efficiency.	City of Palmdale	Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The HSR facilities, including the LMF, would qualify for LEED certification and would be required to meet and/or exceed energy efficiency targets, including Title 24, with the goal of zero net energy use for facilities.
Action 1.3.2: Encourage new construction, remodels over 50%, and tenant improvements to exceed Title 24 energy use requirements by 15%.	City of Palmdale	Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The HSR facilities, including the LMF, would qualify for LEED certification and would be required to meet and/or exceed energy efficiency targets, including Title 24, with the goal of zero net energy use for facilities.
Goal 2: Reduce water consumption for energy conservation.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The HSR project system would, at a minimum, use the water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections for all planning, procurement, design, construction, operations, and maintenance of facilities. The goal for facilities is, where appropriate for the climate, to work toward potable water self-sufficiency through consumption reduction, recycling, and on-site capture and storage. Stormwater would be either managed on-site to supply the facility's internal water demands and landscaping, or released for management through acceptable natural time-scale surface flow, groundwater recharge, agricultural use, or adjacent building needs. The HSR plantings would be drought-resistant plants wherever reasonable.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Measure 2.3: Reduce Water Use 20%. Facilitate a 20% reduction in water use by 2020 to exceed the 20X2020 initiative.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The HSR project system would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections for all planning, procurement, design, construction, operations, and maintenance of facilities. The goal for facilities is, where appropriate for the climate, to work toward potable water self-sufficiency through consumption reduction, recycling, and on-site capture and storage. Stormwater would be either managed on-site to supply the facility's internal water demands and landscaping, or released for management through acceptable natural time-scale surface flow, groundwater recharge, agricultural use, or adjacent building needs. The HSR plantings would be drought-resistant plants wherever reasonable. Therefore, the HSR project would not interfere with the city's goal to facilitate a 20% reduction in water use by 2020.
Measure 2.3.1: Continue to implement the City's Water Conservation Ordinance.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The HSR project system would, at a minimum, use water conservation and efficiency guidelines in the CALGreen Code mandatory and voluntary sections for all planning, procurement, design, construction, operations, and maintenance of facilities. The goal for facilities is, where appropriate for the climate, to work toward potable water self-sufficiency through consumption reduction, recycling, and on-site capture and storage. Stormwater would be either managed on-site to supply the facility's internal water demands and landscaping, or released for management through acceptable natural time-scale surface flow, groundwater recharge, agricultural use, or adjacent building needs. The HSR plantings would be drought-resistant plants wherever reasonable. Landscaping implemented as part of HSR would be implemented such that it is irrigated efficiently and minimizes water use in conformance with current Title 24 design standards. Therefore, the HSR project would not interfere with the implementation of the city's water conservation ordinance.
Goal 6: Reduce Waste	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** During operation, the HSR system would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of the HSR infrastructure. Operation of the Palmdale Station would result in the generation of municipal solid waste. Through compliance with AB 341, California's Mandatory Commercial Recycling Law, waste generated by operation of the Palmdale Station is not anticipated to be substantial.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
			As discussed below in Impact PUE&E#4, the HSR project would be required to comply with the 2010 CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated (CalRecycle 2012). The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills (Authority 2013).
Measure 6.2: Solid Waste Diversion. Achieve an 80% diversion of landfilled waste by 2020.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** During operation, the HSR system would generate minimal waste associated with routine maintenance of the HSR infrastructure. Operation of the Palmdale Station would result in the generation of municipal solid waste. Through compliance with AB 341, California's Mandatory Commercial Recycling Law, waste generated by operation of the Palmdale Station is not anticipated to be substantial. As discussed below in Impact PUE&E#4, the HSR project would be required to comply with the 2010 CALGreen Code, which requires every city and county in California to develop a waste management plan and divert at least 50% of the construction materials generated (CalRecycle 2012). The Authority's 2013 sustainability policy specifies all (100%) steel and concrete would be recycled and a minimum of 75% construction waste would be diverted from landfills (Authority 2013).

Source: California High Speed Rail (2016)
AB = Assembly Bill
Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority
BMP = best management practice
CALGreen Code = California Green Building Standards Code
CalRecycle = California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
FEMA = Federal Emergency Management Agency
HSR = high-speed rail
LEED = Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
LID = low-impact development
LMF = light maintenance facility
MOIF = maintenance of infrastructure facility
MOU = memorandum of understanding
NPDES = National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NREL = National Renewable Energy Laboratory
SEP = Strategic Energy Plan
SWMP = Stormwater Management Plan
SWPPP = Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
USEPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Table 2-H-5 Regional and Local Policy Analysis—Biological Resources and Wetlands

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
County of Kern			
Kern County General Plan (2009) Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element Section 1.10.5, General Provisions: Threatened and Endangered Species, Policies 27 through 32	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will comply with state and federal laws concerning the protection of threatened or endangered species.
Kern County General Plan (2007) Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element Section 1.10.10, General Provisions: Oak Tree Conservation, Policies 65 and 66	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Where possible, oak trees will be protected and incorporated into project development plans, as applicable.
Kern River Plan Element : An Integral Part of the City of Bakersfield General Plan and Kern County General Plan (1985) Section 3.3, Riparian Vegetation and Wildlife Habitat, Policies 1 through 10	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will comply with state and federal laws concerning the protection of threatened or endangered species and habitats of concern.
Kern County Valley Floor HCP (2006)	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Construction and operation of the HSR system within the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not conflict with the Kern County Valley Floor HCP, as discussed in Section 3.7.6.5.
Kern County Municipal Code (2015) Section 13.16, Nature Preserve Areas, Ordinances 13.16.010 through 13.16.020	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would abide by all park, recreation, and public place regulations set forth by the Kern County Municipal Code.
Kern County Municipal Code (2015) Section 19, Zoning, Ordinance 19.73	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will comply with the requirements for development near the Kern River corridor and/or combining district as appropriate.
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (2007) Section 5, Conservation and Biological Resources, Policies 1 through 5	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has designed the alternative alignments to conserve and enhance biological resources where possible. Where impacts could not be avoided, mitigation measures have been proposed, as discussed in Section 3.7.7.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (2007) Section 6, Open Space Element, Policies 1 and 20	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will maintain, protect, and conserve natural resources through the mitigation measures listed in Section 3.7.7, as well as through compliance with various HCPs, including the Metropolitan Bakersfield HCP.
Bakersfield Municipal Code (2016) Section 12.40, Street Trees, Ordinances 12.40.70 through 12.40.100	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will work with the City of Bakersfield to obtain appropriate clearance for the removal of trees on public property in compliance with applicable requirements.
Bakersfield Municipal Code (2016) Section 12.56, Parks, Ordinance 12.56.050	City of Bakersfield	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will work with the City of Bakersfield to obtain appropriate clearance for the removal of vegetation on public property in compliance with applicable requirements.
Metropolitan Bakersfield HCP (1994)	City of Bakersfield	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The construction and operation of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section of the HSR project would be consistent with the Metropolitan Bakersfield HCP, as discussed in Section 3.7.6.5.
Keene Ranch Specific Plan (1997), Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element Section 2.6	Community of Keene	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will protect habitats of species listed as threatened or endangered, consistent with state and federal laws and regulations.
Keene Ranch Specific Plan (1997) Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element Section 2.6, Resources, Policy 4.	Community of Keene	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has proposed various mitigation measures, including those specifically for oak trees and all other trees, to protect significant wildlife habitats and important vegetation. These measures are discussed in Section 3.7.7.
City of Tehachapi General Plan (2012) Section 2, Public Realm Element, Policy PR4	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The construction and operation of the HSR system would not interfere with the integration of natural corridor opportunities. The Authority will include various design features and mitigation measure to maintain wildlife movement corridor connectivity, as discussed in Section 3.7.7.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
City of Tehachapi General Plan (2012) Section 2, Public Realm Element, Policies PR25 through 27	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The construction and operation of the HSR system in the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not conflict with City of Tehachapi policies to track and manage open space within the city.
City of Tehachapi General Plan (2012) Section 2, Natural Resources Element, Policies NR13 and NR16 through 18	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has designed the alternative alignments such that they preserve open space, conservation easements, and HCP areas. The HSR system would not conflict with any applicable conservation plans or easements within the BSA, as discussed in Section 3.7.6.5.
City of Tehachapi General Plan (1999) Section 2, Natural Resources Element, Policies NR26 through 30	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has designed the alternative alignments to avoid impacts to natural habitat resources where possible. Where impacts could not be avoided, mitigation measures have been proposed, as discussed in Section 3.7.7.
Tehachapi Municipal Code (2015) Section 12, Trees and Shrubs, Ordinances 12.08.060 through 12.08.170	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will comply with applicable requirements of the City of Tehachapi Municipal Code related to tree alteration, removal, and planting.
Greater Tehachapi Area Specific and Community Plan (2010) Section 2.3.4, Land Use: Resource Management, Policy LU.37	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has designed the alternative alignments to avoid impacts to jurisdictional wetlands and waters to the extent feasible. Any potential effects to water quality or wetlands will be substantively minimized or eliminated by the mitigation measures discussed in Section 3.7.7, which are also set forth in the Water Quality Management Plan and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Greater Tehachapi Area Specific and Community Plan (2010) Section 3.3.2, Conservation Element: Conservation & Open Space: Scenic and Natural Resources, Policies COS.18 through 23	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has designed the alternative alignments such that they preserve open space, conservation easements, and HCP areas. Where possible, the alternative alignments have been designed to traverse areas with consistent surrounding urbanized land uses. The Authority will also continue to coordinate with applicable agencies, stakeholders, and the public to conserve and protect natural resources throughout project development..
Greater Tehachapi Area Specific and Community Plan (2010) Section 3.3.3, Conservation Element: Conservation & Open Space: Biological Resource, Policies COS.24 through 32	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR system will not conflict with the city's efforts to protect threatened and endangered plant and wildlife species habitats and wetlands in accordance with federal laws on the protection of oak tree woodlands. The Authority will comply with applicable state and federal laws regarding threatened and endangered species.
Cameron Canyon Specific Plan (1986) Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element Section 4, Resource, Policy 2	Unincorporated Kern County (community of Cameron Canyon)	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has designed the alternative alignments to conserve and protect jurisdictional waters and wetlands. Additionally, where impacts cannot be avoided, the Authority will comply with applicable wetland permits and mitigation requirements.
Willow Springs Specific Plan (2008) Section 5, Resource Element, Policy 3	Unincorporated Kern County (community of Willow Springs)	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will comply with applicable state and federal laws to protect biological resources.
Willow Springs Specific Plan (2008) Section 12, Open Space/ Conservation Element, Policies 3 and 5	Unincorporated Kern County (community of Willow Springs)	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has designed the alternative alignments to maintain areas of open space and natural terrain where possible to be consistent with existing land uses surrounding the proposed HSR system. Where impacts could not be avoided, mitigation measures have been proposed, as discussed in Section 3.7.7.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Willow Springs Specific Plan (2008) Section 15, Biological Resources Element, Policies 1 through 3	Unincorporated Kern County (community of Willow Springs)	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has and will continue to conduct focused surveys by county-approved biologists to avoid sensitive species where possible. When avoidance is not possible, mitigation measures have been proposed, as discussed in Section 3.7.7.
Rosamond Specific Plan (2008) Section 1, Land Use: Residential, Policy LU.10	Community of Rosamond	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has undergone an extensive alternatives analysis process to direct the alternative alignments away from "sensitive biological resources" where possible. In addition, mitigation measures will be implemented where impacts have not been avoided, as discussed in Section 3.7.7.
Rosamond Specific Plan (2008) Section 4, Open Space/Conservation Element, Policy OSC.2, 3 and 5	Community of Rosamond	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has designed the HSR system to avoid impacts to open space and hillside areas where possible. Where impacts could not be avoided, the Authority has proposed mitigation measures as discussed in Section 3.7.7. To the extent feasible, the Authority has designed the alternative alignments to be constructed in areas surrounded by consistent existing land uses.
County of Los Angeles			
Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (2015), Conservation and Open Space Element Section 2, Conservation, and Open Space Element: Conserve Natural Areas, Policy 7	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will implement mitigation measures, as discussed in Section 3.7.7, to preserve significant ecological areas and habitat management areas.
Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (2015), Conservation and Open Space Element Section 2, Conservation, and Open Space Element: Conserve Natural Areas, Policy 11	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR system would not conflict with Los Angeles County's ability to coordinate with USFWS to develop a natural forest management program.
Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (2015), Conservation and Open Space Element Section 2, Conservation, and Open Space Element: Conserve Natural Areas, Policies 12 and 13	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR system would comply with applicable water quality regulations and permits as discussed in Section 3.8, Hydrology and Water Quality. Additionally, the HSR system would not conflict with any HCPs or policies within the BSA.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (2015), Conservation and Open Space Element Section 2, Conservation, and Open Space Element: Promote Landscaping, Policy 35	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will coordinate with Los Angeles County to ensure the preservation of heritage trees during construction and operation of the HSR system and will also plant trees as part of landscaping efforts associated with the project.
Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (2015), Conservation and Open Space Element Section 3, Land Use: Ensure Compatibility of Development, Policy 14.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will abide by Los Angeles County regulatory requirements of development adjacent to public open space, recreational areas, and state and regional parks.
Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (2015), Conservation and Open Space Element Section 3, Land Use: Conserve Resources and Enhance Environmental Quality, Policy 20	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The construction and operation of the HSR system will not conflict with the county's land use controls that provide protection of significant ecological and habitat resources.
Los Angeles Municipal Code (2015) Section 12.28, Brush and Vegetation, Policy 12.28.030	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will work with Los Angeles County to obtain appropriate clearance for the removal of vegetation on sloping terrain in compliance with applicable requirements.
Los Angeles Municipal Code (2015) Section 12.28, Brush and Vegetation, Policy 17.04.340	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will work with Los Angeles County to obtain appropriate clearance for the removal of vegetation on public property in compliance with applicable requirements.
Los Angeles Municipal Code (2015) Section 12.28, Brush and Vegetation, Policy 17.04.470	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will abide by all park and hiking trail regulations set forth by the Los Angeles County Municipal Code. Additionally, "take" of any threatened or endangered species would be conducted consistent with FESA Sections 9 and 10.
Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Areas (2015)	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.7.6.5, the HSR system would not conflict with the provisions or requirements for any HCPs or habitat areas, including the Los Angeles County Significant Ecological Areas.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan (2015) Goal LU 2	Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale and Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has developed alternative alignments that avoid environmental resources where possible through an extensive alternatives analysis process. For impacts to environmental resources that have not been avoided, the Authority will implement mitigation measures, as discussed in Section 3.7.7.
Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan (2015) Rural preserve areas	Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale and Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will construct and operate the HSR system such that it avoids rural preserve areas where possible and implements mitigation measures to address residual impacts, as discussed in Section 3.7.7.
Lancaster General Plan of 2030 (2009) Section 2, Plan for the Natural Environment: Biological Resources, Policy 3.4.1	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would comply with applicable requirements of the Lancaster General Plan.
Lancaster General Plan of 2030 (2009) Section 2, Plan for the Natural Environment: Biological Resources, Policies 3.4.2 through 3.4.3	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has designed the alternative alignments such that they avoid significant wash and open space areas to protect sensitive species. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the Authority has proposed mitigation measures to address impacts to special-status species and ensure their protection, as discussed in Section 3.7.7.
Lancaster General Plan of 2030 (2009) Section 2, Plan for the Natural Environment: Biological Resources, Policy 3.4.4:	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has analyzed both short- and long-term impacts to biological resources, as discussed in Section 3.7.6, Environmental Consequences. Mitigation measures have been included to address significant impacts to biological resources. The Authority will pay any required city biological impact fees as appropriate.
Lancaster General Plan of 2030 (2009) Section 2, Plan for the Natural Environment: Biological Resources, Policy 3.4.5	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program, as discussed in BIO IAMF #3, during project construction.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Lancaster Municipal Code (as amended) Section 12.20, Street Trees, Ordinance 12.20.040	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will work with the City of Lancaster to obtain appropriate clearance for the removal of trees on public property, consistent with applicable requirements.
Lancaster Municipal Code (as amended) Section 12.20, Street Trees, Ordinance 12.20.060	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will work with the City of Lancaster to obtain appropriate clearance for the removal of trees on public property, consistent with applicable requirements.
Lancaster Municipal Code (as amended) Section 12.20, Street Trees, Ordinance 12.20.080	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will work with the City of Lancaster to protect trees on public property during construction, consistent with the requirements of the city's tree ordinance.
Palmdale General Plan (1993) Section 2, Environmental Resource Element, Policies ER1.1.1 and 1.1.2	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The construction and operation of the HSR system will not interfere with the City of Palmdale's implementation of a network of open space.
Palmdale General Plan (1993) Section 2, Environmental Resource Element, Policy ER 1.1.4	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has designed the HSR system to avoid impacts to open space and hillside areas where possible. Where impacts could not be avoided, the Authority has proposed mitigation measures, as discussed in Section 3.7.7. To the extent feasible, the Authority has designed the alternative alignments to be constructed in areas surrounded by consistent existing land uses.
Palmdale General Plan (1993) Section 2, Environmental Resource Element, Policy ER 1.1.5	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has designed the HSR system to avoid impacts to open space where possible. Where impacts could not be avoided, the Authority has proposed mitigation measures, as discussed in Section 3.7.7. To the extent feasible, the Authority has designed the alternative alignments to be constructed in areas surrounded by consistent existing land uses.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
The Palmdale General Plan (1993) Section 2, Environmental Resource Element, Policy ER 2.1.1	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has designed the alternative alignments to preserve significant ecological areas. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the Authority has proposed mitigation measures, as discussed in Section 3.7.7. As discussed in Section 3.7.7., the Authority has and will continue to conduct biological surveys prior to approval and construction of the HSR system.
Palmdale General Plan (1993) Section 2, Environmental Resource Element, Policy ER 2.1.2	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would not construct any uses in ecologically sensitive areas that would not be consistent with the existing natural setting.
Palmdale General Plan (1993) Section 2, Environmental Resource Element, Policy ER 2.1.3	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The construction and operation of the HSR system would not interfere with the city's ability to utilize funds to acquire wetland areas.
Palmdale General Plan (1993) Section 2, Environmental Resource Element, Policies ER.2.1.4 and 2.1.5	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has designed the alternative alignments to avoid natural drainages and riparian areas for the preservation of significant habitats to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the Authority has proposed mitigation measures, as discussed in Section 3.7.7.
Palmdale Municipal Code (2015) Section 14, Environmental Management: Joshua Tree and Native Desert Vegetation Preservation, Ordinances 14.04.040 through 14.04.100	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has designed the alternative alignments to avoid special-status plant species and communities to the extent feasible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the Authority has proposed mitigation measures, as discussed in Section 3.7.7, A Biological Resources Management Plan will also be developed, as specified in BIO IAMF #6.
Palmdale Municipal Code (2015) Section 2, Environmental Resource Element, Policy ER 2.2.1	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.7.6.5, the HSR system would not conflict with the West Mojave Coordinated Management Plan.
Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan (2015)	Kern and Los Angeles Counties	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.7.6.5, the HSR system would not conflict with the provisions of the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
PG&E San Joaquin Valley Operations HCP (2006)	City of Bakersfield and unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.7.6.5, the HSR system would not conflict with the provisions of the PG&E San Joaquin Valley Operations HCP.
Tehachapi Uplands Multiple Species HCP (2013)	Greater Tehachapi Area	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.7.6.5, the HSR system would not conflict with the provisions of the Tehachapi Uplands Multiple Species HCP.
Uplands Species San Joaquin Recovery Program (1998)	City of Bakersfield and unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.7.6.5, the HSR system would not conflict with the provisions of the Upland Species San Joaquin Recovery Program.
West Mojave Plan (2005)	Kern and Los Angeles counties	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.7.6.5, the HSR system would not conflict with the provisions of the West Mojave Plan.
West Mojave Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan (2011) Recovery Objective 1 (Demography)	Kern and Los Angeles counties	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.7.6.5, the HSR System would not conflict with the provisions of the West Mojave Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan.
West Mojave Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan (2011) Recovery Objective 2 (Distribution)	Kern and Los Angeles counties	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.7.6.5, the HSR system would not conflict with the provisions of the West Mojave Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan.
West Mojave Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan (2011) Recovery Objective 3 (Habitat)	Kern and Los Angeles counties	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.7.6.5, the HSR system would not conflict with the provisions of the West Mojave Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan.

Source: California High Speed Rail (2016)
Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority
BSA = Biological Study Area
FESA = Federal Endangered Species Act
HCP = Habitat Conservation Plan
HSR = high-speed rail
PG&E = Pacific Gas and Electric Company
USFWS = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Table 2-H-6 Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis—Hydrology and Water Quality

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Kern County General Plan (2009): Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element	
Physical and Environmental Constraints Policy 1: Kern County will ensure that new developments will not be sited on land that is physically or environmentally constrained ((Map Code 2.1 (Seismic Hazard), Map Code 2.2 (Landslide), Map Code 2.3 (Shallow Groundwater), Map Code 2.5 (Flood Hazard), Map Codes from 2.6 – 2.9, Map Code 2.10 (Nearby Waste Facility), and Map Code 2.11 (Burn Dump Hazard)) to support such development unless appropriate studies establish that such development will not result in unmitigated significant impact.	**Consistent.** Portions of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section are located within flood hazard areas. The *Draft Hydrology and Water Resources Technical Report* (Authority 2016) and *Draft Floodplain Impact Report (Authority 2016)* (included in Volume 2, Technical Appendices of this EIR/EIS) and this EIR/EIS section analyzes potential impacts to floodplains associated with the HSR project. This analysis included figures and tables demonstrating the location and extent, respectively, of impacts to floodplains. The Authority is taking steps to reduce floodplain impacts through design modifications and compliance with existing regulations, as identified in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6. Therefore, with the implementation of the mitigation measures mentioned above, the project section would not result in any significant unmitigated impacts to physically or environmentally constrained areas related to floodplains. The *Draft Hydrology and Water Resources Technical Report* (Authority 2016) also analyzed impacts to groundwater. The HSR project is not located on land that is physically or environmentally constrained due to shallow groundwater.
Physical and Environmental Constraints Policy 8: Encourage the preservation of the floodplain's flow conveyance capacity, especially in floodways, to be open space/passive recreation areas throughout the County.	**Consistent.** No FEMA-designated floodways are located in the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section. However, the floodplain, associated with the Kern River in the City of Bakersfield in Kern County, is a CVFPB-designated floodplain. The project section also crosses through several FEMA-designated floodplains. Floodplain crossings would be designed to provide flood flow conveyance and connectivity. Furthermore, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be required to comply with the requirements set forth in USEO 11988 and the FEMA regulations as identified in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6. However, the floodplains associated with Caliente Creek, Tehachapi Creek, and Antelope Valley 11J are located within Kern County and would exceed the 1-foot rise in water surface elevation, conflicting with the requirements set forth in USEO 11988 and FEMA regulations. Even though the water surface elevation would increase by more than 1 foot, no structures would be impacted and the flooding would either occur within the channel or within the project footprint. Therefore, no significant floodplain impacts are anticipated from development of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section. In addition, as required by Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-6, a Conditional Letter of Map Revision/Letter of Map Revision would be required. The CLOMR/LOMR assumes a 1-foot rise in the 100-year base flood elevation. The Bakersfield Station- F Street subsection would be located within the Kern River floodplain. This subsection would be required to comply with the requirements set forth in USEO 11988 and FEMA regulations, which prevent projects from increasing the base flood elevation by more than 1 foot in floodplains, as required by Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6. In addition, this subsection would be required to obtain an encroachment permit from the CVFPB. Therefore, implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce impacts to floodways and floodplains (including significantly affecting the flow conveyance capacity of the floodplains).

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Physical and Environmental Constraints Policy 10: The County will allow lands which are within flood hazard areas, other than primary floodplains, to be developed in accordance with the General Plan and Floodplain Management Ordinance, if mitigation measures are incorporated so as to ensure that the proposed development will not be hazardous within the requirements of the Safety Element (Chapter 4) of this General Plan.	**Consistent.** The Authority is taking steps to reduce floodplain impacts through design modifications and compliance with existing regulations, as identified in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6. Implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6 would reduce safety impacts related to flooding.
Physical and Environmental Constraints Policy 11: Protect and maintain watershed integrity within Kern County.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would implement BMPs to target pollutants of concern and reduce the volume and rate of stormwater runoff during construction and operation activities, as described in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features HYD-IAMF#1 and HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Therefore, the project section would protect and maintain watershed integrity within Kern County.
Physical and Environmental Constraints Implementation Measure F: The County will comply with the Cobey-Alquist Floodplain Management Act in regulating land use within designated floodways.	**Consistent.** No FEMA-designated floodways are located in the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section. However, the floodplain associated with the Kern River is a CVFPB-designated floodway. The Bakersfield Station- F Street subsection would be located within the Kern River floodplain and would be required to obtain an encroachment permit from the CVFPB. The Cobey-Alquist Floodplain Management Act encourages local governments to adopt and enforce land use regulations to accomplish floodplain management and provides state assistance and guidance for flood control. Floodplain impacts within Kern County would be coordinated with the county and would comply with county requirements.
Physical and Environmental Constraints Implementation Measure H: Development within areas subject to flooding, as defined by the appropriate agency, will require necessary flood evaluations and studies.	**Consistent.** The *Draft Floodplain Impact Report* (Authority 2016) and *Draft Hydrology and Water Resources Technical Report* (Authority 2016) (included in Volume 2, Technical Appendices, of this EIR/EIS) and this EIR/EIS section analyzed potential impacts to floodplains. This analysis included figures and tables demonstrating the location and extent, respectively, of impacts to floodplains associated with development of the HSR project. The Authority is taking steps to reduce floodplain impacts through design modifications and compliance with existing regulations, as identified in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6.
Physical and Environmental Constraints Implementation Measure I: Designated flood channels and water courses, such as creeks, gullies, and riverbeds, will be preserved as resource management areas or in the case of urban areas, as linear parks whenever practical.	**Not Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section does not include provisions to preserve flood channels or watercourses as resource management areas or as linear parks.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Physical and Environmental Constraints Implementation Measure J: Compliance with the Floodplain Management Ordinance prior to grading or improvement of land for development or the construction, expansion, conversion or substantial improvements of a structure is required.	**Consistent.** The Authority is taking steps to reduce floodplain impacts through design modifications and compliance with existing regulations, as identified in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6. The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would include mitigation measures to preserve and protect floodplains in compliance with the county Floodplain Management Ordinance. The floodplains associated with Caliente Creek, Tehachapi Creek, and Antelope Valley 11J are located within Kern County and would exceed the 1-foot rise in water surface elevation, conflicting with the requirements set forth in USEO 11988 and FEMA regulations. Even though the water surface elevation would increase by more than 1 foot, no structures would be impacted and the flooding would either occur within the channel or within the project footprint. Therefore, no significant floodplain impacts are anticipated to be associated with the project section. In addition, as required by Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-6, a Conditional Letter of Map Revision/Letter of Map Revision would be required for all floodplains mentioned above. The CLOMR/LOMR assumes a 1-foot rise in the 100-year base flood elevation. Additionally, the Bakersfield Station- F Street subsection would be located within the Kern River floodplain. Development of this subsection within the Kern River floodplain would raise the water surface elevation by 0.7 foot, in compliance with USEO 11988 and FEMA regulations (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6). Any impacts within Kern County would be coordinated with the county and would comply with county requirements.
Physical and Environmental Constraints Implementation Measure N: Applicants for new discretionary development should consult with the appropriate Resource Conservation District and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board regarding soil disturbances issues.	**Consistent.** The Authority would coordinate with applicable Resource Conservation Districts and RWQCBs regarding soil disturbance issues for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section. The portions of the project section located in the Tulare Lake Basin would be subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit, which requires preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs. Portions of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section located in the South Lahontan Basin are not subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit; however, grading and earthwork activities within this basin would comply with similar requirements, including preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of BMPs. The SWPPP will describe temporary drainage patterns within construction sites and indicate stormwater discharge locations from the sites to the existing drainage system, as prescribed in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Through preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs, such as Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs designed to minimize erosion and retain sediment on-site and Good Housekeeping BMPs designed to prevent spills, leaks, and discharges of construction debris and wastes into receiving waters, the HSR project is consistent with county grading requirements.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Resource Policy 11: Minimize the alteration of natural drainage areas. Require development plans to include necessary mitigation to stabilize runoff and silt deposition through utilization of grading and flood protection ordinances.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would minimize alteration of the existing drainage pattern to the maximum extent practicable. The portions of the project section located in the Tulare Lake Basin would be subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit, which requires preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs. Portions of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section located in the South Lahontan Basin are not subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit; however, grading and earthwork activities within this basin would comply with similar requirements, including preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of BMPs. The SWPPP will describe temporary drainage patterns within construction sites and indicate stormwater discharge locations from the sites to the existing drainage system, as prescribed in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Through preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs, such as Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs designed to minimize erosion and retain sediment on-site and Good Housekeeping BMPs designed to prevent spills, leaks, and discharges of construction debris and wastes into receiving waters, the HSR project is consistent with county grading requirements. During operation, on-site stormwater runoff would be directed to infiltration/detention basins to infiltrate (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2). Off-site stormwater runoff would be conveyed to the existing drainage system. Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features HYD-IAMF#1 and HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2 would stabilize runoff and silt deposition during construction and operation.
General Provisions, Surface Water and Groundwater Policy 34: Ensure that water quality standards are met for existing users and future development.	**Consistent.** No surface waters located within the project vicinity have existing water quality impairments. Therefore, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not contribute to any existing water quality impairments. The portions of the project section located in the Tulare Lake Basin would be subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit, which requires preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs. Portions of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section located in the South Lahontan Basin are not subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit; however, grading and earthwork activities within this basin would comply with similar requirements, including preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of BMPs. The SWPPP will describe temporary drainage patterns within construction sites and indicate stormwater discharge locations from the sites to the existing drainage system, as prescribed in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Through preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs, such as Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs designed to minimize erosion and retain sediment on-site and Good Housekeeping BMPs designed to prevent spills, leaks, and discharges of construction debris and wastes into receiving waters, the HSR project is consistent with county grading and water quality requirements. Operation of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be required to comply with the Authority's Phase II MS4 Permit and implement treatment BMPs to reduce pollutants of concern in stormwater runoff, as described in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
General Provisions, Surface Water and Groundwater Policy 43: Drainage shall conform to the Kern County Development Standards and the Grading Ordinance.	**Consistent.** The Kern County Development Standards set forth standards for drainage design in compliance with the Authority's Phase II MS4 Permit. Drainage improvements associated with the HSR project would be in compliance with the Authority's Phase II MS4 Permit, as required by Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. The Kern County Grading Ordinance regulates grading activities and requires detailed plans of drainage structures and patterns during construction. The portions of the project section located in the Tulare Lake Basin would be subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit. Portions of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section located in the South Lahontan Basin are not subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit; however, grading and earthwork activities would comply with similar requirements, including preparation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP will describe temporary drainage patterns within construction sites and indicate stormwater discharge locations from the sites to the existing drainage system, as prescribed in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Through preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs, such as Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs designed to minimize erosion and retain sediment on-site and Good Housekeeping BMPs designed to prevent spills, leaks, and discharges of construction debris and wastes into receiving waters, the HSR project is consistent with county grading and water quality requirements. Through compliance with the requirements of the Authority's Phase II MS4 Permit and Construction General Permit, the HSR project would be consistent with the Kern County Development Standards and Grading Ordinance.
General Provisions, Surface Water and Groundwater Policy 44: Discretionary projects shall analyze watershed impacts and mitigate for construction-related and urban pollutants, as well as alterations of flow patterns and introduction of impervious surfaces as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), to prevent the degradation of the watershed to the extent practical.	**Consistent.** Watershed impacts are analyzed in the *Draft Hydrology and Water Resources Technical Report* (Authority 2016) (included in Volume 2, Technical Appendices, of this EIR/EIS) and this EIR/EIS section. The portions of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section located in the Tulare Lake Basin would be subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit. Portions of the project section located in the South Lahontan Basin are not subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit; however, grading and earthwork activities would comply with similar requirements, including preparation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP will describe temporary drainage patterns within construction sites and indicate stormwater discharge locations from the sites to the existing drainage system, as prescribed in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Through preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs, such as Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs designed to minimize erosion and retain sediment on-site and Good Housekeeping BMPs designed to prevent spills, leaks, and discharges of construction debris and wastes into receiving waters, the HSR project is consistent with county grading and water quality requirements. Development of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in increases in impervious surface area and alterations to the existing drainage pattern. However, the project section would provide on-site infiltration/detention basins for on-site runoff or conveyance of off-site stormwater to the existing drainage system to minimize impacts to the existing drainage patterns and ensure compliance with the requirements of the Authority Phase II MS4 Permit (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2).

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Kern County Municipal Code	
Title 14, Chapter 14.26: Sets forth standards and requirements to comply with County's NPDES Permit.	**Consistent.** Portions of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section within Kern County would comply with the requirements of the County NPDES Permit. Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2 require the implementation of treatment BMPs and compliance with the Authority Phase II MS4 Permit.
Chapter 17.48: Floodplain Management: Prohibits uses that are dangerous to health, safety, and property loss due to water or erosion hazards or flood heights or velocities.	**Consistent.** With the implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6, which require measures to minimize increases in the base flood elevation and minimize floodplain impacts, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not constitute a use that is dangerous to health, safety, or property loss due to water, erosion hazards, flood heights, or velocities.
Chapter 17.28: Grading Code: Regulates grading on private property, sets forth rules and regulations to control grading, establishes procedures for the issuance of permits, and provides for approval of grading permits.	**Consistent.** The Kern County Grading Ordinance regulates grading activities and requires detailed plans of drainage structures and patterns during construction. The portions of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section located in the Tulare Lake Basin would be subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit. Portions of the project section located in the South Lahontan Basin are not subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit; however, grading and earthwork activities would comply with similar requirements, including preparation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP will describe temporary drainage patterns within construction sites and indicate stormwater discharge locations from the sites to the existing drainage system, as prescribed in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Through preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs, such as Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs designed to minimize erosion and retain sediment on-site and Good Housekeeping BMPs designed to prevent spills, leaks, and discharges of construction debris and wastes into receiving waters, the HSR project is consistent with county grading and water quality requirements.
Chapter 19.50: Floodplain Primary District: Protects public health and safety and minimizes property damage from flooding**.**	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not increase the risk to public health or property damage due to implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6, which require measures to minimize increases in the base flood elevation, minimize floodplain impacts, and reduce safety impacts related to flooding. The floodplains associated with Caliente Creek, Tehachapi Creek, and Antelope Valley 11J are located within Kern County and would exceed the 1-foot rise in water surface elevation, conflicting with the requirements set forth in USEO 11988 and FEMA regulations. Even though the water surface elevation would increase by more than 1 foot, no structures would be impacted and the flooding would either occur within the channel or within the project footprint. Therefore, no significant floodplain impacts are anticipated to be associated with the development of the project section. In addition, as required by Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-6, a Conditional Letter of Map Revision/Letter of Map Revision would be required, which assumes a 1-foot rise in the 100-year base flood elevation. Additionally, the Bakersfield Station at F Street subsection would be located within the Kern River floodplain. Development of this subsection would raise the water surface elevation by approximately 0.7 foot, in compliance with USEO 11988 and FEMA regulations (Impact

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
	Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6).
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan	
Conservation Element-Water Resources Goal 2: Assure that adequate groundwater resources remain available to the planning area.	**Consistent.** A variety of existing surface or groundwater supply systems would provide water during construction and operation of the HSR project. The average annual water use over the construction period would be less than the existing water demand due to the elimination of water use for agricultural purposes. In addition, operation of the HSR project would result in a net decrease of water usage rates over existing water usage rates within the project study area. Groundwater extraction would not be required in the Kern County Subbasin. Refer to Section 3.6, Public Utilities and Energy, and Appendix 3.6-C, *Technical Memorandum: Water Usage Analysis* for the HSR Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section of this EIR/EIS for a further discussion of water usage during construction and operation of the HSR project. Should groundwater be encountered during construction of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section, it will be removed and discharged appropriately by provisions of Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-3 and WQ-MM-5. In the unlikely event groundwater is encountered during pier construction, it is anticipated that the volume of groundwater that would be removed would be minor due to the depth of groundwater. Therefore, the HSR project would not deplete groundwater volumes within the project vicinity or affect groundwater resources that would be available to other uses in the planning area.
Conservation Element-Water Resources Goal 6: Maintain effective cooperative planning programs for water resource conservation and utilization in the planning area by involving all responsible water resource agencies in the planning process.	**Consistent.** Water resources agencies have been involved, and will continue to be involved, throughout the planning process for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section. In addition, a review of all available documents from FEMA, SWRCB, and RWQCB were used to assess water quality and water resource impacts.
Conservation Element-Water Resources Policy 1: Develop and maintain facilities for groundwater recharge in the planning area.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would include infiltration/detention basins (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2) that promote infiltration and can increase groundwater recharge within the project vicinity. Additionally, Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-3 requires the use and retention of native materials with high infiltration potential at the ground surface in areas that are critical to infiltration for groundwater recharge.
Conservation Element-Water Resources Policy 6: Protect planning area groundwater resources from further water quality degradation.	**Consistent.** Groundwater levels in the project vicinity are generally deep; most of the water depths are greater than 60 feet bgs. Due to the depth of groundwater, there would not be a direct path for construction-related contaminants to reach groundwater during construction activities. During pier construction of the waterbody crossings, shallow groundwater may be encountered; however, groundwater would be removed and disposed of according to the requirements of the applicable Dewatering Permit, as required by Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-3 and WQ-MM-5.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Conservation Element- Soils and Agriculture Policy 7: Land-use patterns, grading and landscaping practices shall be designed to prevent soil erosion while retaining natural watercourses when possible.	**Consistent.** Construction activities, such as grading, in the City of Bakersfield would be required to comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. Compliance with the Construction General Permit requires the preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs, including but not limited to Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs, which would reduce the potential for erosion during construction (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2). Crossings over surface waters would be designed to provide flow conveyance and connectivity, similar to the existing natural condition.
Conservation Element- Soils and Agriculture Policy 13: Minimize the alteration of natural drainage and require development plans to include necessary construction to stabilize runoff and silt deposition through enforcement of grading and flood protection ordinances.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would minimize alteration to the existing drainage pattern to the maximum extent practicable. During construction in the City of Bakersfield, the HSR project would be required to comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit and prepare a SWPPP that would describe temporary drainage patterns within the construction sites and indicate stormwater discharge locations from the construction sites to the existing drainage system (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2). During operation, on-site stormwater runoff would be directed to infiltration/detention basins to infiltrate. Off-site stormwater runoff would be conveyed to the existing drainage system (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2). Implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features HYD-IAMF#1 and HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2 would stabilize runoff and silt deposition during construction and operation.
Safety Element- Flooding Goal 1: Minimize hazards to planning area residents resulting from flooding.	**Consistent.** The *Draft Floodplain Impact Report* (Authority 2016) (included in Volume 2, Technical Appendices, of this EIR/EIS) conducted a floodplain model for all of the floodplains crossed by the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section. The Authority is taking steps to reduce floodplain impacts through design modifications and compliance with existing regulations, as identified in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6. The Bakersfield Station -- F Street subsection would be located within the Kern River floodplain in the City of Bakersfield. Development of this subsection would raise the water surface elevation by approximately 0.7 foot, in compliance with USEO 11988 and FEMA regulations (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6).
Safety Element- Flooding Goal 2: Reduce the risk of flooding to land uses.	**Consistent.** The Authority is taking steps to reduce floodplain impacts through design modifications and compliance with existing regulations, as identified in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6. The Bakersfield Station at F Street subsection would be located within the Kern River floodplain. Development of this subsection would raise the water surface elevation by approximately 0.7 foot, in compliance with USEO 11988 and FEMA regulations (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6). Implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6 would reduce the risk of flooding to adjacent uses.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Safety Element- Flooding Goal 4: Regulate flood flow on Caliente Creek to mitigate flood hazard in the Lamont area.	**Consistent.** The floodplain associated with Caliente Creek is located outside of the City of Bakersfield; however, the crossing would exceed the 1-foot increase in water surface elevation, conflicting with the requirements set forth in USEO 11988 and the FEMA regulations. Fill associated with the Caliente Creek crossing would be placed within the 100-year floodplain. Even though the crossing would exceed the 1-foot rise in water surface elevation, no structures would be impacted. Since no structures would be impacted by the increased water elevation, the flood hazard to the Lamont area would be reduced. In addition, the design of the HSR project would minimize potential harm to or within the floodplain to the maximum extent practicable as identified in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6.
Safety Element- Flooding Policy 1: Develop specific standards which apply to development located in flood hazard areas as defined by Federal Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) and most recent information as adopted by the responsible agency.	**Consistent.** The City of Bakersfield is responsible for developing specific standards that apply to development in flood hazard areas defined by federal FIRMs. Although it is not the Authority's responsibility to develop floodplain standards, floodplain impacts in the City of Bakersfield would be coordinated with the city and would comply with city requirements.
Bakersfield Municipal Code	
Title 8: Health and Safety 8.34: Industrial Stormwater: No person shall discharge, or cause to be discharged, any industrial wastewaters directly or indirectly to the city's stormwater collection systems, surface canals or any waterway within the city. Stormwater runoff from industrial sites, not including industrial wastewater, may be discharged into the city's stormwater collection system, surface canals or any other waterway included in the city's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) May 17, 1992 application only after filing proper "Notice of Intent" and complying with other permit requirements of the state's General Industrial Storm Water Permit. (Ord. 3527 § 1, 1993)	**Consistent.** The project would not include industrial facilities (either an LMF or an MOIF) in the City of Bakersfield that would be subject to the requirements of the General Industrial Permit, in accordance with Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#4.
Title 8: Health and Safety 8.35: Stormwater System: It is unlawful for any person, firm, corporation, or association to throw, dump, empty or in any way cause sanitary wastewater, rubbish, refuse, litter, accidental spill discharges, garbage of any kind whatsoever, or any unsanitary or deleterious matter including, but not limited to, petroleum products, pesticides, herbicides, controlled substances, hazardous materials, or any other matter prohibited by state or	**Consistent.** During construction within the City of Bakersfield, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. Compliance with the Construction General Permit requires the preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs, including but not limited to Good Housekeeping BMPs, which target pollutants of concern in stormwater runoff, as described in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. During operation, the project section would be required to comply with the requirements of the Authority's Phase II MS4 Permit and implement treatment BMPs to reduce pollutants of concern in stormwater runoff, as described in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
federal law to be introduced into any stormwater system or conveyance that discharges into a stormwater system. (Ord. 4792 § 1, 2014; Ord. 3528 § 1, 1993)	
Title 8: Health and Safety 8.70: Regulation of Wells and Water Systems: Except as to the provisions thereof which address zoning approval that certain ordinance designated as Ordinance No. G-5006 of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Kern and all subsequent amendments or revisions thereto is adopted by reference and shall be applicable to the regulation of wells and water systems in the city. (Ord. 3273 § 1, 1990).	**Consistent.** Implementation of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would displace existing agricultural and domestic wells within the HSR right-of-way. The replacement wells would be located in the same vicinity as the original wells and would pump at the same rate and depth as they did prior to relocation. The Authority would work with individuals on a case-by-case basis to provide equal utility for wells affected by the alignment. Other than the replacement wells, no new wells are anticipated.
Title 15: Buildings and Construction 15.74: Flood Damage Prevention: Prohibits uses that are dangerous due to water or erosion, or flood heights and velocities.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section does not constitute a use that is dangerous to water or erosion by the provision of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2, which institute BMPs and additional precautions that mitigate potential impacts to water quality, runoff, and velocities. Erosion control measures are also included to reduce potential increases in erosion throughout construction and operation. The project section does not constitute a use that is dangerous due to increases in flood heights by the provisions of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6, which prevent raising of the water surface elevation by more than 1 foot and include future monitoring programs to ensure floodplain safety as a result of the project well into the operational phase. In instances where the increases in water surface elevation exceed the 1-foot rise, no structures would be impacted. In addition, the flooding would occur either within the channel or within the project footprint.
Title 15: Buildings and Construction 15.05.170 Grading: Specifies grading plans and grading permit regulations.	**Consistent.** The City of Bakersfield's Grading Code sets forth regulations to control grading and excavation activities and construction site runoff, including erosion sediments and construction-related pollutants. Construction activities associated with the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section in the City of Bakersfield would be required to comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit, as prescribed in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Compliance with the Construction General Permit requires the preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs. Construction BMPs include Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs designed to minimize erosion and retain sediment on-site and Good Housekeeping BMPs designed to prevent spills, leaks, and discharges of construction debris and wastes into receiving waters. Therefore, through adherence to the requirements of the Construction General Permit, the HSR project would be consistent with the city grading code (Appendix J of the city municipal code).

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Title 17: Zoning 17.42: FP-P Floodplain Primary Zone: Purpose. The purpose of the FP-P zone, primary floodplain zone shall be the prevention of loss of life, the minimization of property damage, and the maintenance of satisfactory conveyance capacities of waterways through the prevention of obstructions in the floodplain which diminish the ability of the floodplain to carry overloads during periods of flooding and to permit economic recovery of oil, gas and hydrocarbon substances, to the end that such economically vital development will offer a minimum obstruction to flood-flow, will not cause peripheral flooding of other properties, will not materially impair the ability of the primary floodplain to discharge the waters resulting from an intermediate regional flood, will either be resistant to flotation or immune to extensive damage by flooding. This zone is intended for application in those areas of the city which lie within natural streambeds and those portions of adjacent floodplains through which high velocity waterflows are channelized in times of flood. **Exclusive Zone:** This zone is an exclusive zone and may be applied only to those areas within the boundaries of the intermediate regional flood which have been determined to be the primary floodplain area. (Prior code § 17.46.020)	**Consistent.** Development within the FP-P zone would be required to not obstruct flood flow, cause a 1-foot rise in the surface of the flood, cause peripheral flooding of other properties, impair the ability of the floodplain to discharge waters, or endanger life or property. Portions of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section are located within a flood hazard zone. Floodplain crossings would be designed to provide flood flow conveyance and connectivity. The project section would be required to comply with the requirements set forth in USEO 11988 and the FEMA regulations to prevent projects from increasing the base flood elevation by more than 1 foot in floodplains or substantially changing the floodplain limits, as identified in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6. The Bakersfield Station at F Street subsection would be located within the Kern River floodplain. Development of this subsection would raise the water surface elevation by approximately 0.7 foot, in compliance with USEO 11988 and FEMA regulations (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6). Implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6 would reduce floodplain impacts to prevent loss of life, minimize property damage, maintain satisfactory conveyance capacities of waterways, and not cause significant flooding on peripheral properties in primary floodplain zone areas.
Title 17: Zoning 17.44: FP-S Floodplain Secondary Zone: Purpose, The purpose of the FP-S, secondary floodplain combining zone shall be the protection of life and property from the hazards and damages which may result from floodwaters of the intermediate regional flood and to permit economic recovery of oil, gas and hydrocarbon substances. Application. This zone is intended for application to those areas of the city which lie within the fringe area of the floodplain and are subject to less severe inundation during flooding conditions than occurs in the FP-P zone. This zone may be applied only to those areas located within boundaries of the intermediate regional flood which lie	**Consistent.** Portions of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section are located outside the primary floodplain zone but within the secondary floodplain zone. The Authority is taking steps to reduce floodplain impacts through design modifications and compliance with existing regulations, as identified in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6. Implementation of these measures would reduce impacts to floodplains associated with development in the secondary floodplain. Therefore, with implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6, the HSR project would not increase risk to the secondary floodplain zone.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
outside the FP-P primary floodplain zone. Land may be classified as being solely in the FP-S zone and subject to the development standards and regulations set forth in this chapter or the FP-S zone may be used as an overlay to modify an underlying zone and provide more restrictive standards and regulations than would otherwise apply in such underlying zone. (Ord. 2800 § 2, 1983; prior code § 17.46.100)	
Los Angeles County General Plan	
General Goals Preserve Resources and Protect the Environment: The fulfillment of this goal will involve preserving the natural environment, eliminating air, noise, and water pollution to protect health and safety; avoiding or mitigating the effects of natural hazards; and conserving all resources including natural habitats and wildlife, for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.	**Consistent.** Although portions of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section in Los Angeles County are not subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit, grading and earthwork activities would comply with similar requirements, including preparation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP will describe temporary drainage patterns within construction sites and indicate stormwater discharge locations from the sites to the existing drainage system, as prescribed in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Through preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs, such as Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs designed to minimize erosion and retain sediment on-site and Good Housekeeping BMPs designed to prevent spills, leaks, and discharges of construction debris and wastes into receiving waters, the HSR project is consistent with county grading and water quality requirements. During operation, the HSR project would be required to comply with the requirements of the Authority's Phase II MS4 Permit and implement treatment BMPs to reduce impacts to water quality, as described in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. The LMF and the MOIF in Antelope Valley would be subject to the requirements of the Industrial NPDES Permit as transportation facilities that conduct vehicle maintenance (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#4). Coverage under this permit would require the preparation of a site-specific operational SWPPP, which would require the implementation of measures to target pollutants of concern, reducing impacts to surface water quality. Therefore, through implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features HYD-IAMF#1, HYD-IAMF#3, and HYD-IAMF#4 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2, the project section would eliminate the discharge of pollutants to surface waters in the project vicinity.
General Policies Preserve Resources and Protect the Environment, Policy 13: Conserve the available supply of water and protect water quality.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would protect water quality through the implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features HYD-IAMF#1, HYD-IAMF#3, and HYD-IAMF#4 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Although portions of the project section in Los Angeles County are not subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit, grading and earthwork activities would comply with similar requirements, including preparation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP will describe temporary drainage patterns within construction sites and indicate stormwater discharge locations from the sites to the existing drainage system, as prescribed in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
	Through preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of Construction BMPs, such as Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs designed to minimize erosion and retain sediment on-site and Good Housekeeping BMPs designed to prevent spills, leaks, and discharges of construction debris and wastes into receiving waters, the HSR project is consistent with county grading and water quality requirements. Implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2 requires compliance with the Authority's Phase II MS4 Permit and implementation of treatment BMPs to target pollutants of concern in stormwater runoff during operation. The LMF and the MOIF in the Antelope Valley would be subject to the requirements of the Industrial NPDES Permit as transportation facilities that conduct vehicle maintenance (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#4). Coverage under this permit would require the preparation of a site-specific operational SWPPP, which would require the implementation of measures to target pollutants of concern, reducing impacts to surface water quality. Therefore, the HSR project would include measures (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features HYD-IAMF#1, HYD-IAMF#3, and HYD-IAMF#4 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2) to protect water quality.
Conservation and Open-Space Element Objectives: Conserve water and protect water quality.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would protect water quality through the implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features HYD-IAMF#1, HYD-IAMF#3, and HYD-IAMF#4 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Although portions of the project section in Los Angeles County are not subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit, grading and earthwork activities would comply with similar requirements, including preparation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP will describe temporary drainage patterns within construction sites and indicate stormwater discharge locations from the sites to the existing drainage system, as prescribed in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Through preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of Construction BMPs, such as Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs designed to minimize erosion and retain sediment on-site and Good Housekeeping BMPs designed to prevent spills, leaks, and discharges of construction debris and wastes into receiving waters, the HSR project is consistent with county grading and water quality requirements. Implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-2 requires compliance with the Authority's Phase II MS4 Permit and implementation of treatment BMPs to target pollutants of concern in stormwater runoff during operation. The LMF and the MOIF in the Antelope Valley would be subject to the requirements of the Industrial NPDES Permit as transportation facilities that conduct vehicle maintenance (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#4). Coverage under this permit would require the preparation of a site-specific operational SWPPP, which would require the implementation of measures to target pollutants of concern, reducing impacts to surface water quality. Therefore, the HSR project would include measures (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features HYD-IAMF#1, HYD-IAMF#3, HYD-IAMF#4 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2) to protect water quality.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Conservation and Open-Space Element Objectives: Reduce the risk to life and property from seismic occurrences, flooding, erosion, wildland fires, and landslides.	**Consistent.** Portions of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section are located within flood hazard areas. The *Draft Hydrology and Water Resources Technical Report* (Authority 2016) and *Draft Floodplain Impact Report* (Authority 2016) (included in Volume 2, Technical Appendices of this EIR/EIS) analyzed potential impacts to floodplains associated with the HSR project. The Authority is taking steps to reduce floodplain impacts through design modifications and compliance with existing regulations, as identified in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6. However, two floodplains in Los Angeles County, Antelope Valley 12A and 12B, would still exceed the 1-foot allowable increase in water surface elevation established by FEMA and county regulations. The flooding would occur in a narrow strip along the HSR alignment within 500 feet of the HSR right-of-way. Even though the water surface elevation would rise by more than 1 foot, no structures would be affected and the flooding would occur within the project footprint. Further, a Conditional Letter of Map Revision and a Letter of Map Revision would be required for all floodplain crossings, as described in Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-6. Additionally, the Palmdale Station would be located within FEMA-designated 100-year floodplains and would construct a drainage facility and an 84-acre detention area within the Palmdale "B" Stream floodplain and another drainage facility and a 93-acre detention area within the Anaverde Creek floodplain. However, these basins would convey and detain water during flooding events, reducing impacts on existing floodplain function. In addition, a Spill, Prevention, Containment, and Control Plan would be implemented to reduce the amount of sediment deposited in floodplains, as specified in Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-6. Through implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6, development of the HSR project would not pose a safety risk due to flooding.
Conservation and Open-Space Element Policy 4: Protect groundwater recharge and watershed areas, conserve storm and reclaimed water, and promote water conservation programs.	**Consistent.** The HSR track would not require the extraction of groundwater during operation. However, operation of the Palmdale Station subsection, located within Los Angeles County, would require groundwater withdrawal from the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin. The amount of water withdrawn is not anticipated to be substantial due to the size of the groundwater basin. Additionally, Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-3 requires the use and retention of native materials with high infiltration potential at the ground surface in areas that are critical to infiltration for groundwater recharge. In the unlikely event that groundwater is encountered during pier construction, it is anticipated that the volume of groundwater that would be removed would be minor due to the depth of groundwater. The HSR project would increase impervious surface area, which could decrease infiltration and decrease the amount of water that is able to recharge the aquifer/groundwater basin. However, this reduction in infiltration would not be substantial due to the size of the groundwater basins in the project vicinity. Additionally, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would include infiltration/detention basins, which promote infiltration and can increase groundwater recharge within the project vicinity (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2). The LMF and the MOIF in the Antelope Valley would be subject to the requirements of the Industrial NPDES Permit as transportation facilities

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
	that conduct vehicle maintenance (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#4). Coverage under this permit would require the preparation of a site-specific operational SWPPP and implementation of measures to minimize runoff and promote on-site infiltration and/or retention basins.
Water and Waste Management Element Objective: Maintain the high quality of coastal, surface, and ground waters.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would maintain the quality of surface and groundwaters within the project vicinity. Although portions of the project section in Los Angeles County are not subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit, grading and earthwork activities would comply with similar requirements, including preparation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP will describe temporary drainage patterns within construction sites and indicate stormwater discharge locations from the sites to the existing drainage system, as prescribed in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Through preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs, such as Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs designed to minimize erosion and retain sediment on-site and Good Housekeeping BMPs designed to prevent spills, leaks, and discharges of construction debris and wastes into receiving waters, the HSR project is consistent with county grading requirements. Additionally, implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2 requires compliance with the Authority's Phase II MS4 Permit and implementation of treatment BMPs to target pollutants of concern in stormwater runoff during operation. The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the volume or quality of groundwater resources. Due to the depth of groundwater in the project vicinity (greater than 60 feet), there would not be a direct path for construction- or operation-related contaminants to reach groundwater. During pier construction of the waterbody crossings, shallow groundwater may be encountered; however, groundwater would be removed and disposed of according to the requirements of the applicable Dewatering Permit, as required by Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-3 and WQ-MM-5. Therefore, the HSR project would not have any significant or lasting effect on the groundwater beneath the project vicinity. The LMF and the MOIF in the Antelope Valley would be subject to the requirements of the Industrial NPDES Permit as transportation facilities that conduct vehicle maintenance (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#4). Coverage under this permit would require the preparation of a site-specific operational SWPPP, which would require the implementation of measures to target pollutants of concern, reducing impacts to surface water quality. The SWPPP would also include implementation of measures to minimize runoff and promote on-site infiltration and/or retention basins Therefore, through compliance with applicable regulations and implementation of BMPs (as specified in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features HYD-IAMF#1, HYD-IAMF#3, HYD-IAMF#4 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-2, WQ-MM-3, and WQ-MM-5), the HSR project would maintain the quality of surface and groundwaters.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Los Angeles County Municipal Code	
Title 12: Environmental Protection 12.80 Stormwater and Runoff Pollution Control: Protects the health and safety of the county and enhances water quality.	**Consistent.** Although portions of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section in Los Angeles County are not subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit, grading and earthwork activities would comply with similar requirements, including preparation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP will describe temporary drainage patterns within construction sites and indicate stormwater discharge locations from the sites to the existing drainage system, as prescribed in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Through preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of Construction BMPs, such as Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs designed to minimize erosion and retain sediment on-site and Good Housekeeping BMPs designed to prevent spills, leaks, and discharges of construction debris and wastes into receiving waters, the HSR project is consistent with county grading requirements. Treatment BMPs would be included as part of the HSR project to target operational pollutants of concern and reduce the rate and volume of stormwater runoff, which would reduce water quality impacts to downstream receiving waters (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2). The LMF and the MOIF in the Antelope Valley would be subject to the requirements of the Industrial NPDES Permit as transportation facilities that conduct vehicle maintenance (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#4). Coverage under this permit would require the preparation of a site-specific operational SWPPP, which would require the implementation of measures to target pollutants. Therefore, with the implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features HYD-IAMF#1, HYD-IAMF#3, and HYD-IAMF#4 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2, the HSR project would not result in any significant impacts to water quality in the county and would protect and enhance the quality of stormwater runoff in areas where BMPs are not currently located.
Title 12: Environmental Protection 12.84: Low Impact Development Standards: identifies low-impact development standards.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would implement low-impact development techniques, such as infiltration basins and trenches, bioretention facilities, extended detention basins, and sand filter basins, to retain runoff on-site and reduce off-site runoff, as described in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2.
Title 26: Building Code Appendix J, Grading: Regulates grading on private property, sets forth rules and regulations to control grading, establishes procedures for the issuance of permits, and provides for approval of grading plans.	**Consistent.** The county grading code sets forth regulations to control grading and excavation activities and construction site runoff, including erosion sediments and construction-related pollutants. Although portions of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section in Los Angeles County are not subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit, grading and earthwork activities would comply with similar requirements, including preparation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP will describe temporary drainage patterns within construction sites and indicate stormwater discharge locations from the sites to the existing drainage system, as prescribed in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Through preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs, such as Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs designed to minimize erosion and retain sediment on-site and Good Housekeeping BMPs designed to prevent spills, leaks, and

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
	discharges of construction debris and wastes into receiving waters, the HSR project is consistent with county grading requirements.
Flood Control District Code Chapter 21: **Stormwater and Runoff Pollution Control:** Regulates stormwater and non-stormwater discharges to Los Angeles County Flood Control District facilities and downstream of those facilities, as well as the quality of water stored underground.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would direct on-site stormwater runoff to infiltration/detention basins to infiltrate. Stormwater runoff would be conveyed to the existing drainage system. Therefore, the project section would regulate the discharge of stormwater to receiving waters. Any impacts to Los Angeles County Flood Control District facilities would be coordinated with the county and the flood control district, and would be designed to comply with their requirements.
City of Tehachapi General Plan	
Sustainable Infrastructure Element Watershed and Water Supply Objective 1: Protect the overall health of the watershed.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would preserve the overall health of the watershed through the implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2, which would minimize/reduce impacts to surface water hydrology and surface water quality. Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2 require adherence to the requirements of the Construction General Permit, which includes the preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs to reduce impacts to hydrology and water quality. Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2 requires management and treatment of stormwater runoff during operation and requires compliance with the Authority's Phase II MS4 Permit and implementation of treatment BMPs to reduce impacts to hydrology and water quality during operation.
Sustainable Infrastructure Element Watershed and Water Supply Policy SI 1: Protect stream corridors and recharge areas from development.	**Not Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would include the construction of stream crossings over surface waters. This is not consistent with the watershed and water supply policy calling for the protection of stream corridors and recharge areas from development. However, the stream crossings would be designed to provide flow conveyance and connectivity. The details of these design specifications can be found in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6.
Sustainable Infrastructure Element Watershed and Water Supply Policy SI 2: Locate, map and preserve all aquifer recharge locations	**Not Applicable.** It is the responsibility of the City of Tehachapi, not the Authority, to locate, map, and preserve all aquifer recharge locations relevant to the city. However, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not impact any aquifer recharge locations. In addition, the project section would include infiltration/detention basins included in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2, which promote infiltration and can increase groundwater recharge within the project vicinity. Additionally, Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-3 requires the use and retention of native materials with high infiltration potential at the ground surface in areas that are critical to infiltration for groundwater recharge.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Sustainable Infrastructure Element Watershed and Water Supply Policy SI 3: Improve quality of urban stormwater runoff before discharging to water body or infiltration into aquifer.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. Compliance with the Construction General Permit requires the preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs aimed at targeting pollutants of concern in stormwater runoff, which would reduce impacts to surface water quality of receiving waters (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2). Treatment BMPs would be included as part of the HSR project to target operational pollutants of concern and reduce the rate and volume of stormwater runoff, which would reduce water quality impacts to downstream receiving waters (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2). Therefore, with the implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features HYD-IAMF#1 and HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2, the HSR project would improve the quality of stormwater runoff before discharging to receiving waters or before stormwater runoff infiltrates into the aquifer.
Sustainable Infrastructure Element Watershed and Water Supply Policy SI 4: Incorporate low impact design stormwater best management.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would implement low-impact development techniques, such as infiltration basins and trenches, bioretention facilities, extended detention basins, and sand filter basins, to retain runoff on-site and reduce off-site runoff, as described in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2.
Sustainable Infrastructure Element: Watershed and Water Supply Objective 2: Reduce discharge volumes.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would increase impervious surface area. Increases in impervious surface area have the potential to increase the rate and volume of stormwater runoff reaching receiving waters. The HSR project would include infiltration/detention basins to reduce the volume and rate of runoff, as identified in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2.
Sustainable Infrastructure Element: Watershed and Water Supply Policy SI 5: Reuse stormwater flows onsite.	**Consistent.** The soils in the project vicinity have relatively high infiltration rates. In addition, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would include infiltration/detention basins as part of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Such basins promote infiltration and on-site reuse of stormwater for groundwater recharge.
Sustainable Infrastructure Element: Watershed and Water Supply Policy SI 6: Where soils allow for infiltration, promote infiltration into the groundwater basin.	**Consistent.** The soils in the project vicinity have relatively high infiltration rates. In addition, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would include infiltration/detention basins as part of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Such basins promote infiltration and can increase groundwater recharge within the project vicinity. Additionally, Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-3 requires the use and retention of native materials with high infiltration potential at the ground surface in areas that are critical to infiltration for groundwater recharge.
Sustainable Infrastructure Element: Watershed and Water Supply Policy SI 7: Increase perviousness.	**Not Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would increase impervious surface area. This is not consistent with the watershed and water supply policy calling for increasing perviousness. However, the HSR project would promote infiltration into the soil through the installation of infiltration/detention basins included in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Sustainable Infrastructure Element: Watershed and Water Supply Policy SI 8: Slow stormwater runoff through low impact design BMPs.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would implement low-impact development techniques, such as infiltration basins and trenches, bioretention facilities, extended detention basins, and sand filter basins, to retain runoff on-site and reduce off-site runoff, as described in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2.
Sustainable Infrastructure Element: Watershed and Water Supply Policy SI 9: Naturalize channels whenever possible to maximize recharge opportunities.	**Not Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would cross surface waters on elevated structures/bridges, underground through tunnels or trenches, or at the surface level by culverts. The HSR project does not include improvements that would maximum recharge opportunities or naturalize channels. Therefore, the HSR project is not consistent with this watershed and water supply policy.
Sustainable Infrastructure Element: Watershed and Water Supply Policy SI 10: Discourage large scale retention basins in favor of a decentralized approach, accommodating as much runoff onsite as possible to minimize standing water, maximize infiltration, and improve aesthetics. Vegetated BMP's should be landscaped with native, drought tolerant plantings which conserve water and are cost effective.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would include infiltration/detention basins to capture stormwater runoff to promote infiltration on-site. These localized basins would prevent the need for large-scale retention basins to treat stormwater runoff. Any vegetated BMPs would be landscaped with native, drought-tolerant plant species.
Sustainable Infrastructure Element: Watershed and Water Supply Objective 3: Protect and conserve groundwater resources.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the volume or quality of groundwater resources. Operation of the HSR project would not require groundwater extraction. Additionally, Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-3 requires the use and retention of native materials with high infiltration potential at the ground surface in areas that are critical to infiltration for groundwater recharge. In the unlikely event that groundwater is encountered during pier construction, it is anticipated that the volume of groundwater that would be removed would be minor due to the depth of groundwater. Therefore, the HSR project would not deplete groundwater volumes within the project vicinity or affect groundwater resources that would be available to other uses in the planning area. Due to the depth of groundwater in the project vicinity (greater than 60 feet), there would not be a direct path for construction- or operation-related contaminants to reach groundwater. During pier construction of the waterbody crossings, shallow groundwater may be encountered; however, groundwater would be removed and disposed of according to the requirements of the applicable Dewatering Permit, as required by Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-2 and WQ-MM-5. Therefore, the HSR project would not have any significant or lasting effect on the groundwater beneath the project vicinity.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Sustainable Infrastructure Element: Watershed and Water Supply Policy SI 19: Avoid potential contaminants near vulnerable wells.	**Consistent.** Domestic and agricultural wells are located within the project vicinity. Construction activities near wells would be required to comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. Compliance with the Construction General Permit requires the preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction BMPs aimed at reducing pollutants of concern during construction (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2). During operation, the HSR project would treat stormwater runoff through the use of infiltration/detention basins in compliance with the Authority's Phase II MS4 Permit (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2). Therefore, with the implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features HYD-IAMF#1 and HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2, the potential for contaminants to impact wells would be avoided.
Sustainable Infrastructure Element: Utility Infrastructure Objective 2: Incorporate Low impact Development BMP's at all scales of the community.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would implement low-impact development techniques, such as infiltration basins and trenches, bioretention facilities, extended detention basins, and sand filter basins, to retain runoff on-site and reduce off-site runoff, as described in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2.
Sustainable Infrastructure Element: Utility Infrastructure Policy SI 24: Use low impact development BMPs such as the following to address stormwater and improve water quality: a. Decentralize stormwater basins, accommodating as much runoff on-site as possible; b. Improve surface water quality through increased use of bioretention basins and infiltration measures where possible; c. Require that 5% of all impervious surfaces function as on-site bioretention or infiltration; d. Convey stormwater through natural courses whenever possible rather than through pipes; e. Encourage disconnection of downspouts from storm drain system; f. Encourage stormwater reuse; g. Combine open space areas with stormwater management where possible.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would implement low-impact development techniques, such as infiltration basins and trenches, bioretention facilities, extended detention basins, and sand filter basins, to retain runoff on-site and reduce off-site runoff, as described in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
City of Tehachapi Municipal Code	
Title 13: Public Services 13.24: Floodplain Management: Promotes public health, safety, and welfare and minimizes losses due to flood conditions or flood-related erosions areas.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not increase the risk of safety or losses due to flood conditions or flood-related erosion through the implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6, which require the rise in water surface elevation as a result of the project to be no greater than 1 foot and include provisions for monitoring of floodplains into the future to ensure floodplain safety and avoid erosion.
Title 15: Buildings and Construction 15.04 Code of Building Regulations: Specifies that the City of Tehachapi has adopted the Kern County Grading Code.	**Consistent.** The Kern County Grading Code regulates grading activities and requires detailed plans of drainage structures and patterns during construction. Grading and earthmoving activities associated with construction of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. Compliance with the Construction General Permit requires the preparation of a SWPPP, which would describe the temporary drainage patterns within the construction sites and indicate stormwater discharge locations from the construction sites to the existing drainage system, as described in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Through compliance with the requirements of the Authority's Phase II MS4 Permit and Construction General Permit, the HSR project would be consistent with the Kern County Grading Code.
City of Lancaster General Plan	
Chapter 3: Plan for the Natural Environment Policy 3.1.1: Ensure that development does not adversely affect the groundwater basin.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not require the extraction of groundwater during operation. Additionally, Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-3 requires the use and retention of native materials with high infiltration potential at the ground surface in areas that are critical to infiltration for groundwater recharge. In the unlikely event that groundwater is encountered during pier construction, it is anticipated that the volume of groundwater that would be removed would be minor due to the depth of groundwater. Therefore, the HSR project would not deplete groundwater volumes within the project vicinity or affect groundwater resources that would be available to other uses in the planning area. Due to the depth of groundwater in the project vicinity (greater than 60 feet), there would not be a direct path for construction- or operation-related contaminants to reach groundwater. During pier construction of the waterbody crossings, shallow groundwater may be encountered; however, groundwater would be removed and disposed of according to the requirements of the applicable Dewatering Permit, as required by Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-3 and WQ-MM-5. Therefore, the HSR project would not adversely affect the underlying groundwater basins.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Chapter 4: Plan for Public Health and Safety Policy 4.2.1: Manage flood hazards to ensure an acceptable level of risk and to facilitate rapid physical and economic recovery following a flood through the identification and recognition of potentially hazardous conditions and implementation of effective standards for location and construction of development.	**Consistent.** Construction activities associated with the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section within the 100-year floodplain would be required to comply with standard flood control measures, including BMPs. In addition, the construction crew would monitor for heavy storms and potential flood flows. These measures are identified in Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-4. Further, to manage flood hazards, development within the floodplain would be subject to the requirements set forth in USEO 11988 and the FEMA regulations, which prevent development from increasing the base flood elevations by more than 1 foot. Therefore, the HSR project would manage flood hazards and would not result in an unacceptable level of risk from development.
Chapter 15: Plan for Municipal Services and Facilities Policy 15.1.4: Ensure that mitigation is provided for all development in recognized flood prone areas. Any mitigation of flood hazard in one area shall not exacerbate flooding problems in other areas.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section crosses through several FEMA-designated floodplains. Floodplain crossings would be designed to provide flood flow conveyance and connectivity. The project section would be required to comply with the requirements set forth in USEO 11988 and the FEMA regulations to prevent projects from increasing the base flood elevation by more than 1 foot in floodplains or substantially changing the floodplain limits, as identified in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6. Implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6 would reduce impacts in flood-prone areas associated with development of the HSR project.
City of Lancaster Municipal Code	
Title 13 Public Services 13.04 Prohibits depositing trash or debris in stormwater drainage facilities.	**Consistent.** Construction BMPs and treatment BMPs implemented during construction and operation, respectively, of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would target pollutants of concern in stormwater runoff, including trash and debris (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features HYD-IAMF#1, HYD-IAMF#3, HYD-IAMF#4 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2).
Title 15: Buildings and Construction 15.52: Adopts County of Los Angeles Ordinance Nos. 1549 and 5468, Interference with Flood Control Works**.**	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would direct on-site stormwater runoff to infiltration/detention basins. Stormwater runoff would be conveyed to the existing drainage system. Therefore, the project section would regulate the discharge of stormwater to receiving waters. Any impacts to Los Angeles County Flood Control District Facilities would be coordinated with the district and would be designed to comply with its requirements.
Title 17: Zoning 17.40 General Regulations Article III: Flood Damage Protection: Promotes public health and safety and minimizes losses due to flood conditions.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section crosses through several FEMA-designated floodplains. Floodplain crossings would be designed to provide flood flow conveyance and connectivity. The project section would be required to comply with the requirements set forth in USEO 11988 and the FEMA regulations to prevent projects from increasing the base flood elevation by more than 1 foot in floodplains or substantially changing the floodplain limits, as identified in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6. Implementation of Mitigation Measures Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6 would minimize impacts associated with the HSR project due to flood conditions.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Title 17: Zoning 17.32: Variances, Conditional Use Permits, Nonconforming Uses, Directors Review: Includes information regarding project grading requirements, conditional use grading permits, approved hauling routes, and compliance with the requirements of other county departments and governmental agencies.	**Consistent.** Although portions of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section in the City of Lancaster are not subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit, grading and earthwork activities would comply with similar requirements, including preparation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP will describe temporary drainage patterns within construction sites and indicate stormwater discharge locations from the sites to the existing drainage system, as prescribed in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Through preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of BMPs, the HSR project is consistent with city grading requirements.
City of Palmdale General Plan	
Environmental Resources Element Objective ER4.1: Ensure that groundwater supplies are recharged and remain free of contamination.	**Consistent.** The HSR track would not require the extraction of groundwater during operation. However, operation of the Palmdale Station subsection would require groundwater withdrawal of the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin. The amount of groundwater for operation of the station subsection is not anticipated to be substantial due to the size of the groundwater basin. Additionally, Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-3 requires the use and retention of native materials with high infiltration potential at the ground surface in areas that are critical to infiltration for groundwater recharge. In the unlikely event that groundwater is encountered during pier construction, it is anticipated that the volume of groundwater that would be removed would be minor due to the depth of groundwater. The HSR project would increase impervious surface area, which could decrease infiltration and decrease the amount of water that is able to recharge the aquifer/groundwater basin. However, this reduction in infiltration would not be substantial due to the size of the groundwater basins in the project vicinity. Additionally, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would include infiltration/detention basins, which promote infiltration and can increase groundwater recharge within the project vicinity as described in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. In addition, due to the depth of groundwater in the project vicinity (greater than 60 feet), there is not a direct path for construction- or operation-related contaminants to reach groundwater. Therefore, the HSR project would not affect groundwater supplies in the project vicinity.
Environmental Resources Element Policy ER 4.1.1: Incorporate the use of flood control measures which maximize groundwater recharge and the use of floodways as native habitat.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would implement standard flood control measures, including revegetation and BMPs, during construction as described in Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-4. Revegetation of surfaces would allow for stormwater to infiltrate, recharging the groundwater basin.
Environmental Resources Element Policy ER 4.1.2: Restrict building coverage and total impervious area in the vicinity of natural recharge areas.	**Not Applicable.** No main groundwater recharge areas are located within the project vicinity.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Environmental Resources Element Policy ER 4.1.3: Protect from pollutants or other materials which might degrade groundwater supplies, and enhance natural recharge areas such as the Little Rock and Big Rock Washes, and Amargosa and Anaverde Creeks, and ensure that no mineral resources recovery activities extend below the groundwater table.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not impact the quality of groundwater due to the depth of groundwater in the project vicinity. Additionally, the project section would include infiltration/ detention basins, which promote infiltration and can increase groundwater recharge within the project vicinity. No mineral resources recovery activities are proposed in association with the HSR project.
Environmental Resources Element Objective ER4.2: Minimize the impacts of urban development on groundwater supplies.	**Consistent.** The HSR track would not require the extraction of groundwater during operation. However, operation of the Palmdale Station subsection would require groundwater withdrawal from the Antelope Valley Groundwater Basin. The amount of groundwater for operation of the station subsection is not anticipated to be substantial due to the size of the groundwater basin. Additionally, Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-3 requires the use and retention of native materials with high infiltration potential at the ground surface in areas that are critical to infiltration for groundwater recharge. In the unlikely event that groundwater is encountered during pier construction, it is anticipated that the volume of groundwater that would be removed would be minor due to the depth of groundwater. The HSR project would increase impervious surface area, which could decrease infiltration and decrease the amount of water that is able to recharge the aquifer/groundwater basin. However, this reduction in infiltration would not be substantial due to the size of the groundwater basins in the project vicinity. Additionally, the project section would include infiltration/detention basins, which promote infiltration and can increase groundwater recharge within the project vicinity (Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#1 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2). Groundwater levels in the project vicinity are generally deep; most of the water depths are greater than 60 feet bgs. Due to the depth of groundwater, there would not be a direct path for construction-related contaminants to reach groundwater during construction activities. Therefore, the HSR project would not impact the quality or quantity of groundwater supplies. Therefore, the HSR project would not have any significant or lasting effect on the groundwater beneath the project vicinity.
Public Services Element Policy PS3.1.2: Evaluate the impact of all new development and expansion of existing facilities on storm runoff and ensure that the cost of upgrading existing drainage facilities to handle the additional runoff is paid for by the development that generates it.	**Consistent.** The drainage improvements associated with the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section were analyzed in the *Draft Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Drainage Report* (Authority 2016) and are analyzed in this EIR/EIS section. On-site stormwater runoff associated with the project section would be directed to on-site infiltration/detention basins and off-site stormwater runoff would be conveyed to the existing drainage system. These drainage improvements would be in compliance with the Authority's Phase II MS4 Permit, identified in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features HYD-IAMF#1 and HYD-IAMF#4 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2.
Public Services Element Policy PS3.2.1: Where feasible, plan for detention or retention facilities in areas where groundwater recharge can be accomplished.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would include infiltration/detention basins, which can increase groundwater recharge within the project vicinity.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
City of Palmdale Municipal Code	
Title 8: Health and Safety: 8.04.265/ 70. 7010 Stormwater Management: Requires that a stormwater management plan be prepared prior to obtaining a grading permit.	**Consistent.** A Stormwater Management Plan was prepared for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section and is included in Volume 2, Technical Appendices, of this EIR/EIS.
Title 8: Health and Safety 8.04.265/ 70: Excavation and Grading: Sets forth rules and regulations to control grading and grading site runoff, establishes the procedure for issuance of permits, provides for the inspection of grading construction	**Consistent.** Although portions of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section in the City of Palmdale are not subject to the requirements of the Construction General Permit, grading and earthwork activities would comply with similar requirements, including preparation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP will describe temporary drainage patterns within construction sites and indicate stormwater discharge locations from the sites to the existing drainage system, as prescribed in Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#3 and Mitigation Measure WQ-MM-2. Through preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of BMPs the HSR project is consistent with city grading requirements.
Title 15: Buildings and Construction 15.28 Floodplain Management: Requires that a floodplain development permit be obtained from the city prior to construction	**Consistent.** Floodplain impacts within Los Angeles County would be coordinated with the county and would comply with the applicable county requirements. The Authority has taken steps to meet city requirements through the implementation of Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature HYD-IAMF#2 and Mitigation Measures WQ-MM-1 and WQ-MM-6, which would minimize and/or reduce impacts to floodplains.

Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority
bgs = below ground surface
BMP = best management practice
CVFPB = Central Valley Flood Protection Board
EIR = environmental impact report
EIS = environmental impact statement
FEMA = Federal Emergency Management Agency
FP-P zone = Floodplain Primary Zone
HSR = high-speed rail
LMF = light maintenance facility
MOIF = maintenance of infrastructure facility
NPDES = National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
RWQCB = Regional Water Quality Control Board
SWPPP = Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB = State Water Resources Control Board
USEO = U.S. Executive Order

Table 2-H-7 Summary of Local Plans, Policies, and Ordinances—Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources

Policy Title	Summary
Kern County	
Kern County General Plan	• Chapter 1, Land Use, Open-Space, and Conservation Element: Goals 1.9.1 and 1.9.2, Policies 1.9.14 and 1.9.25, and Implementation Measures 1.9.H and 1.9.K promote compatible uses on or next to mineral and oil and gas lands. • Chapter 4, Safety Element: Goals 4.3.1 and 4.3.2, Policy 4.3.1, and Implementation Measures 4.3.A through 4.3.L minimize damage and loss of life and protect from geological hazards.
Kern County Ordinances	• Chapter 17, Building and Construction: Chapter 17.08 amends and enforces provisions of the California Building Code with respect to seismic design. It includes requirements for building construction, including geotechnical evaluations. • Title 19, Zoning: Title 19 outlines development requirements, such as the provision of geology and soils reports.
City of Bakersfield	
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan	• Chapter 5, Conservation Element: Goals B.1 through B.4, Policies B.1 through B.16, and Implementation Measures B.1 through B.5 protect areas of significant resource potential for future use and avoid conflicts between the productive use of mineral and energy resource lands and urban growth. • Chapter 8, Safety Element: Goals A.1 through A.7, Policies A.1 through A.25, and Implementation Measures A.1 through A.36 reduce the level of death, injury, property damage, economic and social dislocation, and disruption of vital services that would result from earthquake damage.
Bakersfield Ordinances	• Title 5, Business Taxes, Licenses, and Regulations: Chapter 5.58, Seismic Survey Activities, outlines requirements for seismic surveys. • Title 15, Building and Construction: Chapter 15.05 enforces and amends provisions of the California Building Code with respect to seismic safety. • Title 17, Zoning: Title 17 outlines development requirements, such as the provision of geology and soils reports.
Los Angeles County	
Los Angeles County General Plan	• Chapter 9, Conservation and Natural Resources Element: Goals C/NR 10 and C/NR 11, Policies 10.2 through 11.5, regulate development in MRZs and require remediation of abandoned surface mines. • Chapter 12, Safety Element: Goal S1, Policies S 1.1 through 1.2, discourage development in areas prone to seismic hazards.
Los Angeles County Ordinances	• Title 26, Building Code: Chapters 2 through 35 adopt and modify the California Building Code, including as it applies to seismic design. • Title 22, Planning and Zoning: Chapter 22.44, Hazards Area, includes requirements for analysis and development standards for projects located in geologic and soils hazard areas.

Policy Title	Summary
City of Tehachapi	
City of Tehachapi General Plan	• Natural Resources Element, Soil and Minerals Section: Objectives 1 through 3, Policies NR 33 through 39, protect mineral resources, regulate their extraction, and call for the reclamation of closed mining sites. • Community Safety Element: Objective 1, Policies CS1 through CS2, require geotechnical evaluation for development to address seismic hazards. Objective 4, Policies CS12 through CS14, reduce slope hazards and maintain the natural integrity of slopes.
City of Tehachapi Ordinances	• Title 15, Buildings and Construction: Article III, Building Code, adopts the uniform codes of the County of Kern, including the Building Code.
City of Lancaster	
City of Lancaster General Plan	• Chapter 2, Plan for the Natural Environment Objective 3.5, Policy 3.5.1, Specific Actions 3.5.1(a) through (e), minimize erosion caused by development. Objective 3.7, Policies 3.7.1 and 3.7.2, Specific Actions 3.7.1(a) through 3.7.2(b), ensure proper management of mineral resources in the City of Lancaster. • Chapter 3, Plan for Public Health and Safety: Objective 4.1, Policies 4.1.1 and 4.1.2, Specific Actions 4.1.1(a) through 4.1.2(b), include measures for assessing seismic hazards and ensuring development meets seismic design requirements.
City of Lancaster Ordinances	• Title 15, Buildings and Construction: Title 15 includes adopted codes and guidelines for building construction, including those that apply to seismic and geologic hazards.
City of Palmdale	
City of Palmdale General Plan	• Land Use Element: Goal L1, Objective L1.4, Policies L1.4.1 through L1.4.3, protect residential uses from mineral resource extraction, seismic hazards, and steep slope hazards. Goal L7, Policies L7.1.6 through L7.1.7, ensure that mining activities in the Mineral Resource Extraction Zone east and west of 70th Street and south of Avenue N are compatible with surrounding residential uses. • Environmental Resources Element: Goal ER6, Objectives ER6.1 and ER6.2, Policies ER6.1.1 through 6.2.6, identify the conservation of mineral resources and the reclamation of mineral resource extractions zones, principally the Little Rock Waste area. • Safety Element: Goal S1, Objective S1.1, Policies S1.1.1 through S1.1.10, set geologic hazard assessment requirements for development, including the preparation of geotechnical studies, restriction of utility lines from active fault traces, and structural requirements for prevention of seismic damage.
City of Palmdale Ordinances	• Chapter 8.04: Adoption of Health, Safety, and Technical Construction Codes Chapter 8.04 requires development to be consistent with the Palmdale Building Code, including regulations related to seismic design.

Policy Title	Summary
Grading Codes	
Kern County Grading Code, Chapter 17.28	Chapter 17.28 regulates grading on private property, sets forth rules and regulations to control grading, establishes procedures for the issuance of permits, and provides for approval of grading plans.
Los Angeles County Grading Code, Title 26 Appendix J	Title 26, Appendix J, regulates grading on private property, sets forth rules and regulations to control grading, establishes procedures for the issuance of permits, and provides for approval of grading plans.
Los Angeles County Grading Ordinance	The Los Angeles County Grading Ordinance provides an informational manual for the preparation and processing of grading permit applications
City of Bakersfield Grading Code, Section 15.05.170	Section 15.05.170 specifies grading plans and grading permit regulations.
City of Tehachapi Grading Code, Section 15.04.160	The City of Tehachapi has adopted the Kern County Grading Code.

Source: California High Speed Rail (2016)
SSMP = Sewer System Management Plan
SWRCB = State Water Resources Control Board

Table 2-H-8 Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis—Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Kern County General Plan (2009): Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element			
Goal 1.9.1: To contain new development within an area large enough to meet generous projections of foreseeable need, but in locations which will not impair the economic strength derived from the petroleum, agriculture, rangeland, or mineral resources, or diminish the other amenities which exist in the County.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project alignment is not expected to affect existing mineral resources because the alignment would be routed around locations where mining is occurring. The HSR project would encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield and Palmdale station sites, which would indirectly discourage new development from occurring in petroleum, agriculture, rangeland, or mineral resource areas, or diminish the other amenities that exist in the county. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal 1.9.2: Protect areas of important mineral, petroleum, and agricultural resource potential for future use.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project alignment is not expected to affect existing mineral resources because the alignment would be routed around locations where mining is occurring. While a small number of individual wells may be affected by the project, the project would not result in damage to the geologic horizons containing the oil or gas due to the depth of the oil and gas reserves. The HSR project would encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield and Palmdale station sites, which would indirectly discourage new development from occurring in petroleum, agriculture, or mineral resource areas. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 1.9.14: Emphasize conservation and development of identified mineral deposits.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project alignment is not expected to affect existing mineral resources because the alignment would be routed around locations where mining is occurring. The HSR project would encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield and Palmdale station sites, which would indirectly discourage new development from occurring in mineral resource areas. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 1.9.25: Discourage incompatible land use adjacent to Map Code 8.4 (Mineral and Petroleum) areas.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project alignment is not expected to affect existing mineral resources because the alignment would be routed around locations where mining is occurring. The HSR project alignment will cross the Edison oil field, where there are many active oil wells. While the project may affect a small number of individual wells, it would not result in damage to the geologic horizons containing the oil or gas due to the depth of the oil and gas reserves. The project would not result in a loss of access to oil and gas resources. Further, the project will

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
			comply with the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (Cal. Public Res. Code, § 2710 et seq.) to prevent and minimize the adverse impacts of surface mining on public health, property, and the environment. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Implementation Measure 1.9.H: Use the California Geological Survey's latest maps to locate mineral deposits until the regional and Statewide importance mineral deposits map has been completed, as required by the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would use the latest CGS maps to obtain information on the mineral resource potential in the area, including mineral deposits. The HSR project is therefore consistent with the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act, and all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this measure.
Implementation Measure 1.10.3M: In areas of known paleontological resources, the County should address the preservation of these resources where feasible.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** This is required as part of the IAMFs.
Kern County General Plan (2009): Safety Element			
Goal 4.1.1: Minimize injuries and loss of life and reduce property damage.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, the HSR project will be constructed to minimize injuries and loss of life, as well as property damage, consistent with applicable plans, policies and requirements.
Goal 4.1.2: Reduce economic and social disruption resulting from earthquakes, fire, flooding, and other geologic hazards by assuring the continuity of vital emergency public services and functions.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, the HSR project may increase emergency service demands at the LMF with earthquakes, fire, flooding, and other geologic hazards. Emergency responses to incidents at the LMF would be monitored and if it were determined that the HSR alternative alignments increased demand for these services, a fair-share impact fee to local service providers would be negotiated. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 4.3.1: The County shall require development for human occupancy to be placed in a location away from an active earthquake fault in order to minimize safety concerns.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would ensure that development for human occupancy will be placed in a location away from active earthquake faults. LMFs of this alignment are not located in a hazardous fault zone, and safety concerns related to surface fault rupture are not anticipated. All four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Implementation Measure 4.3.B: Require geological and soils engineering investigations in identified significant geologic hazard areas in accordance with the Kern County Code of Building Regulations.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that appropriate geologic and soils engineering investigations in significant geologic hazard areas are conducted in accordance with the Kern County Code of Building Regulations.
Implementation Measure 4.3.C: The fault zones designated in the Kern County Seismic Hazard Atlas should be considered significant geologic hazard areas. Proper precautions should be instituted to reduce seismic hazard, whenever possible in accordance with State and County regulations.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR Authority will implement applicable State and County regulations to minimize seismic hazards.
Implementation Measure 4.3.D: Detailed geologic investigations shall be conducted in conformance with guidelines of the California Geological Survey for all discretionary permits and construction designed for human occupancy in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that detailed geologic investigations are conducted in conformance with the guidelines of the California Geologic Survey and all human occupancy within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone would be designed to applicable standards for these areas.
Implementation Measure 4.3.G: Route major lifeline components such as highways, utilities, petroleum or chemical pipelines around areas of high groundwater whenever possible. Where they must cross an area of high groundwater, plans, and permits shall require design features to accommodate extensive ground rupture without prolonged disruption of an essential service or threat to health and safety.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.8, Hydrology and Water Resources, the groundwater levels adjacent to the HSR alignment are generally deep; however, groundwater in mountainous regions, where groundwater basins are not present, is highly variable. The HSR project will be constructed to accommodate any potential ground rupture in areas of high groundwater and design features would ensure no prolonged disruption of essential service or threat to health and safety. All of the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this measure.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Implementation Measure 4.3.H: Require that plans and permits for installation of major lifeline components such as highways, utilities, petroleum or chemical pipelines to incorporate design features to accommodate potential fault movement in areas of active faults without prolonged disruption of essential service or threat to health and safety.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project will incorporate design features to accommodate potential fault movement in areas of active faults without prolonged disruption of essential service or threat to health and safety.
Implementation Measure 4.3.I: Design significant lifeline installations, such as highways, utilities, and petrochemical pipelines which cross an active fault, to accommodate potential fault movement without prolonged disruption of essential service or creating threat to health and safety.	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR will implement project design features to address potential fault movement for areas of the alignment that cross an active fault. All four Build Alternatives will implement these features and be consistent with this measure.
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (2002): Land Use Element			
Policy 104: As part of the environmental review procedure, an evaluation of the significance of paleontological, archaeological, and historical resources and the impact of proposed development on those resources shall be conducted and appropriate mitigation and monitoring included for development projects.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As part of the environmental review process, a paleontological identification and evaluation technical report was prepared and potential impacts associated with the project were analyzed. The project includes IAMFs (including monitoring) that would mitigate impacts.
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (2002): Conservation Element			
Goal B.1: Protect areas of significant resource potential for future use.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR system would not conflict with significant resource areas that may be needed for future use.
Goal B.3: Avoid conflicts between the productive use of mineral and energy resource lands and urban growth.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project alignment is not expected to create conflict between urban growth and existing mineral and energy resource lands. The alignment would be routed around locations where mining is occurring. While the project may affect a small number of individual oil wells, it would not result in damage to the geologic horizons containing the oil or gas due to the depth of the oil and gas reserves. The project would not result in a loss of access to oil and gas resources. Further, the project will comply with the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (Cal. Public Res. Code, § 2710

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
			et seq.) to prevent and minimize the adverse impacts of surface mining on public health, property, and the environment. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy B.3: Encourage and support the exchange of information on mineral and energy resources between private industry, City of Bakersfield and Kern County (I-1).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will participate in the transparent exchange of information on mineral and energy resources related to the construction and operation of the project alignment.
Policy B.4: Land use decisions shall recognize the importance of identified mineral resources and need for conservation of resources identified by the State Mining and Geology Board (I-2).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project alignment is not expected to affect existing mineral resources because the alignment would be routed around locations where mining is occurring.
Policy B.5: Protect significant mineral and petroleum resource areas, including potential sand and gravel extraction areas (I-2).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project alignment is not expected to affect existing mineral resources because the alignment would be routed around locations where mining is occurring. The HSR project alignment will cross the Edison oil field, where there are many active oil wells. While the project may affect a small number of individual wells, it would not result in damage to the geologic horizons containing the oil or gas due to the depth of the oil and gas reserves. The project would not result in a loss of access to oil and gas resources. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy B.7: Promote development of compatible uses adjacent to mineral extraction areas (I-2).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project alignment is expected to be consistent with adjacent mineral extraction areas because the alignment would be routed around locations where mining is occurring. The HSR project would encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield and Palmdale station sites, which would indirectly discourage new development from occurring in mineral resource areas. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy B.9: Encourage preservation of any known deposits of gemstones and fossils (I-1).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project will integrate federal and state laws into development that address the preservation of fossil and gemstone deposits.
Policy B.10: Implement, as appropriate, the California Environmental Quality Act to minimize land use conflicts and reduce environmental impacts of all proposed resource extraction operations (I-2).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will follow CEQA guidelines to minimize environmental impacts related to resource extraction operations.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy B.11: Prohibit incompatible development in areas which have a significant potential for harm to public health, safety and welfare due to mineral and petroleum extraction and processing (I-2).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project alignment is not expected to affect existing mineral resources because the alignment would be routed around locations where mining is occurring. The HSR project alignment will cross the Edison oil field, where there are many active oil wells. While a small number of individual wells may be affected by the project, the project would not result in damage to the geologic horizons containing the oil or gas due to the depth of the oil and gas reserves. The project would not result in a loss of access to oil and gas resources. Further, the project will comply with the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (Cal. Public Res. Code, § 2710 et seq.) to prevent and minimize the adverse impacts of surface mining on public health, property, and the environment. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy B.12: Design resource extraction operations subject to discretionary permits to maintain the integrity of areas of "high environmental quality" and unique scenic value (I-2).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (Cal. Public Res. Code, § 2710 et seq.) to prevent and minimize the adverse impacts of surface mining on public health, property, and the environment. The project will also comply with local jurisdictions that have the specific responsibility for permitting and oversight of mineral resources extraction activities. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy B.13: Require surface mineral resource extraction sites to have plans and procedures for land reclamation; pursuant to the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (Public Resource Code Section 2710 et seq.) and conforming with the requirements of the State Mining and Geology Board Reclamation Regulations, to be implemented upon completion of extraction operations at each site or portion thereof (I-2).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would comply with both the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act and State Mining and Geology Board Reclamation Regulations with regard to any surface mineral resource extraction that may be related to the project.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy B.16: Require all mineral development to be predicated on appropriate reclamation plans that meet the standards of the State Surface Mining and Reclamation Act and the implementing guidelines of the State Mines and Geology Board, and (or) the standards of the State Division of Oil and Gas. Reclamation/restoration of the sites shall be done as each phase of development or extraction is completed (I-4, I-5).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project alignment is not expected to affect existing mineral resources because the alignment would be routed around locations where mining is occurring. The HSR project alignment will cross the Edison oil field, where there are many active oil wells. While a small number of individual wells may be affected by the project, the project would not result in damage to the geologic horizons containing the oil or gas due to the depth of the oil and gas reserves. The project would not result in a loss of access to oil and gas resources. The HSR project will comply with the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (Cal. Public Res. Code, § 2710 et seq.) and meet the standards of DOGGR's regulatory program. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Implementation Measure B.4: Contact responsible local, State, and Federal agencies upon receipt of application for mineral and/or petroleum resource exploration, or development, to establish development compliance criteria, health hazards safe guards, and restoration/re-vegetation follow-up procedures.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (Cal. Public Res. Code, § 2710 et seq.) to prevent and minimize the adverse impacts of surface mining on public health, property, and the environment. The project will also comply with local jurisdictions that have the specific responsibility for permitting and oversight of mineral resources extraction activities. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (2002) : Safety Element			
Goal A.1: Substantially reduce the level of death, injury, property damage, economic and social dislocation and disruption of vital services that would result from earthquake damage.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will design and implement the HSR system such that risks and damage as a result of earthquake damage are minimized to the greatest extent possible through implementation of appropriate design feature and avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures.
Goal A.2: Ensure the availability and effective response of emergency services following an earthquake.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, the Authority will ensure that emergency service response levels are maintained during construction and operation.
Goal A.3: Prepare the planning area for effective response to, and rapid, beneficial recovery from, an earthquake.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, the construction and operation of the HSR system would not interfere with the ability of the planning area to recover from an earthquake.
Goal A.4: Prevent loss of life from the failure of critical facilities in an earthquake and ensure the continued functioning of essential facilities following a disaster.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR alternative alignments would not interfere with the operation of critical facilities in the event of an earthquake. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, the HSR system would not interfere with access to these facilities in the event of an emergency.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Goal A.5: Protect essential lifelines and prevent casualties and major social and economic disruption due to liquefaction in an earthquake.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR alternative alignments have been designed to avoid known liquefaction hazard areas to the greatest extent possible. Where avoidance is not possible, the Authority would implement appropriate design measures to reduce the risks as a result of liquefaction.
Goal A.7: Protect land uses from the risk of dam failure inundation including the assurances that: the functional capabilities of essential facilities are available in the event of a flood; hazardous materials* are not released; effective measures for mitigation of dam failure inundation are incorporated into the design of critical facilities; and the rapid and orderly evacuation of populations in the inundation area will occur.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** The Authority will design the HSR system to minimize damage and hazards to nearby communities to the greatest extent possible.
Policy A.1: Ensure that earthquake survival and efficient post-disaster functions are a primary objective in the siting, design and construction standards for discretionary essential facilities or for expansion of such existing facilities (I-1 through I-11).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would construct the Build Alternatives such that they do not interfere with the provision of earthquake survival and post-disaster functions for discretionary essential facilities. As discussed in Chapter 3.11, Safety and Security, the HSR system would not interfere with access provisions for emergency services.
Policy A.2: Require that the siting and development of critical facilities under discretionary approval by the City Council and Board of Supervisors be supported by documentation of thorough hazard investigations relating to site selection, preconstruction site investigations and application of the most current professional standards for seismic design (I-1, I-2, I-10, I-13, I-26, I-29).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has and will continue to prepare appropriate documentation for potential hazards consistent with current standards for seismic design.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy A.4: Encourage critical facilities in dam inundation areas to develop and maintain plans for safe shut-down and efficient evacuation from their facilities, as appropriate to the degree of flood hazard for each facility (I-26, I-31).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Critical facilities of the HSR project (MOIF and LMF) are not within any catastrophic dam failure inundation zone. Neither the Lancaster General Plan nor the County of Los Angeles General Plan indicates a seismically induced flooding hazard for these facilities. The Authority will ensure that structures within a dam inundation area are designed such that evacuation and hazards to occupants/surrounding communities are minimized in the event of dam failure and that plans for safe shutdown are maintained.
Policy A.5: Incorporate planning for incidents affecting critical facilities into contingency plans for disaster response and recovery (I-31).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, planning for incidents affecting critical facilities will be incorporated into applicable safety and security planning documents for the HSR system.
Policy A.9: Adopt and maintain high standards for seismic performance of buildings, through prompt adoption and careful enforcement of the most current seismic standards of the Uniform Building Code (I-1, I-2, I-3, I-5, I-7, I-10 through I-12).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** The Authority will ensure that construction of the Bakersfield Station would not conflict with the maintenance of high standards for seismic performance of buildings in the City of Bakersfield.
Policy A.10: Prohibit development designed for human occupancy within 50 feet of a known active fault and prohibit any building from being placed astride an active fault (I-14, I-15).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project would ensure that development for human occupancy will be placed in a location away from active earthquake faults. LMFs of this alignment are not located in a hazardous fault zone, and safety concerns related to surface fault rupture are not anticipated. All four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy A.11: Require site-specific studies to locate and characterize specific fault traces within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone for all construction designed for human occupancy (I-13).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has conducted detailed geologic investigations in order to conform to the guidelines of the California Division of Mines and Geology within areas mapped as Alquist-Priolo Earthquake fault zones in the RSA.
Policy A.12: Design significant lifeline installations such as highways, utilities and petrochemical pipelines which cross an active fault, to accommodate potential fault movement without prolonged disruption of an essential service or creating threat to health and safety (I-16).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** In the event of the relocation of a lifeline installation (i.e., utilities, pipelines) for construction and operation of the HSR system, the Authority will relocate such installations such that they do not create a threat to health and safety or prolonged disruption of service.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy A.13: Determine the liquefaction potential at sites in areas of high groundwater prior to development and determine specific mitigation to be incorporated into the foundation design, as necessary to prevent or reduce damage from liquefaction in an earthquake (I-17 through I-19).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has identified liquefaction potential for the RSA, and has developed and will implement appropriate mitigation measures to minimize damage from liquefaction during an earthquake.
Policy A.14: Route major lifeline installations around potential liquefaction areas or otherwise protect them against significant damage from liquefaction in an earthquake (I-20).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR alternative alignments have been designed to avoid known liquefaction hazard areas to the greatest extent possible. Where avoidance is not possible, the Authority would implement appropriate design measures to reduce the risks as a result of liquefaction.
Policy A.18: Design discretionary critical facilities located within the potential inundation area for dam failure in order to: mitigate the effects of inundation on the facility; promote orderly shut-down and evacuation (as appropriate); and, prevent on-site hazards from affecting building occupants and the surrounding communities in the event of dam failure (I-26).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will ensure that any structures or facilities within a dam inundation area are designed such that evacuation and hazards to occupants/surrounding communities are minimized in the event of dam failure.
Policy A.19: Design discretionary facilities in the potential dam inundation area used for the manufacture, storage or use of hazardous materials to prevent on-site hazards from affecting surrounding communities in the event of inundation (I-27).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will ensure that any structures or facilities within a dam inundation area are designed such that any hazardous materials would not affect the surround community in the event of inundation.
Policy A.22: Require local agencies to coordinate with the business community to reduce seismic hazards (I-29 through I-36).	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has and will continue to coordinate with the business community to reduce seismic hazards within the RSA.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Implementation A.2: Require detailed site studies for ground shaking characteristics, liquefaction potential, dam failure inundation and flooding potential, and fault rupture potential, as background to the design process for critical facilities under city and county discretionary approval.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** The Authority has and will continue to prepare detailed site studies to appropriately identify, address, and mitigate ground shaking characteristics within the RSA.
Implementation A.3: Require structures that are within the plan area and are subject to Building Department review to adhere to the most current seismic standards adopted as part of the Uniform Building Code.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that all structures constructed as part of the HSR system would conform to Uniform Building Code standards.
Implementation A.13: Detailed geologic investigations shall be conducted, in conformance with guidelines of the California Division of Mines and Geology, for all construction designed for human occupancy in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Study Zone.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority has conducted detailed geologic investigations in order to conform to the guidelines of the California Division of Mines and Geology within areas mapped as Alquist-Priolo Earthquake fault zones in the RSA.
Implementation A.16: Require plans and permits for installation of major lifeline components such as for highways, utilities and petroleum or chemical pipelines to incorporate design features to accommodate potential fault movement in areas of active faults without prolonged disruption of an essential service or threat to health and safety.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will submit all required plans and permits for installation of major lifeline components to accommodate potential fault movement when such lifeline components must be relocated for the HSR project.
Implementation A.17: Require liquefaction investigations in all areas of high groundwater potential and appropriate foundation designs to mitigate potential damage to buildings on sites with liquefaction potential.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will conduct all required liquefaction investigation in areas with high groundwater potential and any additional areas with liquefaction potential in order to appropriately mitigate potential damage.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Implementation A.19: Require the proper sealing of any abandoned wells and the removal of abandoned underground irrigation and drainage systems to be accomplished prior to subdivision approval in areas of high groundwater, to prevent the uncontrolled flow of water from adversely affecting long-term efforts for liquefaction and groundwater mitigation.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Although the HSR project would not require subdivision approval, all abandoned wells and drainage/irrigation systems will be properly sealed to prevent adverse effects to liquefaction potential and/or ground water mitigation.
Implementation A.20: Route major lifeline components such as for highways, utilities and petroleum or chemical pipelines around areas of high groundwater wherever possible. Where they must cross an area of high groundwater, plans and permits shall require design features to accommodate extensive ground rupture without prolonged disruption of an essential service or threat to health and safety.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives and Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** The HSR project alignment will be routed around areas of high groundwater wherever possible. These areas will also be evaluated during the design investigation phase of the project so that appropriate foundations can be designed and constructed. The infrastructure and development projects would, at a minimum, be subject to the Title 24 Building Code requirements, which require application of engineering design features to address and minimize risks related to high groundwater and ground rupture.
Implementation A.27: Facilities used for the manufacture, storage or use of hazardous materials shall comply with the uniform fire code, with requirements for siting or design to prevent on-site hazards from affecting surrounding communities in the event of inundation.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	Bakersfield Station	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield Station will potentially use and store hazardous materials. The Authority will ensure that all materials are stored consistent with applicable codes and regulations to prevent on-site hazards in the event of inundation.
Implementation A.29: Maintain effective disaster response and earthquake response plans and update on a regular basis.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, the Authority would ensure the implementation and maintenance of disaster and earthquake response plans**.** In addition to structural design features, the HSR system would implement operational procedures to protect passenger and employee health. The HSR system would also have a seismic monitoring system of sensors and slide detectors that would automatically stop trains approaching areas of seismic activity in order to minimize the possibility of a derailment due to a seismic event.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Implementation A.30: Require the city and county to maintain effective mutual aid agreements for fire, police, medical response, emergency morgue, mass care, heavy rescue, and other functions as appropriate.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, the Authority will ensure that adequate emergency services are maintained within the RSA, including through implementation of mutual aid agreements should additional demand for emergency services arise as a result of the HSR system.
Implementation A.31: Require emergency response plans and disaster exercise scenarios to include contingencies for the problems listed below; earth-quake response exercises shall be conducted at least once a year. • Rupture of any active fault within 40 miles of Bakersfield. • Collapse of 50 buildings or more, including some mid-rise structures, some essential facilities and numerous unreinforced masonry buildings. • Ground rupture and attendant property damage due to pockets of liquefaction in areas of high groundwater. • Complete evacuation of the potential inundation area. • Many aftershocks, continuing for many weeks or months.	City of Bakersfield/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The construction and operation of the HSR system in the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not interfere with the requirements or provisions set forth for emergency response plans and/or disaster exercise scenarios related to earthquake response.
Los Angeles County General Plan (2015): Conservation and Natural Resources Element			
Goal C/NR 10: Locally available mineral resources to meet the needs of construction, transportation, and industry.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The construction and operation of the HSR system would not interfere with the provision of adequate mineral resources to meet long-term regional needs. The Authority has avoided and minimized impacts to mineral resource extraction operations or potential future reserves where possible.
Policy C/NR 10.4: Work collaboratively with agencies to identify Mineral Resource Zones and to prioritize mineral land use classifications in regional efforts.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Chapter 3.9, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, the Authority has identified MRZs within the RSA through field work and agency coordination. The Authority will avoid and minimize impacts to mineral resource extraction operations or potential future reserves where possible.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy C/NR 10.5: Manage mineral resources in a manner that effectively plans for access to, development and conservation of, mineral resources for existing and future generations.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The construction and operation of the HSR system would not interfere with the provision of adequate mineral resources to meet long-term regional needs. The Authority has avoided and minimized impacts to mineral resource extraction operations or potential future reserves where possible.
Policy C/NR 10.6: Require that new non-mining land uses adjacent to existing mining operations be designed to provide a buffer between the new development and the mining operations. The buffer distance shall be based on an evaluation of noise, aesthetics, drainage, operating conditions, biological resources, topography, lighting, traffic, operating hours, and air quality.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Where applicable, the HSR project footprint would be located between existing mining operations and existing and potential new nonmining land uses. The HSR system would provide an adequate buffer between these land uses.
Policy C/NR 11.1: Require mineral resource extraction and production activities and drilling for and production of oil and natural gas to comply with County regulations and state requirements, such as SMARA, and DOGGR regulations.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (Cal. Public Res. Code, § 2710 et seq.) and meet the standards of DOGGR's regulatory program to prevent and minimize the adverse impacts of surface mining on public health, property, and the environment. The project will also comply with local jurisdictions that have the specific responsibility for permitting and oversight of mineral resources extraction activities. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy C/NR 11.3: Require appropriate levels of remediation for all publicly-owned oil and natural gas production sites based on possible future uses.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project alignment will cross the Edison oil field, where there are many active oil wells. While the project may affect a small number of individual wells, it would not result in damage to the geologic horizons containing the oil or gas due to the depth of the oil and gas reserves. The project would not result in a loss of access to oil and gas resources. The construction and operation of the HSR system would not interfere with the provision of adequate resources to meet long-term regional needs. The Authority has avoided and minimized impacts to potential future reserves where possible.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy C/NR 11.4: Require that mineral resource extraction and production operations, as well as activities related to the drilling for and production of oil and natural gas, be conducted to protect other natural resources and prevent excessive grading in hillside areas.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (Cal. Public Res. Code, § 2710 et seq.) and meet the standards of DOGGR's regulatory program to prevent and minimize the adverse impacts of surface mining on public health, property, and the environment. The project will also comply with local jurisdictions that have the specific responsibility for permitting and oversight of mineral resources extraction activities. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy C/NR 11.5: Encourage and support efforts to increase the safety of oil and gas production and processing activities, including state regulations related to well stimulation techniques such as hydraulic fracturing or "fracking."	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (Cal. Public Res. Code, § 2710 et seq.) and meet the standards of DOGGR's regulatory program to prevent and minimize the adverse impacts of surface mining on public health, property, and the environment. The project will also comply with local jurisdictions that have the specific responsibility for permitting and oversight of mineral resources extraction activities. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy C/NR 14.1: Mitigate all impacts from new development on or adjacent to historic, cultural, and paleontological resources to the greatest extent feasible.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As part of the environmental review process, a paleontological identification and evaluation technical report was prepared and potential impacts associated with the project were analyzed. The project includes IAMFs (including monitoring) that would mitigate impacts.
Policy C/NR 14.6: Ensure proper notification and recovery processes are carried out for development on or near historic, cultural, and paleontological resources.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** These steps are required as part of the IAMFs.
Los Angeles County General Plan (2015): Safety Element			
Goal S1: An effective regulatory system that prevents or minimizes personal injury, loss of life and property damage due to seismic and geotechnical hazards.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, the HSR project will be constructed to minimize injuries and loss of life, as well as property damage, consistent with applicable plans, policies and requirements. The Authority will implement applicable state and county regulations to minimize seismic hazards.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy S 1.1: Discourage development in Seismic Hazard and Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Not Consistent.** The HSR project would ensure that development for human occupancy will be placed in a location away from active earthquake faults. LMFs of this alignment are not located in a hazardous fault zone, and safety concerns related to surface fault rupture are not anticipated. Portions of the HSR alignment do cross into an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Appropriate project design features would be implemented to reduce adverse effects related to seismically induced ground shaking.
Policy S 1.2: Prohibit the construction of most structures for human occupancy adjacent to active faults until a comprehensive fault study that addresses the potential for fault rupture has been completed.	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that detailed geologic investigations are conducted in conformance with the guidelines of the California Geologic Survey and all human occupancy adjacent to an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone would be designed to applicable standards for these areas.
Tehachapi General Plan (2012): Natural Resources Element, Soil and Minerals Section			
Objective 1: Protect mineral resources	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project alignment is not expected to affect existing mineral resources because the alignment would be routed around locations where mining is occurring. The HSR project would encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield and Palmdale station sites, which would indirectly discourage new development from occurring in mineral resource areas. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy NR 33: Avoid allowing any use or development in areas identified with important mineral resources. For sites outside of Tehachapi's Sphere of Influence, represent this policy to Kern County as part of the review process.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project alignment is not expected to affect existing mineral resources because the alignment would be routed around locations where mining is occurring. The HSR project would encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield and Palmdale station sites, which would indirectly discourage new development from occurring in mineral resource areas. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective 2: Balance between the need to extract mineral resources and the need for a healthy and beautiful environment	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project alignment is not expected to affect existing mineral resources because the alignment would be routed around locations where mining is occurring. Further, the project will comply with the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (Cal. Public Res. Code, § 2710 et seq.) to prevent and minimize the adverse impacts of surface mining on public health, property, and the environment. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy NR 35: Monitor the requirements set forth by Kern County and other agencies on mineral-extraction operations to identify issues regarding compliance (e.g., dust-management, dust-control by haulers, noise, vibration, odor, aesthetics, etc.).	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with local jurisdictions, including Kern County, that have the specific responsibility for permitting and oversight of mineral resources extraction activities. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy NR 39: As each portion of a mineral-extraction operation is closed, apply the most current and environmentally responsible reclamation measures, as consistent with the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA).	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Where applicable, the Authority would apply the most current and environmentally responsible reclamation measures to closing mineral extraction operations within the RSA.
Tehachapi General Plan (2012): Community Safety Element			
Objective 1: Avoid and/or address seismic and geologic hazards through early and clear information	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, the HSR project will be constructed to minimize injuries and loss of life, as well as property damage, consistent with applicable plans, policies and requirements.
Policy CS 1: Require the following of project applicants as appropriate to the proposed land use/development activity: a. Geotechnical evaluations and mitigation prior to development on any property with the following characteristics: i. Contains slopes greater than 10 percent or that otherwise have potential for landsliding, ii. Within an Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone or within 100 feet of an identified active or potentially active fault, iii. Within areas mapped as having moderate or high risk of liquefaction, subsidence, or expansive soils, iv. Within the 100-year flood zone, in conformance with all Federal Emergency Management Agency regulations;	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that appropriate geologic and soils engineering investigations in significant geologic hazard areas are conducted in accordance with the Kern County Code of Building Regulations. As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, the HSR project will be constructed to minimize injuries and loss of life, as well as property damage, consistent with applicable plans, policies and requirements.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
v. Having the reasonable potential for seismic and geologic hazards. b. That all analyses adequately address site-specific questions such as slope stability, erosion, subsidence, groundwater effects and earthquakes. The effects of proposed development on adjacent upslope and downslope areas as well as on the site itself shall be evaluated; c. Apply Chapter 18 of the California Building Code regulating earth work and grading during construction, Chapter 32 - Encroachments into Public Right-of-Way, and Chapter 33 - Safeguards During Construction (includes protection of adjoining property, and temporary use of streets & public property); d. Limit acreage of bare soils exposed at any one time. Restrict grading to the dry season and require immediate re-vegetation for areas of the site slated to be left.			
Policy CS 2: Require all development within an identified geologic special studies zone to be setback at least 100 feet from each side of an active or potentially active fault trace. If the exact location and/or nature of the fault is not clear, a full site-specific study by a registered geologist or certified engineering geologist is required to determine the exact location and nature of the fault and the probability and probable extent of earthquake damage.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Not Consistent.** The HSR project would ensure that development for human occupancy will be placed in a location away from active earthquake faults. LMFs of this alignment are not located in a hazardous fault zone, and safety concerns related to surface fault rupture are not anticipated. Portions of the HSR alignment do cross into an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. While all four Build Alternatives are inconsistent with this policy, appropriate project design features would be implemented to reduce adverse effects related to seismically induced ground shaking.
Objective 4: Avoid new development in areas susceptible to slope instability and landslide	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** No landslides are indicated along the project section. All four Build Alternatives are therefore consistent with this objective.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy CS 12: In hillside areas such as subarea 5B, development standards are directed at the specific issues of landslides, erosion, grading, flooding, fire, and the integrity of natural and scenic character.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will implement applicable state and county regulations to minimize hazards related to landslides, erosion, grading, flooding, fire, and the integrity of natural and scenic character.
Policy CS 13: Direct new standards for cut slopes to result in minimal locations, conform to existing contours, and use integral retaining walls or aesthetically pleasing rock-filled crib walls to transition between grades.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority will conform to existing contours and use integral retaining walls or aesthetically pleasing crib walls where feasible.
Policy CS 14: Replant cut-and-fill slopes to control erosion through a wide variety of native plant materials in contrast to hydro-seeding and mulching with annual grasses. In addition, incorporate native trees to add structure to the soil and take up moisture while adding color and diversity; a. Blend cut-and-fill slopes within existing contours and provide horizontal variation to avoid the artificial appearance of engineered slopes; b. Verify structural integrity of sites that have been previously filled prior to the approval of any land use/development activity; c. Prohibit development on slopes greater than 15 percent.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Refer to Section 3.6, Biological Resources and Wetlands, for a discussion of replanting for erosion control. Cut-and-fill slopes will be confined to slopes less than 15% where feasible.
Tehachapi General Plan (2012): Civic Culture and Health Element			
Policy CH 21: Integrate the preservation of archaeological and paleontological resources into the planning and development process as early as possible.	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As part of the environmental review process, a paleontological identification and evaluation technical report was prepared and potential impacts associated with the project were analyzed. The project includes IAMFs that identify specific steps (including preservation) if paleontological resources are found.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Lancaster General Plan 2030 (2009): Plan for the Natural Environment			
Objective 3.5: Preserve land resources through the application of appropriate soils management techniques and the protection and enhancement of surrounding landforms and open space.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** Prior to construction of the HSR project, a CMP will be prepared to outline how to address geologic constraints and minimize or avoid impacts to geologic resources during construction. The plan will be submitted to the Authority for review and approval. This plan will address soil management techniques to protect the surrounding landforms and open space.
Policy 3.5.1: Minimize erosion problems resulting from development activities.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** Standard construction practices will be implemented to reduce the potential for erosion. Practices include soil stabilization, watering for dust control, perimeter silt fences, and sediment basins. Because these standard practices would be implemented, problems from soil erosion will be minimized during the development and operation of HSR.
Specific Actions 3.5.1 (a): Concurrent with the submittal of a grading plan, require the submittal and approval by the appropriate City departments of erosion control plans prior to the approval of the grading plan. • Erosion control plans shall be prepared and shall cover all areas impacted by the proposed grading. • The erosion control plans shall address methods of control (i.e. detention basins, check dams, sandbagging, etc.), and interim storm drain construction if required.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** Prior to construction of the HSR project, the contractor will prepare a CMP addressing how the contractor will address geologic constraints and minimize or avoid impacts to geologic resources during construction. The plan will be submitted to the Authority for review and approval. This plan will specifically address wind and water erosion.
Specific Actions 3.5.1 (b): Require that erosion control measures be in place prior to the rainy season.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** Prior to construction of the HSR project, the contractor will prepare a CMP addressing how the contractor will address geologic constraints and minimize or avoid impacts to geologic resources during construction. The plan will be submitted to the Authority for review and approval. This plan will specifically address wind and water erosion, and will be in place before the start of construction.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Specific Actions 3.5.1 (c): Require implementation of erosion control measures as soon as possible during the grading operation, and require that they remain in operation until improvement construction has begun within the controlled area.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** Prior to construction of the HSR project, the contractor will prepare a CMP addressing how the contractor will address geologic constraints and minimize or avoid impacts to geologic resources during construction. The plan will be submitted to the Authority for review and approval. This plan will specifically address wind and water erosion, and will be in place before the start of construction.
Specific Actions 3.5.1 (d): Periodically review the grading and subdivision ordinances with regard to special precautions that minimize soil erodibility by incorporating provisions relating to surface drainage and restoration of the natural drainage surface, the attenuation of slope instability, reductions in the amount of impermeable surface, and techniques that enhance local water recovery.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The Authority will refer to local grading and subdivision ordinances for guidance in minimizing erosion. All earthwork construction will be done in conformance with California Building Code standards and require grading work to follow BMPs.
Specific Actions 3.5.1 (e): Require that grading plans include appropriate and feasible measures to minimize fugitive dust. Potential measures include: • Regular watering of cleared areas. • Minimizing the extent of cleared areas at any given time. • Establishing of vegetative cover as soon as possible after grading is completed. • Using soil tackifiers, soils stabilization mulches, and/or oil emulsions, where feasible.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** Prior to construction of the HSR project, the contractor will prepare a CMP addressing how the contractor will address geologic constraints and minimize or avoid impacts to geologic resources during construction. The plan will be submitted to the Authority for review and approval. This plan will specifically address wind and water erosion, and will be in place before the start of construction. Additionally, local grading ordinances will be followed and will require that all earthwork construction be done in conformance with California Building Code standards and require grading work to follow BMPs.
Objective 3.7: Ensure the proper management of mineral resources in the Lancaster study area.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The HSR project alignment is not expected to affect existing mineral resources because the alignment would be routed around locations where mining is occurring.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Specific Actions 3.7.1 (a): Request the State's Division of Mines and Geology to identify potential Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs) and the feasibility for extracting aggregate resources within the study area.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** MRZs within the project site were located using from CGS publications. The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 directs the State Geologist to classify the nonfuel MRZs of the state to show where economically significant mineral deposits occur based on scientific data. According to the CGS, the major mining and mineral products active near the project section in the San Joaquin, Tehachapi, and Antelope Valleys consist of sand, gravel, and limestone. The HSR alignment is not expected to affect existing mineral resources because the alignment would be routed around locations where mining is occurring.
Specific Actions 3.7.2 (a): Enact development code provisions as necessary to govern the extraction of mineral resources within the City of Lancaster, including standards for their location and performance which will mitigate potential impacts on adjacent lands.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The HSR alignment is not expected to affect existing mineral resources because the alignment would be routed around locations where mining is occurring. All four Build Alternatives are consistent with this specific action.
Specific Action 3.7.2(b): Require any lands within the study area which may be designated MRZ-2 to comply with the provisions of the Surface Mining and Recovery Act of 1975 (SMARA).	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The proposed project does cross an MRZ 2 area containing significant aggregate mineral resources in the vicinity of Caliente Creek. While the proposed project would cross this region, it would not impede mining from occurring in the area surrounding the alignment. Accordingly, no substantial adverse effects are anticipated.
Lancaster General Plan 2030 (2009): Plan for Public Health and Safety			
Objective 4.1: Minimize the potential for loss of life, physical injury, property damage, and social disruption resulting from seismic ground shaking and other geologic events.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The Authority will implement appropriate project design features to reduce adverse effects related to seismically induced ground shaking and to minimize the potential for related loss of life, physical injury, property damage, and social disruption.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy 4.1.1: Manage potential seismic hazards resulting from fault rupture and strong ground motion to facilitate rapid physical and economic recovery following an earthquake through the identification and recognition of potentially hazardous conditions and implementation of effective standards for seismic design of structures.[1]	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The Authority would design the HSR system to withstand strong earthquakes in the HSR alignment area. Further, plans for rapid repair to minimize physical and economic impacts would be in place during construction and operation of the HSR system.
Specific Actions 4.1.1(a): Implement a program for upgrading seismically hazardous (unreinforced masonry) buildings within the City of Lancaster pursuant to the provisions of SB-547.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not construct seismically hazardous buildings. Any seismically hazardous buildings acquired during the right-of-way process would be eliminated for the purpose of HSR construction and operation.
Specific Action 4.1.1(b): Require that all new developments comply with the most recent California Building Code seismic design standards and such other supplemental design criteria.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that the HSR system, including maintenance facilities, would comply with the current California Building Code seismic design standards and applicable supplemental design criteria.
Specific Action 4.1.1(c): Implement the provisions of Title 24 of the State Building Code pertaining to siting, seismic design, and review of Critical, Sensitive, and High-Occupancy structures.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The infrastructure and development projects would, at a minimum, be subject to the Title 24 Building Code requirements. Any new structures would comply with current seismic design standards. A review of all critical, sensitive, and high-occupancy structures within the RSA would be completed prior to construction.
Specific Action 4.1.1(d): Along with Los Angeles County, the State of California, and other agencies as appropriate, undertake, as necessary, a review of existing Critical and Essential structures for any significant siting, design, or construction problems that would make them vulnerable in an earthquake. Incorporate findings of the review into the Multi-hazard Functional Plan, and address long-term programs for facility upgrading or relocation.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that all existing structures within the RSA would be reviewed and included in the Multi-Hazard Functional Plan. Additionally, plans for relocation of these structures would be in place prior to construction.

[1] Groundshaking within the study area is considered to be the greatest potential risk.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Specific Action 4.1.1(e): Provide expedited review of any State seismic-related revisions to the California Building Code for adoption and implementation.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The Authority, when applicable, would provide expedited review of seismic-related revisions to the California Building Code for implementation into the design and construction of the HSR system.
Policy 4.1.2: Require development within hillside areas and areas which potentially have soils or underlying formations that might produce severe building constraints to have engineering studies performed in order to determine appropriate structural design criteria and effective construction standards.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** As discussed in Chapter 3.9, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, a soil analysis of the RSA has been performed to ensure safety and feasibility of construction and operation. Additionally, engineering studies have been completed to ensure appropriate structural design criteria and effective construction standards.
Specific Action 4.1.2(a): Require specialized soils reports in areas suspected of having problems with bearing strength and in areas suspected of having problems with expansive soils, soil settlement, and subsidence.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that all necessary soil reports are completed for areas that may exhibit soil hazards.
Specific Action 4.1.2(b): Through the Development Review Process, ensure that any new development proposal located within an area determined by the State of California to be a seismic hazard zone is conditioned for appropriate mitigation.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that the proposed Lancaster North B MOIF and/or any alternative alignment would conform to all applicable mitigation related to seismic hazards.
Lancaster General Plan 2030 (2009): Plan for Active Living			
Specific Action 12.1.1(a): As part of the CEQA review process, require site-specific historical, archaeological, and/or paleontological studies when there exists a possibility that significant environmental impacts might result or when there is a lack of sufficient documentation on which to determine potential impacts.	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives and Lancaster North B MOIF	**Consistent.** A paleontological resources field survey was completed as part of the environmental review process.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Palmdale General Plan (1993): Land Use Element			
Goal L1: Create a vision for long-term growth and development in the City of Palmdale which provides for orderly, functional patterns of land uses within urban areas, a unified and coherent urban form, and a high quality of life for its residents.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The HSR system would ensure compliance with the City of Palmdale's growth, development, and transportation plans. The HSR system would provide a suitable alternative to automobile transportation, and would provide an effective link to larger metropolitan areas such as Los Angeles.
Objective L1.4: Adopt land use policies which minimize exposure of residents to natural hazards, protect natural resources, and utilize land with limited development potential for open space and recreational uses where feasible.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority, in compliance with CEQA and NEPA, has studied and incorporated environmental standards for minimizing exposure to natural hazards, identified and designed measures to protect natural resources wherever possible, and minimized impacts on land designated for open space and recreational use wherever feasible.
Policy L1.4.1: Establish the following transitional standards between Mineral Resource Extraction designations and less intensive uses, in order to protect residents from noise and dust while preserving the availability of mineral resources: 1. Where feasible, encourage a transition of uses between quarry operations and less intensive uses. 2. Separate residential neighborhoods from mineral extraction zones by public streets, setbacks, berms, landscaping, green belts, trail systems, or other similar buffers or combinations thereof. 3. When land designated for less intensive uses abuts mineral extraction areas, the responsibility for providing adequate buffers should be borne equitably by both quarry operators and adjacent developers, where feasible based upon existing conditions and existing approvals.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The HSR alignment would avoid residential areas wherever possible. In applicable areas, the alignment would provide a buffer between existing or future mineral extraction areas and existing or future residential areas.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy L1.4.2: Establish the following standards in and adjacent to Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault zones and other active fault zones as determined based on geotechnical analysis, in order to protect residents, property and infrastructure systems from damage by seismic activity: (*General Plan Amendment 96-4, adopted by City Council April 9, 1997. General Plan Amendment 98-3, adopted by City Council June 10, 1998.)*	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** As discussed in Chapter 3.9, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, all known fault zones within the RSA have been identified and studied. Additionally, the HSR system would be designed to current seismic standards.
Policy L1.4.3: Establish the following standards for development in hillside areas: 1. Development in hillside areas should minimize grading, conform to natural topography, preserve ridgelines and exhibit sensitivity to natural landforms. 2. Development should be restricted on natural slopes of fifty percent and greater. 3. Visually prominent ridges and hillsides should be retained in a natural condition. 4. Flexibility in land use regulations may be permitted when it can be demonstrated that such flexibility will meet hillside management objectives.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The HSR alignment will not be located in any hillside areas within the City of Palmdale. All four Build Alternatives are therefore consistent with the standards for development in hillside areas.
Goal L7: Provide proactive comprehensive planning within designated areas of the City where unique development opportunities or physical conditions warrant special planning efforts.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The HSR system would provide unique development opportunities within the City of Palmdale. The Authority would comply with existing development and transportation plans.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy L 7.1.7: Ensure that development within the area bounded by Palmdale Boulevard and Avenue S and 70th and 75th Streets East provides adequate separation of residential development and mineral resource extraction land uses, provides passive recreational opportunities and creates a range of single-family residential housing opportunities supported by well-planned infrastructure, as set forth in the following criteria: (*General Plan Amendment 96-2. Adopted by City Council July 10, 1996*) 2. Provide adequate buffering between residential uses and mineral resource extraction uses and ensure that residential development does not interfere with the continued use of the mining area. a.) Examine the feasibility of downgrading 75th Street East from an arterial roadway to a local or collector street, and provide a linear park with trails as an alternative use or require a greenbelt or linear park which averages 100 feet in width, on the west side of 75th Street East, to provide a land use buffer between residential and mineral resource extraction areas. b.) Require larger lots adjacent to the mineral resource extraction area.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The HSR system avoids residential areas wherever possible, and would comply with all zoning designations and transportation plans where applicable. The alignment would also provide a suitable buffer between residential and industrial land uses where applicable.
Palmdale General Plan (1993): Environmental Resources Element			
Goal ER6: Ensure an adequate supply of mineral resources to meet long-term regional construction needs.	City of Palmdale	Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The construction and operation of the HSR system would not interfere with the provision of adequate mineral resources to meet long-term regional needs. The Authority has avoided and minimized impacts to mineral resource extraction operations or potential future reserves where possible.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Objective ER 6.1: Recognize the regional importance of the classified and designated mineral deposits within Palmdale's Planning Area (as described in Special Report 143, Part V, Classification of Sand and Gravel Resource Areas, Saugus-Newhall Production-Consumption Region and Palmdale Production-Consumption Region, and Designation Report No. 6, Designation of Regionally Significant Construction Aggregate Resource Areas in the Saugus-Newhall and Palmdale Production-Consumption Regions and as shown on Exhibits ER-1B and ER-1C) and discourage encroachment of incompatible land uses which could threaten the long-term viability of sand and gravel mining and processing operations in the Little Rock Wash area.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The HSR project alignment is not expected to affect existing mineral resources because the alignment would be routed around locations where mining is occurring. The HSR project would encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield and Palmdale station sites, which would indirectly discourage new development from occurring in mineral resource areas. Therefore, all four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy ER 6.2.2: In the Little Rock Wash area, address environmental concerns related to: 1. Ground water contamination; 2. Sensitive Ecological Areas of flora and fauna; 3. Performance standards related to dust and noise and their impacts on surrounding properties and uses; 4. Interface between mining activities and surrounding uses; 5. Aesthetics; and 6. Public safety.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority, in compliance with CEQA and NEPA, has conducted environmental analysis addressing all of these potential implications, and the project has been designed to minimize potential impacts in all of the areas listed.
Policy ER 6.2.4: The area-wide reclamation plan should analyze and plan for adequate areas for groundwater recharge.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The HSR project would, at a minimum, comply with an adequate groundwater recharge plan through design measures to reduce water consumption and waste, recycle water for internal water demands, and manage stormwater for use or controlled release for groundwater recharge.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy ER 7.1.3: Require that new development protect significant historic, paleontological, or archaeological resources, or provide for other appropriate mitigation.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** As part of the environmental review process, a paleontological identification and evaluation technical report was prepared and potential impacts associated with the project were analyzed. The project includes IAMFs (including monitoring) that would mitigate impacts.
Palmdale General Plan (1993): Safety Element			
Goal S 1: Minimize danger and damage to public health, safety, and welfare resulting from natural hazards.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, the Authority will design the HSR system to minimize danger and damage as a result of natural hazards, consistent with applicable regulations, plans, and requirements.
Objective S 1.1: Review development within or adjacent to geologic hazards, to ensure adequate provisions for public safety.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** As discussed in Chapter 3.9, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, the geologic hazards in the RSA have been analyzed. Additionally, the HSR system has been designed to provide the most current design features to ensure adequate provisions for public safety.
Policy S 1.1.1: Provide copies of geotechnical reports for projects located within the seismic hazard zone, as shown on latest California Department of Conservation Seismic Hazard Zones Map, to the State Division of Mines and Geology. (General Plan Amendment 04-01, adopted by City Council April 14, 2004.)	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority would ensure that all geotechnical reports prepared for the proposed project are reviewed by the State Division of Mines and Geology for review and comment.
Policy S 1.1.3: Require geotechnical studies, to be reviewed and approved by the City's geologist, for development proposals in areas where geotechnical hazards may be present, and implement the recommendations of those reports as deemed necessary by the City.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** The Authority will provide all required and applicable geotechnical studies at the request of the city geologist for review and comment.
Policy S 1.1.4: Require appropriate structural setbacks from active fault rupture traces in accordance with Alquist-Priolo standards and as required by the City, based on geotechnical analysis.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** As discussed in Chapter 3.9, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, all known fault zones within the RSA have been identified and studied. Additionally, the HSR system would be designed to current seismic standards.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy S 1.1.5: Require structural setbacks or special foundations for structures within potentially active fault zones as determined by the City, based on geotechnical analysis.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** As discussed in Chapter 3.9, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, all known fault zones within the RSA have been identified and studied. Additionally, the HSR system would be designed to current seismic standards.
Policy S 1.1.6: Require special foundations within inactive fault zones if determined necessary by the City.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** As discussed in Chapter 3.9, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, all known fault zones within the RSA have been identified and studied. Additionally, the HSR system would be designed to current seismic standards.
Policy S 1.1.7: Restrict location of utility lines, whether above or below ground, within an appropriate distance from active fault traces, as determined by geotechnical investigation and approved by the City. Utility lines crossing active fault traces should be specifically designed to withstand the expected movement of the earth in these locations. Utility lines as defined here would include, but not be limited to, electricity, water, natural gas and sewer.	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Avenue M LMF Zone	**Consistent.** If utilities require relocation as part of the HSR system, these utilities will be relocated to avoid crossing active fault lines.

Source: California High Speed Rail (2016)
Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority
BMP = best management practice
CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act
CGS = California Geological Survey
CMP = Construction Management Plan
DOGGR = (California) Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources
HSR = high-speed rail
IAMF = Impact Avoidance and Minimization Feature
LMF = light maintenance facility
MOIF = maintenance of infrastructure facility
MRZ = Mineral Resource Zone
NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act
RSA = resource study area
USEPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Table 2-H-9 Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis—Hazardous Materials and Wastes

Kern County General Plan (County of Kern 2009)	
Transportation Element, Section 2.5.4, Policies 1 and 2, Implementation Measure A—Commercial transport of hazardous materials hazardous waste facilities will be in conformance with the adopted *Kern County and Incorporated Cities Hazardous Waste Management Plan*	**Consistent.** The IAMFs described in Section 3.10.6, Affected Environment, include measures specifying how materials and wastes are handled, stored, and transported, as well as actions to occur should an accidental spill or release of materials or wastes occur during construction, in order to minimize the potential for adverse effects (Authority and FRA 2005).
Safety Element, Section 4.9, Policies 1 and 2, Implementation Measures A and B—Facilities used for the manufacture, storage, and use of hazardous materials will comply with the Uniform Fire Code and *Kern County and Incorporated Cities Hazardous Waste Management Plan.*	
Metropolitan Area Bakersfield General Plan (City of Bakersfield and County of Kern 2007)	
Safety Element, Policy 12—When feasible and where recommended by appropriate local, state, or federal agencies for discretionary projects, soils shall be tested for concentrations of agricultural chemicals prior to grading permit approval. Contaminated soils shall be excavated and disposed of at a certified hazardous waste disposal facility whenever necessary.	**Consistent.** The potential for impacts associated with the presence of contaminated soils, including agricultural chemicals and effects on human health, is discussed in Section 3.10.6. IAMFs that would be applied as part of the project include specifications for pre-construction testing and analysis where hazardous materials may be present, as well as implementation of a Phase I, II, and III ESAs (as needed) during the right-of-way acquisition phase, among other requirements to identify and remove or remediate hazardous materials to avoid adverse effects associated with construction near PEC sites.
Safety Element, Policy 16—all new discretionary development projects are subject to environmental and design review on a site-specific, project-by-project basis, including, but not limited to, an assessment to determine whether hazardous materials present potential health effects on human health.	
Tehachapi General Plan (City of Tehachapi 2012)	
Safety Element, Policy CS50—For proposed land use/development activity adjacent to industrial, commercial, or agricultural uses the plan dictates that the following is in place: (a) require a soil and groundwater contamination assessment in accordance with ASTM standards to determine if contamination exceeds regulatory action levels and to apply the appropriate remediation procedures prior to approval of the proposal; (b) require non-agricultural development to provide all necessary buffers, as determined by the Agriculture Commissioner's Office, from agricultural operations to minimize the potential for pesticide drift.	**Consistent.** The potential for impacts associated with the presence of contaminated soils, including agricultural chemicals and effects on human health, is discussed in Section 3.10.6. IAMFs that would be applied as part of the project include specifications for pre-construction testing and analysis where hazardous materials may be present; implementation of Phase I, II, and III ESAs (as needed) during the right-of-way acquisition phase; and other requirements to identify and remove or remediate hazardous materials to avoid adverse effects associated with construction near PEC sites.
City of Lancaster General Plan 2030 (City of Lancaster 2009)	
Plan for Public Health and Safety Element, Objective 4.5, Policy 4.5.1 (a) states the City will implement the goals and policies of the Los Angeles County Certified Unified Program Agency by ensuring through the environmental review process.	**Consistent.** The analysis of environmental consequences provided in Section 3.10.6 provides a thorough environmental review consistent with the Los Angeles County CUPA.

City of Palmdale General Plan Safety Element (City of Palmdale 2004)	
Safety Element, Policy S2.3.3—Requires that soils containing toxic or hazardous substances be cleaned up to the satisfaction of the agency having jurisdiction, prior to the granting of any permits for new development.	**Consistent.** IAMFs that would be applied as part of the project include requirements to clean up or remove contamination along the project alignment. In addition, the impact analysis identifies PEC sites within a 1-mile search radius of the project's centerline, in accordance with ASTM requirements. The impact analysis identifies IAMFs that require actions to minimize or avoid adverse impacts associated with PEC sites.
Policy Section 2.3.7—Review proposed development in proximity to any existing or proposed hazardous waste facility to ensure that future development and land use decisions consider and incorporate site design, setbacks and buffering techniques appropriate for the site, and that they provide adequate mitigation of any potential adverse impacts to such development from hazardous waste facilities.	

The *Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan* (County of Los Angeles 2015) did not contain policies related to hazardous materials and waste.
ASTM = ASTM International
Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority
CUPA = Certified Unified Program Agency
ESAs = Environmental Site Assessment
FRA = Federal Railroad Administration
IAMF = impact avoidance and mitigation feature
PEC = potential environmental concern

Table 2-H-10 Consistency with Regional Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies—Hazardous Materials and Wastes

Plan	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (2016): Safety Element	City of Bakersfield	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	Consistent
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (Unincorporated Planning Area) (2007): Safety Element	Unincorporated Kern County/Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	Consistent
Kern County General Plan (2009): Transportation Element and Safety Element	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	Consistent
City of Tehachapi General Plan (2012): Safety Element	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	Consistent
Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan (2015): Conservation and Open Space Element	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	Consistent
City of Lancaster General Plan (2009): Plan for Public Health and Safety Element	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	Consistent
City of Palmdale General Plan (2013): Safety Element	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Palmdale Station	Consistent

Table 2-H-11 General Plans and Other Plans Considered—Safety and Security

Plan	Description
Kern County	
Kern County General Plan (2009)	The Safety Element provides information for the protection of the community from any unreasonable risks associated with the effects of seismically induced surface rupture, ground shaking, ground failure, tsunami, seiche, and dam failure; slope instability leading to mudslides and landslides; subsidence, liquefaction, and other seismic hazards identified pursuant to Chapter 7.8 (commencing with Section 2690) of the Public Resource Code; other geologic hazards known to the legislative body; flooding; and wildland and urban fires.
Kern County Emergency Operations Plan (2008)	The Kern County EOP establishes an emergency management organization and assigns functions and tasks consistent with California's SEMS and the NIMS.
Kern County Municipal Code (as amended)	Chapter 2.66: Emergency Services implements the California Emergency Services Act (Government Code Sections 8550 et seq.) by and for the County of Kern.
Terrorism Response and Recovery Contingency Plan (2003)	This Terrorism Contingency Plan is designed to establish responsibilities and to coordinate preparedness, response, and recovery from a terrorist-initiated incident, with emphasis placed on incidents involving weapons of mass destruction. This contingency plan supplements the existing Kern County Emergency Plan and is intended to provide general guidance. Actual response will be dependent upon conditions existing at the time of the emergency, including the availability of local and mutual-aid resources.
Kern Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan (2012)	The purpose of hazard mitigation and this plan is to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to people and property from natural hazards and their effects in Kern County, California. This plan update has been prepared to meet the requirements of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 in order to maintain Kern County's eligibility for Federal Emergency Management Agency Pre-Disaster Mitigation and Hazard Mitigation Grant Programs. More importantly, this plan update and planning process lays out the strategy that will enable Kern County to become less vulnerable to future disaster-related losses.
Emergency Alert System Plan (2014)	This plan is the Federal Communications Commission-mandated document outlining the organization and implementation of the Emergency Alert System.
Policy/Procedures Manual, Chapter 16: Emergency Preparedness	This Chapter of the Kern County Policy and Administrative Procedures Manual implements the requirement that county departments must provide for the safety of persons, property, and county facilities in the case of an emergency. Department heads are responsible for ensuring that employees are trained and prepared to respond to an emergency or a threatening incident.
Los Angeles County	
Los Angeles County All-Hazard Mitigation Plan (2014)	This All-Hazard Mitigation Plan sets strategies for coping with the natural and man-made hazards faced by residents. The plan is a compilation of information from county departments correlated with known and projected hazards that face Southern California. The plan complies with, and has been approved by, the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Governor's Office of Emergency Services. The plan has been formally adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors for use in the development of specific hazard mitigation proposals that have a high cost-benefit ratio. The County of Los Angeles All-Hazard Hazard Mitigation Plan addresses potential damages in the unincorporated portions of the County as well as to County facilities. Cities, schools, special districts and eligible nonprofit organizations within Los Angeles County must prepare and submit separate Hazard Mitigation Plans to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for approval. Please contact the Office of Emergency Management for additional information at (323) 980-2260.

Plan	Description
Los Angeles County General Plan Public Review Draft (2015)	The purpose of the General Plan Safety Element is to reduce the potential risk of death, injuries, and economic damage resulting from natural and man-made hazards. The California Government Code requires the General Plan to address "the protection of the community from any unreasonable risks associated with the effects of seismically induced surface rupture, ground shaking, ground failure, tsunami, seiche, and dam failure; slope instability leading to mudslides and landslides; subsidence, liquefaction, and other seismic hazards...; flooding; and wildland and urban fires." The Safety Element addresses only limited aspects of man-made disasters, such as hazardous waste and materials management (in particular, those aspects related to seismic events, fires, and floods). In general, hazardous materials management is addressed in the Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management Plan (California Code of Regulations Section 18755.5).
Los Angeles County Municipal Code (as amended)	The declared purposes of Chapter 2.68: Emergency Services of the Municipal Code are to provide for the preparation and execution of plans for the protection of life and property within Los Angeles County in the event of an emergency; the establishment, coordination, and direction of the Los Angeles County operational area and emergency organization; the establishment, coordination, and direction of the Los Angeles County Emergency Management Council; the establishment, coordination, and direction of the Los Angeles County Office of Emergency Management; and the coordination of the preparatory and emergency functions of the county with those of all other public agencies, organizations, and individuals.
County of Los Angeles General Plan (2015)	The Safety Element of the County of Los Angeles General Plan is basically a long-range emergency response plan. It seeks to reduce future losses of life, injuries, and socioeconomic disruption by design of safer environments and facilities; by avoidance of hazardous sites; by removal or strengthening of unsafe structures; and by promotion of emergency preparedness. The Safety Element addresses earthquakes, landsliding, flood and fire hazards; and potential hazardous material incidents related to these hazards.
County of Los Angeles Emergency Survival Guide	This plan provides a guide for citizens of Los Angeles County to prepare for, respond to, and recover from disasters that face Los Angeles County through increased awareness.
National Preparedness Goal Project, Part 1: NIMS Implementation Plan (2005)	The County of Los Angeles created the National Preparedness Goal Project to ensure the countywide implementation of goal initiatives. The Los Angeles County Office of Emergency Management will take the lead in developing National Preparedness Goal Project implementation plans outlining countywide implementation strategies and timeframes of goal initiatives. The National Preparedness Goal Project's implementation plans will ultimately consist of multiple parts, each corresponding with goal initiatives. The Office of Emergency Management will update implementation plans to reflect further federal and state directives as necessary.
Emergency Public Information Plan (2003)	The purpose of this document is to establish guidelines for an Emergency Public Information Plan based on the policies that were approved by the Los Angeles County Emergency Management Council on August 21, 2003, and to provide guidance when the County of Los Angeles gives information to the public in time of crisis or disaster. This plan also provides a framework for how the County provides accurate, timely, appropriate, consistent, and coordinated information. Elements of this document will also be used when there is "pre-event" public concern regarding a possible emergency/disaster and in the recovery phase after a major disaster. This plan's mission is to provide timely and accurate disaster-related information to the media and the public during and immediately following an emergency/disaster. The purpose of the Emergency Public Information Plan is to proactively alert, inform, and reassure. Information will be accurate and timely, with messages that are clear and consistent. Alert and warning messages always have the highest priority in any emergency. It is also important that timely information and reassuring messages be developed and released to the public.

Plan	Description
Tsunami Annex (2006)	The Tsunami Annex is an extension of the OAERP. The objective of the OAERP is to incorporate and coordinate all county facilities and personnel, along with the jurisdictional resources of the cities and special districts within the county, into an efficient organization capable of responding to any emergency using SEMS, mutual aid, and other appropriate response procedures.
Spontaneous Volunteer Management Annex (2009)	The Spontaneous Volunteer Management Annex is an extension of the OAERP. The objective of the OAERP is to incorporate and coordinate all county facilities and personnel, along with the jurisdictional resources of the cities and special districts within the county, into an efficient organization capable of responding to any emergency using SEMS, mutual aid, and other appropriate response procedures.
Los Angeles County Terrorism Plan	This plan establishes policies and procedures to guide the Los Angeles County operational area in planning for and responding to an emergency caused by an actual or suspected act of terrorism (including cyber/electronic terrorism), and especially terrorist acts employing weapons of mass destruction such as chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or explosive weapons.
County of Los Angeles Emergency Response Plan (2012)	The objective of the OAERP is to integrate operational area resources to be an efficient organization capable of responding to emergencies using NIMS, SEMS, mutual aid, and other appropriate response procedures. The OAERP is an extension of the State of California Emergency Plan.
Los Angeles County Emergency Repatriation Plan (1996)	The California Emergency Repatriation Plan requires that counties develop plans for providing specified services to repatriates during periods of emergency that necessitate the mass return of U.S. citizens from outside the U.S. The plan provides information about responsibilities for an emergency repatriation process at the federal, state, and county levels and delineates county departmental responsibilities and policies for activating and operating the Emergency Processing Center at Los Angeles International Airport or a site nearby.
Los Angeles County Operational Area Family Assistance Center Plan (2010)	The scope of this plan includes activation, operation, and demobilization strategies for Family Assistance Centers within the Los Angeles County operational area (covering all 88 cities and unincorporated areas). As such, the plan seeks to provide a framework for establishing and managing Family Assistance Centers in the operational area during both large-scale mass fatality incident/mass casualty incident MFI/MCIs (e.g., earthquakes) and smaller, more localized incidents involving multiple fatalities/casualties (e.g., explosions, shootings) to ensure consistency of response and management, and to establish a baseline of service.
City of Bakersfield	
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (2002)	Safety Element: The Safety Element addresses seismic safety, flooding, and public safety, as well as other general provisions for the Metropolitan Bakersfield area.
City of Bakersfield Municipal Code, as amended	The purpose of Chapter 2.40: Emergency Services of the Municipal Code is to provide for the preparation and execution of plans for the protection of persons and property within this city in the event of an emergency; the direction of the emergency organization; and the coordination of the city's emergency functions with all other public agencies, corporations, organizations, and affected private persons.
Keene CDP	
Keene Ranch Specific Plan (1997)	The Seismic Safety and Safety Element addresses safety-related issues in Keene related to drainage, geologic conditions, fire safety, and other environmental hazards. The element aims to provide adequate levels of service and emergency preparedness to maintain public safety.

Plan	Description
Golden Hills CDP	
Golden Hills Specific Plan (1986)	The purpose of the Seismic Safety and Safety Element is to protect area residents from the risk of injury and property damage that can result from seismic activities, flooding, or geologic hazards; to minimize economic and social displacement stemming from earthquake occurrences; and to ensure adequate fire protection services throughout the entire Golden Hills area and surrounding vicinity.
City of Tehachapi	
City of Tehachapi Emergency Operations Center, Volume One: EOC Guidebook and Section Checklists (2013)	This plan is intended to provide a guide and checklists for various emergency events and situations and their responses.
City of Tehachapi Emergency Operations Center, Volume Two: NIMS and SEMS (2013)	This section provides a short overview of the EOP and the locations of key components within the plan. Also included in this section are the Letter of Promulgation, the Record of Revisions, signed concurrence by the Principal Department, and a Plan Distribution List.
Greater Tehachapi Area Specific and Community Plan Draft (2010)	The Safety Element contains a discussion of the existing safety concerns within the greater Tehachapi area and the policies and implementation measures, if necessary, to mitigate any adverse safety concerns. The identified safety concerns provide direction for developing goals and policies to protect the greater Tehachapi area from adverse safety impacts through subsequent development implementation within the plan. This element also provides mapping of all known safety issues associated with the greater Tehachapi area. Potential safety issues include seismic hazards, landslides, shallow groundwater, steep slopes, flood hazards, and wildland fires. Kern County has developed the Kern County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to people and property from natural hazards in the county. The Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan lays out a countywide strategy to enable the county to become less vulnerable to future disasters. As part of this strategy, the Tehachapi Mountain Community Response Plan establishes responsibilities and coordinates response to major emergencies or disasters that occur in or impact the greater Tehachapi area. The Tehachapi Mountain Community Response Plan's purpose is to augment the Kern County Emergency Plan. It provides guidelines for operations assuming that out-of-area emergency personnel may not be able to reach sections of the Tehachapi Mountain area for the first few hours or days following a disaster. The Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan describes the Incident Command System and lists potential shelter locations and casualty staging areas.
City of Tehachapi General Plan (2012)	The Community Safety Element informs and guides Tehachapi's public health and safety measures to maintain its reputation and perception among residents, potential residents, and visitors as a small, safe town where one can enjoy community, culture, and a full range of amenities. Within this element, community preferences, directions, and corresponding objectives and policies ensure that proper measures are taken in all new development, and that proper monitoring of the existing built environment is undertaken to support public safety and health, and the longevity and vitality of the built environment.
City of Tehachapi Municipal Code, as amended	The declared purposes of Chapter 2.36: Emergency Services and Riot Control are to provide for the preparation and carrying out of plans for the protection of persons and property within the city in the event of an emergency; the direction of an emergency organization; and the coordination of the city's emergency functions with all other public agencies, corporations, organizations, and affected private persons.

Plan	Description
Rosamond CDP	
Rosamond Specific Plan (2008)	The Rosamond Specific Plan Safety Element provides measures to protect the community from flood, seismic, and steep slope hazards.
City of Lancaster	
City of Lancaster Code of Ordinances, as amended	Chapter 2.36: Disaster Council: The declared purposes of this chapter are to provide for the preparation and carrying out of plans for the protection of persons and property within this city in the event of an emergency; the direction of the emergency organization; the coordination of the city's emergency functions with all other public agencies, corporations, organizations, and affected private persons; and the planned and orderly recovery from the emergency's adverse effects. Chapter 2.48: Emergency Plan: The declared purpose of this chapter is to provide for the general direction and guidelines by which the city shall plan and operate under emergency conditions.
City of Lancaster EOP (2010)	The EOP is a flexible, multi-hazard document that addresses the City of Lancaster's planned response to and short-term recovery from extraordinary emergency/disaster situations associated with natural disasters, technological incidents, and national security emergencies. The plan does not address normal day-to-day emergencies or the well-established and routine procedures used in coping with such emergencies. Instead, the operational concepts reflected in this plan focus on potential large-scale disasters that can generate unique situations requiring unusual responses.
City of Lancaster General Plan 2030 (2009)	The Plan for Public Health and Safety contains an evaluation of natural and built conditions that may pose certain levels of health and safety hazards to life and property within Lancaster, along with a comprehensive program to mitigate those hazards to acceptable levels. Inherent in this plan is a determination of "acceptable risk." Acceptable risk is based on a determination of how safe is safe enough, balancing the cost of hazard mitigation with its benefits. The Plan for Public Health and Safety identifies constraints to urban and rural development that must be considered as part of the overall and site-specific development strategies. This plan also addresses existing hazards faced by Lancaster residents and businesses and provides a program to mitigate those hazards. The Plan for Public Health and Safety addresses the following issues: • Geology and Seismicity • Flooding and Drainage • Noise • Air Installation Land Use Compatibility • Hazardous Materials • Crime Prevention and Protection Services • Fire Prevention and Suppression Services • Disaster Preparedness • Emergency Medical Facilities
City of Lancaster Hazard Mitigation Plan (2013)	The Mission of the City of Lancaster Hazard Mitigation Plan is to promote sound public policy and programs designed to protect the public, critical facilities, infrastructure, private and public property, and the environment from natural and human-generated hazards. This will be achieved by developing, implementing, and maintaining this plan to guide the city toward creating and maintaining a safer, more sustainable community.

Plan	Description
City of Palmdale	
City of Palmdale General Plan (1993) (Amended 2004)	The Safety Element presents a plan for minimizing hazards to public health and safety. It outlines natural and man-made hazards that affect existing and future development and provides guidelines for protecting residents from injury and death. It identifies present conditions and public concerns, sets policies and standards for improved public safety, and plans for protection from potential disasters. It seeks to minimize physical harm as well as economic and social disruptions. The goals and objectives of the Safety Element reflect the community's regard for the health and safety of its residents. The Safety Element addresses issues which the entire community believes would require government intervention in order to effectively achieve public safety. The purposes and goals of the other elements go hand-in-hand with the goals of the Safety Element. Together, they serve as a guide for decision-making by public and private investors and for the future expenditure of public funds.
Palmdale Municipal Code, as amended	The declared purposes of Chapter 2.28: Civil Defense and Disasters are to provide for the preparation and carrying out of plans for the protection of persons and property within this city in the event of an emergency; the direction of the emergency organization; and the coordination of the city's emergency functions with all other public agencies, corporations, organizations and affected private persons (Ordinance 1375 § 2, 2009).
City of Palmdale EOP (2012)	The City of Palmdale EOP was written in compliance with California's SEMS and the NIMS guidelines, recommendations, and requirements at the time of its publishing. The plan was developed with a multi-hazard perspective to make it applicable to the widest range of emergencies and disasters, both natural and human-caused. The plan, however, should serve as a guidance document and not impede Incident Commanders and Emergency Operations Center Directors from retaining flexibility to modify procedures and/or organization structures, as necessary, to accomplish the emergency/disaster response and recovery missions in the context of a particular hazard scenario.

Source: California High Speed Rail (2016)
CDP = census-designated place
EOP = Emergency Operations Plan
NIMS = National Incident Management System
OAERP = Operational Area Emergency Response Plan
SEMS = Standardized Emergency Management System

Table 2-H-12 Consistency with Local Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies—Socioeconomics and Communities

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Kern County General Plan (2007)	
Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element (2007)	
Goal 1.4-2: Promote an urban growth pattern in areas where adequate public service infrastructure exists or can be provided.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development in areas near the Bakersfield Station site, which is served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. This would support a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 1.6-2: Ensure the provision of safe and amenable living environments and the promotion of efficient and economical use of land.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which would support a more efficient and economical land use pattern in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 1.6-4: Promote higher-density residential development within the County of Kern in areas with adequate public services and infrastructure.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill residential development at higher densities near the Bakersfield Station site but would not be expected to result in higher-density residential development along the HSR project alignment in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 1.6-5: Discourage premature urban encroachment into areas of intense agriculture areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which would indirectly discourage new development from occurring in agricultural areas in unincorporated Kern County. Further, because the HSR project does not include any stations in or near agricultural areas in Kern County, it would be consistent with this policy. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 1.6-9: Development in areas without adequate infrastructure or development that places a burden on public services (i.e. fire, sheriff, parks, and libraries) shall be discouraged.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could make the areas immediately surrounding the Bakersfield Station site, which are already served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, more attractive for future development by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. This could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in outlying areas in unincorporated Kern County that currently lack adequate public services and infrastructure. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal 1.7-2: Pursue a strong economy through logical placement and distribution of commercial development within the rural and urban areas of Kern County.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including commercial development. This could indirectly discourage new commercial development from occurring in outlying areas in unincorporated Kern County that are not currently well supported by infrastructure. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in the Bakersfield area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 1.7-4: Diversify and broaden the commercial base within Kern County.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development and may attract new businesses to the area, including unincorporated Kern County, by improving regional transportation access in the Bakersfield area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 1.7-1: Kern County will promote a pattern of commercial development that contributes to the economic and physical development of existing unincorporated communities as well as to the incorporated cities.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development and may attract new businesses to Bakersfield and areas in unincorporated Kern County by improving regional transportation access in the Bakersfield area. The HSR project would support economic and physical development throughout Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal 1.8-2: Promote the future economic strength and well-being of Kern County and its residents without detriment to its environmental quality.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could promote a more efficient and economic overall land use pattern in Bakersfield and unincorporated Kern County. The HSR project would enhance the quality of life in Kern County by providing access to regional and statewide transit systems and opportunities for economic growth in the county. The HSR project could also reduce impacts on the environment by indirectly discouraging new development from occurring in outlying areas in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 1.8-5: Provide for the clustering of new industrial development adjacent to existing industrial uses and along major transportation corridors.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development and may attract new businesses to Bakersfield and areas in unincorporated Kern County by improving regional transportation access in the Bakersfield area. The HSR project would promote economic and physical development throughout Kern County as a whole. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal 1.9-1: To contain new development within an area large enough to meet generous projections of foreseeable need, but in locations which will not impair the economic strength derived from the petroleum, agriculture, rangeland, or mineral resources, or diminish the other amenities which exist in the County.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would avoid mining and mineral resource areas and would therefore be consistent with this goal to avoid impairing the economic value of mineral resources in unincorporated Kern County. The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of agricultural land in unincorporated Kern County to transportation use. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 1.9-2: Protect areas of important mineral, petroleum, and agricultural resource potential for future use.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would avoid mining and mineral resource areas and would therefore be consistent with this goal to avoid impairing the economic value of mineral resources in unincorporated Kern County. The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of agricultural land in unincorporated Kern County to transportation use. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal 1.9-4: Encourage safe and orderly energy development within the County, including research and demonstration projects, and to become actively involved in the decision and actions of other agencies as they affect energy development in Kern County.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to minimize conflicts with existing wind and solar energy-producing plants and planned energy projects in the project vicinity. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 1.9-5: Conserve prime agriculture lands from premature conversion.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of prime agricultural land in unincorporated Kern County to transportation use. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 1.9-8: Provide for the orderly expansion of new urban-scale infrastructure and development and the creation of new urban-scale centers in a manner that minimizes adverse effects on agriculture and natural resource uses.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in agricultural and natural resource areas in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal 1.10-1: Ensure that the County can accommodate anticipated future growth and development while maintaining a safe and healthful environment and a prosperous economy by preserving valuable natural resources, guiding development away from hazardous areas, and assuring the provision of adequate public services.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which would promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in Kern County. The HSR project could also indirectly discourage new development from occurring in outlying areas in unincorporated Kern County that are not well served by infrastructure, thereby preserving valuable natural resources in those areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 1.10-5: Higher density development and in-filling should be encouraged within urbanized and built-up areas of the County.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could make the areas immediately surrounding the Bakersfield Station site, which are already served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, more attractive for future infill and higher-density development by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 1.10-6: The County shall ensure the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, incomes and age groups with respect to the development, adoption, implementation and enforcement of land use and environmental programs.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project would support this policy by creating a more diverse transportation system capable of accommodating a diverse population's transportation needs. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 1.10-50: Employ land use policies that protect the County's businesses from physical degradation and ensure orderly growth, thereby, sustaining opportunities for current and future generations to enjoy economic vitality.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which would promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in Kern County. The HSR project would support existing businesses in the area and could act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in Bakersfield and the surrounding areas in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 1.10-54: Recognize the importance of major transportation corridors, airports, and rail lines as important economic tools for the establishment of commercial and industrial development and promotion.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in Bakersfield and the surrounding areas in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 1.10-57: Support and work closely with local jurisdictions and other organizations concerned with economic development to minimize inter-jurisdictional competition.	**Consistent.** During the planning and environmental studies for the HSR project, the Authority conducted extensive consultation and coordination with local jurisdictions along the alignment, including representatives from Kern County. The HSR project could act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in Bakersfield and surrounding areas in Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 1.10-63: Promote improved public transportation service between major job centers and areas of transit dependency and high unemployment.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would improve public transportation in areas immediately surrounding the Bakersfield Station site, including areas in unincorporated Kern County, and would be consistent with the existing public service infrastructure and services in those areas by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in Bakersfield and surrounding areas in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 1.10-64: Provide infrastructure and coordinate local land use, regulatory practices and job training to foster and maintain a robust economy.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in Kern County. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in the Bakersfield and Palmdale areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Circulation Element (2007)	
Goal 2.1-1: To make certain that transportation facilities needed to support development are available. To ensure that these facilities occur in a timely manner so as to avoid traffic degradation.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could make the areas immediately surrounding the Bakersfield Station site, which are already served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, more attractive for future development by improving regional transportation access in this part of Kern County. The HSR project would also support efficient movement of people so as to avoid traffic degradation. During construction of grade-separated crossings, only one crossing per community would be closed at a time to avoid traffic degradation. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal 2.1-2: Kern County intends to provide plans for circulation infrastructure in support of the Land Use, Open Space and Conservation Element.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. In addition, as part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local officials to ensure emergency access to/from and around all project construction areas during construction. For example, during construction of grade-separated crossings, only one crossing per community would be closed at a time to avoid impacts to emergency access. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR facility to ensure that emergency services providers are able to safely and quickly cross that facility. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 2.1-3: To plan for transportation modes available to all segments of the population, including people with restricted mobility.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project would support this goal by creating a more diverse, fully accessible transportation system that is more readily able to accommodate a diverse population's transportation needs, including those of people with restricted mobility. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 2.1-7: Kern County through its representatives on the Kern COG Board of Directors shall coordinate with Kern County cities and Caltrans to develop more effective transportation planning and congestion management programs.	**Consistent.** During the planning and environmental studies for the HSR project, the Authority conducted extensive consultation and coordination with local jurisdictions along the alignment, including representatives from Kern County, the Kern Council of Governments, and Caltrans. The HSR project would make the areas immediately surrounding the Bakersfield Station site, which are served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, accessible to regional and statewide transit systems. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Kern County Economic Development Strategy Update (July 2010)	
Goal 1.2-1: Expand Jobs and Overall Prosperity	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which would promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in Kern County. The HSR project would enhance the quality of life for citizens of Kern County by providing access to regional and statewide transit systems and opportunities for economic growth in the area, including expanded job opportunities. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 1.2-2: Foster Inclusion and Increased Equity	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in Bakersfield and the surrounding areas in unincorporated Kern County. The HSR project would support inclusion and equity by increasing transportation options to serve a diverse population's transportation needs. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal 1.2-3: Promote Sustainability and High Quality of Life	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which would promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in Kern County. The HSR project would also provide safe and efficient mass transit, which would contribute to reduced vehicle emissions and energy use in comparison to other regional transportation modes. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Kern County Bicycle Master Plan and Complete Streets Recommendations (June 2012)	
Policy 9.1: Maintain and improve the quality, operation, and integrity of the bicycle and pedestrian network and support facilities.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (December 2007)	
Land Use Element (2007)	
Goal 1: Accommodate new development which captures the economic demands generated by the marketplace and establishes Bakersfield's role as the capital of the southern San Joaquin Valley	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield Station could attract growth, which would be expected to be consistent with economic demands in the city. The station would also support the city's role as the capitol of the southern San Joaquin Valley. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 10: Accommodate high and high-medium density residential adjacent to existing and planned commercial, multi-family, and principal transportation corridors.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield Station could attract growth, which could include high- and high-medium-density residential uses adjacent to the station and other nonresidential uses in the area. The station would be expected to support activities that would enhance the Golden State Avenue Corridor. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 39: Enhance existing and establish new centers as the principal focus of development and activity in the planning area, around which other land uses are grouped. Centers should be linked by adequate transportation facilities and may be linked to the Kern River, canals, or other resource amenities. Centers may be differentiated by functional activity, density/intensity, and physical character.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield Station would be a primary transportation facility, which could attract growth, including a variety of residential and nonresidential uses. This growth would be expected to enhance the Golden State Avenue Corridor. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 40: Provide for the enhancement and intensification of existing "centers" such as: a. Downtown b. California State University, Bakersfield c. Bakersfield Airpark/Casa Loma d. Meadows Field e. Highway 58/Weedpatch Highway f. Lamont g. Greenfield h. McAllister Ranch	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield Station could attract growth, including a variety of residential and nonresidential uses, and other activities that would enhance the Golden State Avenue Corridor on the edge of downtown Bakersfield. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
i. Northwest Bakersfield j. Rosedale Ranch	
Circulation Element (2007)	
Goal Streets-2: Provide for safe and efficient motorized, non-motorized, and pedestrian traffic movement.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the City of Bakersfield's design standards and requirements. The HSR project would also support safe and efficient movement of people, providing a new HSR passenger service that would be grade-separated from other modes of travel. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy Streets-22: Design transportation improvements to minimize noise impacts on adjacent uses.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy Streets-33: Provide new transportation facilities as needed based on existing usage and future demand.	**Consistent.** The HSR project and the Bakersfield Station would provide new rail facilities and services in the area to accommodate existing and future demand. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal Transit-1: Provide planning area residents with a choice of travel modes.	**Consistent.** The HSR project and the Bakersfield Station would provide new rail facilities and services to provide area residents with an additional travel mode for trips to/from other urban centers in California. The HSR project would also complete all approved and planned transportation improvements, including bike lanes and transportation facilities, where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment. The HSR project supports and is consistent with this goal by expanding transportation options and providing residents with a choice of travel modes.
Goal Transit-3: Provide cost effective public transportation services.	**Consistent.** The HSR project and the Bakersfield Station would provide new rail facilities and services to accommodate existing and future demand with a cost-effective alternative transportation mode for travel to/from other urban centers in California. The HSR project would also complete all approved and planned transportation improvements, including bike lanes and transportation facilities, where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment. The HSR project would support and be consistent with this goal by increasing transportation options to meet a diverse population's transportation needs, including access to economical means of transportation.
Goal Transit-5: Enhance rail service capacities and usage in the planning area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project and the Bakersfield Station would provide new HSR service in the area to accommodate existing and future demand. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy Transit-11: Work to provide grade separations at all arterial/railroad crossings.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide new rail passenger service on an alignment that would be grade-separated from other modes of travel. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy Transit-12: Support efforts to develop high-speed rail facilities to service the plan area.	**Consistent.** This policy indicates the City of Bakersfield's support for HSR. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal Bikeways-3: Provide a continuous easily-accessible bikeway system within the metro area.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street bikeways cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Bakersfield design standards and requirements. Existing and proposed trails that require temporary closures during construction of the HSR Build Alternatives would be detoured around the construction areas to maintain continuous access to the bikeway system. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Housing Element (December 2008)	
Objective 4-2: Reduce the incidence of displacement.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to refine the alignments to reduce the number of property acquisitions and displacements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy 4-2-1: In development of public projects, require an analysis of potential displacement of existing residences with an emphasis on minimizing both temporary displacement and relocation.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to refine the alignments to reduce the number of property acquisitions and displacements of residents and residential uses. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Conservation Element (2007)	
Goal Mineral Resources-3: Avoid conflicts between the productive use of mineral and energy resource lands and urban growth.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would require capping several oil production wells but would avoid other mining and mineral resource areas, including energy resources. As part of the planning and environmental studies for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to minimize conflicts with existing wind and solar energy-producing plants. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which could directly discourage new development from occurring in mineral and energy resource lands from future urban growth. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy Mineral Resources-5: Protect significant mineral and petroleum resource areas, including potential sand and gravel extraction areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would require capping several oil production wells but would avoid other mining and mineral resource areas, including sand and gravel extraction areas. However, capping these oil production wells would not affect future extraction from the affected oil field at nearby wells. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal Soils and Agriculture-1: Provide for the planned management, conservation, and wise utilization of agricultural land in the planning area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of agricultural land to transportation use. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal Air Quality-1: Promote air quality that is compatible with health, well-being, and minimizing vehicular trips to reduce air pollutants.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide efficient movement of people, which would reduce total vehicle miles traveled, thus reducing air pollutants. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy Air Quality-12: Encourage the use of mass transit, carpooling and other transportation options to reduce vehicle miles traveled.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy Air Quality-14: Establish park and ride facilities to encourage carpooling and the use of mass transit.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield Station would include parking for HSR project patrons and would also be in the vicinity of existing transit services in the city. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Open Space Element (2007)	
Goal 1: Conserve and enhance the unique aspects of open space within the planning area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing natural resources land use in Bakersfield and unincorporated Kern County within the planning area. Although vacant land would be impacted, it should not be considered open space. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Keene Ranch Specific Plan (December 1997)	
Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element (1997)	
Policy 2.2-5: Utilize guidelines identified in the implementation section of [the Keene Ranch Specific Plan] to protect scenic viewsheds (see Figure 2-9 [of the Keene Ranch Specific Plan] for Scenic Viewshed Designation Areas).	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with the guidelines in the Keene Ranch Specific Plan regarding the protection of scenic viewsheds. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Circulation Element (1997)	
Goal 3-1: To provide an effective circulation system that is safe, reflects and complements the character of the project site, provides for a network of trails and minimizes effects on the environment.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. The HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project would support this goal by contributing to a more diverse and effective circulation system. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 3-3: All roads and bridges will be designed to safely carry project traffic and maintain the rural character of the surrounding area and proposed development.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. The designs of those facilities would be consistent with Kern County design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 3-5: The Circulation Plan includes trails for pedestrians, bicycles and horses whenever practical, separates them from roads.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street trails cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with Kern County design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
GTASCP (October 2010)	
Land Use Element (2010)	
Goal LU.2: Promote land use development that results in sustainable land use patterns and conservation of GTA resources.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which would promote a more efficient land use pattern and indirectly discourage new development from occurring in outlying natural resource areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy LU.10: Encourage new development to infill existing development areas such as bypassed parcels and provide for an orderly outward expansion of new urban development so that it maintains continuity of existing development, allows for the incremental expansion of infrastructure and public service, minimizes impacts on natural environmental resources, and provides a high-quality environment for residents and businesses.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which would promote a more efficient land use pattern and indirectly discourage new development from occurring in outlying natural resource areas. The HSR project would also enhance the quality of life for the residents of this part of Kern County by providing access to regional and statewide transit systems and opportunities for economic growth in the area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal LU.14: Preserve the rural and agricultural character of the GTA.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of agricultural land to transportation use. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land and would not affect the rural and agricultural character of the GTA. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas in the GTA. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal LU.18: Conserve prime agriculture lands, as defined by CEQA (Public Resources Code section 21060.1), from premature conversion.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of agricultural land to transportation use. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land, including prime agricultural land. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy LU.28: Preserve existing agricultural areas, including charted Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Farmland of Local Importance which can support a variety of agricultural uses based on soil characteristics, topography, and location from premature conversion.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of agricultural land to transportation use. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land, including prime agricultural land (e.g., Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance). Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Conservation and Open Space Element (2010)	
Goal COS.3: Preserve and protect scenic and natural resources and open space within the GTA.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing natural resources land use in Tehachapi and unincorporated Kern County within the planning area. Although vacant land would be impacted, it should not be considered open space. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy COS.23: Comply with dark sky lighting guidelines as established by the Kern County Zoning Ordinance to preserve night-time views, prevent light pollution, and minimize impacts on wildlife.	**Consistent.** The design and operation of the HSR project would comply with the Kern County Zoning Ordinance dark sky lighting guidelines. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal COS.9: Protect and improve air quality in the Greater Tehachapi Area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an HSR alternative for travel to/from urban centers in California, which would provide an alternative travel mode for those trips that would be expected to beneficially affect air quality. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal COS.13: Promote the safe and orderly development of wind and solar energy as a clean method of generating electricity while providing for the protection of the environment.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to minimize conflicts with existing wind and solar energy-producing plants and planned energy projects in the vicinity of the HSR project. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy COS.43: Support efforts to provide the necessary infrastructure and transmission capacity to accommodate renewable energy resources, such as wind energy farms, photovoltaic panels on structures, and commercial solar projects, and support efforts to create a “smart grid” energy system.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to minimize conflicts with existing wind and solar energy-producing plants and planned energy projects in the vicinity of the HSR project. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Circulation Element (2010)	
Goal CIR.1: Provide a safe and efficient circulation system that serves local needs and meets forecast demands of residents and visitors, while reducing the potential for traffic congestion.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for regional travel to/from urban centers in California and is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this goal and are therefore considered to be consistent with this goal.
Goal CIR.2: Maintain a level of service (LOS) C or better on roadways within the identified Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) areas within the GTA, and LOS D for all areas outside of the TIF areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could result in traffic effects on local streets providing access to/from the Bakersfield Station as patrons travel to/from that station. Because the station is not within an identified TIF in the GTA, the HSR project would not affect the LOS on streets in the GTA. Local roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility. As a result, because the four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this goal, they are considered to be consistent with this goal.
Policy CIR.4: Maintain a minimum Level of Service (LOS) C on all circulation system segments within the identified Transportation Impact Fee Areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could result in traffic effects on local streets providing access to/from the Bakersfield Station as patrons travel to/from that station. Because the station is not within an identified TIF in the GTA, the HSR project would not affect the LOS on streets in the GTA. Local roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility. As a result, because the four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy, they are considered to be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy CIR.6: All new development along State and local roadways shall consider access management principles (e.g., minimize new points of ingress and egress) based on American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standards and the Transportation Research Board (TRB) Access Management Manual. Caltrans (if a state highway) and the Kern County Roads and Planning and Community Development Departments will consult to determine the optimal access configuration.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to consider access management principles based on the AASHTO standards and the TRB Access Management Manual. As a result, because the four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy, they are considered to be consistent with this policy.
Policy CIR.9: Support City of Tehachapi to provide a new interchange at State Route 58 and Dennison Road.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not conflict with the ability of the City of Tehachapi to implement this proposed interchange. As a result, because the four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy, they are considered to be consistent with this policy.
Policy CIR.10: The County shall work with various agencies and support efforts to improve emergency access within the Greater Tehachapi Area.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local officials to ensure emergency access to/from and around all project construction areas during construction. For example, during construction of grade-separated crossings, only one crossing per community would be closed at a time to avoid impacts to emergency access. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR facility to ensure the ability of emergency services providers to safely and quickly cross that facility. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal CIR.7: Provide a useful, enjoyable, safe, and efficient regional trail system for hikers, bicyclists, and equestrians that links communities, recreational areas, public lands, and activity centers	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street trails cross the proposed HSR alignment the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy CIR.11: Promote the creation and/or expansion of non-vehicular circulation systems (bikeways, walkways, equestrian trials, etc.) that create linkages within the GTA and encourage new development to include provisions for such facilities.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy CIR.12: Encourage street network connectivity and "complete streets" designed to accommodate multiple transportation modes such as, but not limited to, those routes identified in the Kern County Bicycle Facilities Plan as identified in Figure 4-3 [of the Greater Tehachapi Area Specific and Community Plan].	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project would support this policy by creating a more diverse transportation system that can accommodate a diverse population's transportation needs. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal CIR.8: Provide for increased transit services to allow residents of the GTA access to outlying communities such as Bakersfield, Mojave, and Lancaster.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. However, the HSR project would not meet local or subregional transit needs such as connections in the GTA to outlying areas. Because the HSR project would not conflict with this goal, the four Build Alternatives are considered to be consistent with this goal.
Policy CIR.18: The County shall encourage transit purveyors to increase the frequency of services between the GTA and the adjacent communities such as Bakersfield, Mojave, and Lancaster such services as funding and ridership demand allows.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. However, the HSR project would not meet local or subregional transit needs such as connections in the GTA to outlying areas. Because the HSR project would not conflict with this policy, the four Build Alternatives are considered to be consistent with this policy.
Goal CIR.11: Promote land use compatibility for new uses adjacent to high speed rail lines.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development in areas near the Bakersfield Station site, which is served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. This would support a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in unincorporated Kern County. Because there are no stations in the GTA, it is unlikely that land use changes in response to the HSR project would occur in the GTA. Because the HSR project would not conflict with this goal, the four Build Alternatives are considered to be consistent with this goal.
Policy CIR.22: The County shall encourage purveyors of transit services between the GTA and adjacent communities such as Bakersfield, Mojave, and Lancaster to increase the frequency of such services as funding allows by those providers.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. However, the HSR project would not meet local or subregional transit needs such as connections in the GTA to outlying areas. Because the HSR project would not conflict with this policy, the four Build Alternatives are considered to be consistent with this policy.
Policy CIR.23: Support the development of high-speed rail where consistent with existing land uses throughout the GTA.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project would be consistent with existing land uses where the GTA allows for transportation uses. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives are considered to be consistent with this policy.
Safety Element (2010)	
Goal SAF.2: Minimize injuries and loss of life and reduce property damage.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to ensure that the design, construction, and operation of the HSR project minimize the potential for injuries, loss of life, and property damage based on existing applicable design and operations standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal SAF.5: Ensure the availability and effective response of emergency services following a catastrophic event.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local officials to ensure emergency access to/from and around all project construction areas during construction. For example, during construction of grade-separated crossings, only one crossing per community would be closed at a time to avoid impacts to emergency access. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR facility to ensure the ability of emergency services providers to safely and quickly cross that facility following a catastrophic event. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy SAF.4: The County shall encourage extra precautions be taken for the design of significant lifeline installations, such as highways, utilities, and petrochemical pipelines.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local officials and utility providers to ensure that the design, construction, and operation of the HSR project are consistent with applicable standards to minimize the potential for effects on lifeline installations. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal SAF.11: Ensure that infrastructure (emergency water sources, road access, address displays, etc.) are sufficient to protect residents and structures against wildland fires.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local fire and other emergency services officials to ensure that the design, construction, and operation of the HSR project are consistent with applicable standards to minimize risks associated with wildfires. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Noise Element (2010)	
Goal NOI.1: Protect the health and welfare of GTA residents from both long-term operational noise impacts (e.g., traffic noise) and short-term construction related noise impacts.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal NOI.2: Maintain the predominantly lower ambient noise levels reflective of the rural and agricultural character of the GTA and its various communities.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy NOI.1: The County shall not support proposed projects that generate noise emissions that are not compatible to the standards established in the GTASCP and other applicable County regulatory documents.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Sustainability Element (2010)	
Goal SUS.1: Encourage alternatives to use of gas-powered vehicles.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an HSR alternative for travel to/from urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy SUS.1: Provide for alternative modes of transportation such as walking, biking, carpools, vanpools, and public transportation to reduce emissions associated with automobile use.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an HSR alternative for travel to/from urban centers in California. Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Tehachapi General Plan 2035 (January 2012)	
Mobility Element (2012)	
Objective 1: Connect as many streets as possible.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions and would provide grade-separated crossings at those locations. Because the HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this objective, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy M3: Increase regional roadway connections to improve mobility.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions and would provide grade-separated crossings at those locations. Because the HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this policy, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective 6: Enhance regional transportation access.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an HSR alternative for travel to/from urban centers in California, which would enhance regional transportation access in the city. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Public Realm Element (2012)	
Objective 2: Enhance Access and Walkability	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions and would provide grade-separated crossings at those locations. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy PR7: Maintain bicycle access-types (class 1, 2, or 3) on all thoroughfare types including grade-separations	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. In addition, where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, grade-separations would be provided at crossings. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Natural Resources Element (2012)	
Objective A-1: Improve Air Quality	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an HSR alternative for travel to/from urban centers in California, which would provide an alternative travel mode for those trips that would be expected to beneficially affect air quality. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Objective A-3: Support Kern County's Policies to Maintain Open Space around Tehachapi	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing natural resources land uses in Tehachapi and unincorporated Kern County within the planning area. Although vacant land would be impacted, it should not be considered open space. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy NR11: Support the economic viability of agriculture by maintaining a compatible relationship with agricultural operations pursuant to the Greater Tehachapi Specific Plan	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of agricultural land in Tehachapi to transportation use. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural operations. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas in and around Tehachapi. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Objective B-2: Enable prime and unique farmland to operate effectively.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of agricultural land in Tehachapi to transportation use, which would be consistent with this objective. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land, including prime and unique farmland. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas in Tehachapi. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Objective C-3: Improve access to natural areas for enjoyment by the community.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions and would provide grade separations at those crossings. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy NR32: Maintain standards that: a. prohibit walls form blocking views of, or access into, natural areas b. reflect the intended physical context(s) to which the standards are to be applied c. require appropriate and contextually responsive connections between urban and rural areas d. treat paths, trails, etc., as an integral part of the adjacent, intended physical context	**Consistent.** The Authority has adopted design standards and guidelines established to create a minimum aesthetic quality impact for a long-lasting infrastructure. The Authority's *Urban Design Guidelines for the California High Speed Train Project* (Authority 2011) discusses the principles of context-sensitive solutions to guide the design of stations. This approach is equally applicable to elevated guideways and would be employed to mitigate visual impacts through context-sensitive design. The Authority Technical Memorandum *Aesthetic Guidelines for Non-Station Structures* (Authority 2011b) also guides the design of the HSR components. The Authority's *Aesthetic Design Review Process for Non-Station Structures* (Authority 2014) would guide the development of mitigation for nonstation-area structures. These standards and guidelines work to minimize and avoid aesthetic effects on the adjacent surroundings where possible. During design, the Authority will work collaboratively with local agencies, stakeholders, and contractors to address aesthetic issues. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective D-1: Protect Mineral Resources	**Consistent.** The HSR project would avoid mining and mineral resource areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy NR33: Avoid allowing use or development in areas identified with important mineral resources. For sites outside of Tehachapi's Sphere of Influence, represent this policy to Kern County as part of the review process.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would avoid mining and mineral resource areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Community Safety Element (2012)	
Objective 2: Improve Tehachapi's Noise Environment	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy CS63: Incorporate noise considerations into planning and development decision-making, and guide the location and design of transportation facilities to minimize the effects of noise on adjacent and nearby land uses.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Tehachapi Municipal Airport Master Plan Update (August 2004)	
Revenue-Supporting Objectives, Opportunities, and Constraints	
Objective: The project should be coordinated with adjacent land use plans and existing and planned circulation and infrastructure improvements	**Consistent.** The Authority will coordinate the design, construction, and operation of the HSR project with the Airport Master Plan to ensure that the HSR project will not conflict with airport operations. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Cameron Canyon Specific Plan (June 1986)	
Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element (1986)	
Goal VI-4: To ensure that any earthwork or grading is adequately designed for drainage and erosion control and site rehabilitation.	**Consistent.** The design, construction, and operation of the HSR project will be conducted consistent with applicable engineering and design standards to ensure that the project drainage and erosion control features meet or exceed applicable standards. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy VI-2: Rivers and streams in the County are important visual and recreational resources and wildlife habitats. Areas of riparian vegetation along rivers and streams will, therefore, be preserved.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding impacts associated with recreational and visual resources, and wildlife habitat of rivers and streams, including mitigation requirements. As a result, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy VI-5: Use of the Pacific Crest Trail for recreational hiking and horseback riding will be supported.	**Consistent.** Grade separations will be provided where the HSR project alignments cross the Pacific Crest Trail to ensure continued use of those segments of the Pacific Crest Trail for hiking and horseback riding. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Willow Springs Specific Plan (April 2008)	
Circulation Element (2008)	
Goal 1: To provide for greater efficiency of circulation within the plan area by providing more direct routes between populated areas of the community.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for regional travel to/from urban centers in California and is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this goal and are therefore considered to be consistent with this goal.
Goal 5: To maintain public safety within the plan area by providing a more direct and efficient circulation system for law enforcement and fire protection vehicles.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local officials to ensure emergency access to/from and around all project construction areas during construction. For example, during construction of grade-separated crossings, only one crossing per community would be closed at a time to avoid impacts to emergency access. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR facility to ensure the ability of emergency services providers to safely and quickly cross that facility. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 9: The proposed circulation pattern as shown on the Rosamond-Willow Springs Circulation Map, included in [the Circulation Element of the Willow Springs Specific Plan], is presently considered necessary and adequate to service the community growth pattern presented in the Land Use Element of the Willow Springs Specific Plan.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. The HSR project would also support safe and efficient movement of people, providing a new HSR passenger service that would be grade-separated from other modes of travel. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Rosamond Specific Plan (April 2008)	
Land Use Element (October 2010)	
General Goal 3: To achieve proper relationships and compatibility between various types of land uses.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including commercial development. This could indirectly discourage new commercial development from occurring in outlying areas in unincorporated Kern County that are not currently well supported by infrastructure and that may not be consistent with existing uses in those outlying areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Circulation Element (2008)	
Goal 2: To reduce time spent in travel within the plan area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for regional travel to/from urban centers in California and would be expected to reduce travel times to/from those urban centers. However, the HSR project is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity and would therefore not reduce travel times within the plan area itself. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this goal and are therefore considered to be consistent with this goal.
Goal 3: To maintain adequate traffic safety.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will be designed, constructed, and operated consistent with applicable traffic control, management, and safety requirements and standards. In addition, as part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local officials to ensure emergency access to/from and around all project construction areas during construction. For example, during construction of grade-separated crossings, only one crossing per community would be closed at a time to avoid impacts to emergency access. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR facility to ensure the ability of emergency services providers to safely and quickly cross that facility following a catastrophic event. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 4: To maintain public safety within the plan area by providing a more direct and efficient circulation system for law enforcement and fire protection vehicles.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local officials to ensure emergency access to/from and around all project construction areas during construction. For example, during construction of grade-separated crossings, only one crossing per community would be closed at a time to avoid impacts to emergency access. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR facility to ensure the ability of emergency services providers to safely and quickly cross that facility following a catastrophic event. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal 6: To provide for [a] circulation system which will support planned land uses.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for regional travel to/from urban centers in California and would be expected to reduce travel times to/from those urban centers. The HSR project is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity and would therefore not address circulation system needs within the plan area itself. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this goal and are therefore considered to be consistent with this goal.
Policy 1: The proposed circulation pattern as shown on the Rosamond-Willow Springs Circulation Map, included in [the Circulation Element of the Rosamond Specific Plan], is presently considered necessary and adequate to service the community growth pattern presented in Land Use Element of the Rosamond Specific Plan.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Open Space/Conservation Element (2008)	
Goal 2: To conserve those open space areas of the community which, because of unique qualities of history and geography, should be preserved for the enjoyment of the entire community and the public as a whole.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing natural resources land uses in Rosamond and unincorporated Kern County within the planning area. Although vacant land would be impacted, it should not be considered open space. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 3: To maintain the open space qualities of the plan area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing natural resources land uses in Rosamond and unincorporated Kern County within the planning area. Although vacant land would be impacted, it should not be considered open space. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Noise Element (2008)	
Goal 2: To minimize disruption to the quality of life resulting from excessive noise.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Los Angeles County General Plan (October 2015)	
Land Use Element (2015)	
Goal LU3: A development pattern that discourages sprawl, and protects and conserves areas with natural resources and SEAs.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development in areas near the Palmdale Station site, which is served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. This would support a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of unincorporated Los Angeles County and could minimize effects on SEAs in the project vicinity. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy LU3.3: Discourage development in undeveloped areas where infrastructure and public services do not exist, or where no major infrastructure projects are planned, such as state and/or federal highways.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development in areas near the Palmdale Station site, which is served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. This would support a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of unincorporated Los Angeles County and would discourage development in unincorporated county areas where infrastructure and public services are limited or nonexistent. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal LU4: Infill development and redevelopment that strengthens and enhances communities.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development in areas near the Palmdale Station site, which is served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, that would be expected to strengthen and enhance Palmdale while minimizing pressure for development in adjacent areas of unincorporated Los Angeles County. This would support a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of unincorporated Los Angeles County and would discourage development in unincorporated county areas where infrastructure and public services are limited or nonexistent. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy LU4.1: Encourage infill development in urban and suburban areas on vacant, underutilized, and/or brownfield sites.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development on vacant, underutilized, and/or brownfield sites near the Palmdale Station site while minimizing pressure for development in adjacent areas of unincorporated Los Angeles County. This would support a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of unincorporated Los Angeles County and would discourage development in unincorporated county areas where infrastructure and public services are limited or nonexistent. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy LU4.3: Encourage transit-oriented development in urban and suburban areas with the appropriate residential density along transit corridors and within station areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development in areas near the Palmdale Station site with increased residential densities, which would require approval by the City of Palmdale. Because there are no stations on the segment of the HSR project in unincorporated Los Angeles County, there would be no need for transit-oriented development along that alignment. Because the HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this policy, the four Build Alternatives would be considered consistent with this policy.
Goal LU7: Compatible land uses that complement neighborhood character and the natural environment.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development in areas near the Palmdale Station site, but would not be expected to result in pressure to develop new land uses in unincorporated Los Angeles County in the vicinity of the City of Palmdale because there are no stations on the segment of the HSR project in unincorporated Los Angeles County. Because the HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this goal, the four Build Alternatives would be considered consistent with this goal.
Policy LU7.6: Ensure that proposed land uses located within Airport Influence Areas are compatible with airport operations through compliance with airport land use compatibility plans.	**Consistent.** The Authority will coordinate the design, construction, and operation of the HSR project with the Airport Master Plan to ensure that the HSR project would be a consistent land use in the Airport Influence Areas and that it would not conflict with airport operations. The HSR project would not be impacted by aircraft operations noise and would not concentrate people or facilities in areas susceptible to aircraft accidents, or place facilities in areas that would adversely affect the use of navigable airspace. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Mobility Element (2015)	
Goal M1: Street designs that incorporate the needs of all users.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. All road improvements would be designed and constructed consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy M1.1: Provide for the accommodation of all users, including pedestrians, motorists, bicyclists, equestrians, users of public transit, seniors, children, and persons with disabilities when requiring or planning for new, or retrofitting existing, transportation corridors/networks whenever appropriate and feasible.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. All road improvements would be designed and constructed consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal M2: Interconnected and safe bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly streets, sidewalks, paths and trails that promote active transportation and transit use.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Los Angeles County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project would support this goal by creating a more diverse transportation system that can accommodate a diverse population's transportation needs. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy M2.1: Provide transportation corridors/networks that accommodate pedestrians, equestrians and bicyclists, and reduce motor vehicle accidents through a context-sensitive process that addresses the unique characteristics of urban, suburban, and rural communities whenever appropriate and feasible.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal M4: An efficient multimodal transportation system that serves the needs of all residents.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide one component of a multimodal circulation system to address transportation needs in this part of Los Angeles County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy M4.1: Expand transportation options that reduce automobile dependence.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide a new regional HSR transportation option that would be expected to reduce dependence on automobiles for trips to/from other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy M4.3: Maintain transit services within the unincorporated areas that are affordable, timely, cost-effective, and responsive to growth patterns and community input.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide one component of a circulation system to address transportation needs in this part of Los Angeles County. The HSR project is not intended to address local transit needs in unincorporated Los Angeles County. The HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this policy. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy M4.4: Ensure expanded mobility and increase transit access for underserved transit users, such as seniors, students, low income households, and persons with disabilities.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for regional travel to/from urban centers in California and would be expected to reduce travel times to/from those urban centers. The HSR project is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity and would therefore not address circulation system needs for underserved transit users in this part of Los Angeles County. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy and are therefore considered to be consistent with this policy.
Policy M4.5: Encourage continuous, direct routes through a connected system of streets, with small blocks and minimal dead ends (cul-de-sacs), as feasible.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with Los Angeles County design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy M4.9: Ensure the participation of all potentially affected communities in the transportation planning and decision-making process.	**Consistent.** The planning and environmental processes for the HSR project have provided, and will continue to provide, extensive opportunities for members and representatives of affected communities to participate in the planning, evaluation, and decision-making processes for this project. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy M4.10: Support the linkage of regional and community-level transportation systems, including multimodal networks.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide a new component in the regional transit system. In addition, the Palmdale Station site is in an area with existing adequate public service infrastructure and services. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy M4.11: Improve the efficiency of the public transportation system with bus lanes, signal prioritization, and connections to the larger regional transportation network.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide a new component in the regional transit system, including connections to existing transit services in the vicinity of the Palmdale Station site. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy M4.12: Work with adjacent jurisdictions to ensure connectivity and the creation of an integrated regional network.	**Consistent.** During the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority coordinated with the local jurisdictions the HSR project would traverse to ensure connectivity and an integrated regional transportation network. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal M7: Transportation networks that minimizes negative impacts to the environment and communities.	**Consistent.** During the planning, conceptual design, and environmental evaluation for the HSR project, the Authority coordinated with the local jurisdictions the HSR project would traverse to minimize environmental and community impacts. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Conservation and Natural Resources Element (2015)	
Goal C/NR1: Open space areas that meet the diverse needs of Los Angeles County.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing natural resources land uses in Los Angeles County within the planning area. Although vacant land would be impacted, it should not be considered open space. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal C/NR8: Productive farmland that is protected for local food production, open space, public health, and the local economy.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would avoid agricultural areas in unincorporated Los Angeles County. In addition, because the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, it could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in agricultural areas in unincorporated Los Angeles County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy C/NR8.1: Protect ARAs, and other land identified as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance by the California Department of Conservation, from encroaching development and discourage incompatible adjacent land uses.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would avoid land in unincorporated Los Angeles County that is identified as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance. In addition, because the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, it could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in agricultural areas in unincorporated Los Angeles County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Noise Element (2015)	
Policy N1.7: Utilize traffic management and noise suppression techniques to minimize noise from traffic and transportation systems.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy N1.8: Minimize noise impacts to pedestrians and transit-riders in the design of transportation facilities and mobility networks.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers or other noise reduction features in the design of the Palmdale Station to reduce noise effects on station patrons and pedestrians. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Economic Development Element (2015)	
Goal ED1: An economic base and fiscal structures that attract and retain valuable industries and businesses.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development and may attract new businesses to the area, including unincorporated Los Angeles County, by improving regional transportation access in the Palmdale area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy ED1.6: Develop, advance, and promote competitive advantages for economic development and growth.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development and may attract new businesses to the area, including unincorporated Los Angeles County, by improving regional transportation access in the Palmdale area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal ED2: Land use practices and regulations that foster economic development and growth.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development and may attract new businesses to the area, including unincorporated Los Angeles County, by improving regional transportation access in the Palmdale area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy ED2.7: Incentivize economic development and growth along existing transportation corridors and in urbanized areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development and may attract new businesses to the area, including unincorporated Los Angeles County, by improving regional transportation access in the Palmdale area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal ED3: An expanded and improved infrastructure system to support economic growth and development.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could make the areas immediately surrounding the Palmdale Station site, which are served by existing adequate public service infrastructure and services, more attractive for future development by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy ED3.3: Work with state agencies dedicated to financing important critical infrastructure and economic development projects.	**Consistent.** The Authority is working with federal and state agencies at all levels to plan the HSR project, including pursuing funding for the design and construction of the project. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy ED4.4: Incentivize infill development in urban and suburban areas that revitalizes underutilized commercial and industrial areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development and may attract new businesses to the area, including unincorporated Los Angeles County, by improving regional transportation access in the Palmdale area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy ED4.6: Retrofit and reuse vacant and underutilized industrial and commercial sites in urban and suburban areas for emerging and targeted industries.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development on vacant and underutilized sites near the Palmdale Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including targeted industries. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan (December 2011)	
Goal 1: Expanded, improved, and interconnected system of county bikeways and bikeway support facilities to provide a viable transportation alternative for all levels of bicycling abilities, particularly for trips of less than five miles.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street bikeways cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those crossings would be grade-separated. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 1.1: Construct the bikeways proposed in 2012 County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan over the next 20 years.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street bikeways cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those crossings would be grade-separated. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Fox Field Industrial Corridor Specific Plan (May 1996)	
Goal Circulation a: Provide for the efficient movements of goods and people into and throughout the project area, establishing adequate access to individual land uses.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for regional travel to/from urban centers in California and would be expected to reduce travel times to/from those urban centers. The HSR project is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity and, therefore, would not address circulation system needs identified in this specific plan. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this goal and are therefore considered to be consistent with this goal.
City of Lancaster General Plan 2030 (July 2009)	
Plan for the Natural Environment (2009)	
Objective 3.3: Preserve acceptable air quality by striving to attain and maintain national, state and local air quality standards.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide efficient movement of people, which would reduce total vehicle miles traveled, thus reducing air pollutants. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 3.3.1: Minimize the amount of vehicular miles traveled.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 3.3.2: Facilitate the development and use of public transportation and travel modes such as bicycle riding and walking.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Lancaster design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 3.5.3: Protect lands currently in agricultural production from the negative impacts created when urban and rural land uses exist in close proximity, while recognizing the possibility of their long-term conversion to urban and rural use.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would avoid agricultural areas in unincorporated Los Angeles County. In addition, because the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, it could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in agricultural areas in unincorporated Los Angeles County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Objective 3.6: Encourage efficient use of energy resources through the promotion of efficient land use patterns and the incorporation of energy conservation practices into new and existing development, and appropriate use of alternative energy.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development in areas near the Palmdale Station site, which is served by existing energy utility providers. That infill development would be expected to include energy-efficiency features and to not require substantial new infrastructure. The HSR project itself will be operated using efficient electrical systems. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy 3.6.1: Reduce energy consumption by establishing land use patterns which would decrease automobile travel and increase the use of energy efficient modes of transportation	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled. The HSR project could also indirectly encourage new infill development in the vicinity of the Palmdale Station, which could promote a more efficient land use pattern. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective 3.8: Preserve and enhance important views within the City, and significant visual features which are visible from the City of Lancaster.	**Consistent.** The HSR project does not impact any important views within the City of Lancaster or significant visual features visible from the City of Lancaster and the magnitude of any aesthetic and visual impacts within city limits related to the four Build Alternatives have been identified as neutral. The Authority has committed to incorporating context-sensitive design and mitigation strategies during construction where feasible. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy 3.8.1: Preserve views of surrounding ridgelines, slope areas and hilltops, as well as other scenic vistas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project does not impact any views of surrounding ridgelines, slope areas, or hilltops, or other scenic vistas in the City of Lancaster, and the magnitude of any aesthetic and visual impacts within city limits related to the four Build Alternatives have been identified as neutral. The Authority has committed to incorporating context-sensitive design and mitigation strategies during construction where feasible. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Plan for Public Health and Safety (2009)	
Policy 4.3.2: Wherever feasible, manage the generation of single event noise levels (SENL) from motor vehicles, trains, aircraft, commercial, industrial, construction, and other activities such that SENL levels are no greater than 15 dBA above the noise objectives included in the plan for Public Health and Safety.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 4.4.2: Limit the uses surrounding airport facilities at Fox Field, Edwards Air Force Base, and Plant 42 to ensure their continued safe operation.	**Consistent.** The Authority will coordinate the design, construction, and operation of the HSR project with the Airport Master Plan for Plant 42 to ensure that the HSR project will not conflict with operations at that airport. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Plan for Active Living (2009)	
Objective 10.2: Through the adoption and implementation of a Master Plan of trails, establish and maintain a hierarchical system of trails (including equestrian, bicycle, and pedestrians trails) providing recreation opportunities and an alternative means of reaching schools, parks and natural areas, and places of employment, and connecting to regional trail systems.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street trails cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy 10.2.1: Establish and maintain a Master Plan of Trails which designates trail status and approximate locations, providing for the following types of trails: • Urban Trails: multi-purpose pedestrian/ bicycle trails which connect residential areas to other residential areas, regional and community parks, schools, and commercial and industrial employment areas. • Rural Trails: multi-purpose equestrian/pedestrian/ bicycle trails which connect residential areas to other residential areas, regional and community parks, schools, and commercial and industrial employment areas. • Bicycle Right of Way: integrates with the urban and rural trails and provides additional access to residential, recreational, educational, and commercial/ industrial employment areas.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street trails cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 10.2.4: Facilitate the use of bicycles as an alternative form of transportation, as well as a form of recreation.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street trails cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Plan for Physical Mobility (2009)	
Objective 14.1: Maintain a hierarchical system which balances the need for free traffic flow with economic realities, such that streets are designed to handle normal traffic flows with tolerances to allow for potential short-term delays at peak hours.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street trails cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy 14.1.6: Work with regional partners to ensure that the regional circulation system provides adequate connections across the Antelope Valley for convenient circulation and rapid emergency access.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for regional travel to/from urban centers in California and would be expected to reduce travel times to/from those urban centers. The HSR project is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity and, therefore, would not address circulation system needs in this part of Los Angeles County. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy and are therefore consistent with this policy.
Objective 14.4: Reduce reliance of the use of automobiles and increase the average vehicle occupancy by promoting alternatives to single-occupancy auto use, including ridesharing, non-motorized transportation (bicycle, pedestrian), and the use of public transit.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for high-speed regional rail travel to/from urban centers in California and would be expected to reduce dependence on automobiles for those trips. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this objective and are, therefore, consistent with this objective and this policy.
Policy 14.4.1: Under the guidance of the Transportation Master Plan, support and encourages the various public transit companies, ridesharing programs and other incentive programs, that allow residents to utilize modes of transportation other than the private automobile, and accommodate those households within the Urbanizing Area of the City that rely on public transit.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for high-speed regional rail travel to/from urban centers in California and would be expected to reduce dependence on automobiles for those trips. That service would be accessible from the Palmdale Station, which would serve the City of Lancaster. The four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 14.4.2: Promote the use of alternative modes of transportation through the development of convenient and attractive facilities that support and accommodate the services.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for high-speed regional rail travel to/from urban centers in California and would be expected to reduce dependence on automobiles for those trips. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this objective and are, therefore, consistent with this objective and this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Plan for Economic Development Vitality (2009)	
Objective 16.1: Implement the four Pillars of the Lancaster Economic Development/Redevelopment Strategic Plan in order to achieve a more vibrant, energetic and prosperous Lancaster.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which would promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of Los Angeles County, including the City of Lancaster. The HSR project would support existing businesses in the area and could also act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in this part of Los Angeles County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy 16.1.1: Promote a jobs/housing balance that places an emphasis on the attraction of high-paying jobs which will enable the local workforce to achieve the standard of living necessary to both live and work within the community.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which could promote more jobs in Lancaster and this part of Los Angeles County. The HSR project could support existing businesses in the area and could also act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in this part of Los Angeles County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective 16.3: Foster development patterns and growth which contributes to, rather than detracts from net fiscal gains to the City.	**Consistent.** Because there is no station in the City of Lancaster, the HSR project is not expected to result in substantial land use changes in the city. Property acquisition would result in a reduction in tax revenues generated in the city. However, the HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this objective. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be considered to be consistent with this objective.
Policy 16.3.1: Promote development patterns which will minimize the costs of infrastructure development, public facilities development and municipal service cost delivery.	**Consistent.** Because there is no station in the City of Lancaster, the HSR project is not expected to result in substantial land use changes or increases in infrastructure, public facilities, or municipal services costs. However, the HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this policy. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be considered to be consistent with this policy.
Objective 16.4: Promote the revitalization of Downtown Lancaster as the Urban Center of the Antelope Valley creating a mix of cultural, recreational, social, economic and residential activities.	**Consistent.** Because there is no station in the City of Lancaster, the HSR project is not expected to result in substantial land use changes in the city. However, the HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this objective. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be considered to be consistent with this objective.
Policy 16.4.1: Continue to promote the creation of a transit village development district around the Metrolink commuter rail station to provide opportunities for transit-oriented development, including mixed-use housing, shopping, public services, employment opportunities and cultural/recreational activities within a safe, pedestrian-friendly environment.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in the relocation of the Lancaster Metrolink station; however, it would not affect the ability of the city to implement a transit development district around the relocated Metrolink station. The HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this policy and, therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Housing Element (2014–2021) (October 2013)	
Goal 6: To promote sufficient housing to meet the diverse housing needs of all economic segments of the present and future City of Lancaster.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in a substantial number of residential displacements in Lancaster; however, sufficient replacement housing sites are available in the surrounding area to accommodate the relocation of the residents displaced by the project. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 6.1.2: Promote infill housing development within areas presently approved for urban density residential development, as well as areas which have been committed to urban development.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill housing development in areas near the Palmdale Station site with increased residential densities, which would require approval by the City of Palmdale. Because there are no stations on the HSR project alignment in Lancaster, there would be no need for transit-oriented development along that alignment. Because the HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this policy, the four Build Alternatives would be considered consistent with this policy.
Goal 7: To preserve existing housing stock within areas for which a desirable living environment can be provided; to promote conversion of such residential areas for which a desirable living environment cannot be sustained.	**Not Consistent.** The HSR project would remove some existing housing in Lancaster. While sufficient replacement housing sites are available in the surrounding area to accommodate the relocation of the residents displaced by the project, the HSR project would result in the loss of housing stock in the city. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be inconsistent with this goal.
City of Lancaster Master Plan of Trails and Bikeways (October 2011)	
Goal 1: Provide a safe, connected, and convenient street environment where people of all ages and physical abilities can travel throughout Lancaster without a vehicle.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Lancaster by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 2: Create a network of off-street shared-use paths and trails within the City that is well located, safe, and secure.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Lancaster by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 1: The City will actively accommodate and encourage safe and convenient bicycle and pedestrian commuting throughout Lancaster.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Lancaster by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 2: The City will actively accommodate and encourage safe and convenient bicycle and pedestrian utilitarian trips to schools, stores, parks and other destinations throughout Lancaster.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Lancaster by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 7: The City will develop a trails system along available rights of way and in new development.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Lancaster by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Lancaster Business Park Phase III Specific Plan (January 1991)	
Economic Objective	
Help the City reach a jobs/housing balance as required by the Air Quality Management District. The project will provide employment opportunities for those people seeking to relocate to the Lancaster area, and for those living in the Lancaster area who now commute to outlying employment centers.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which could promote more jobs in Lancaster and this part of Los Angeles County. The HSR project could support existing businesses in the area and could also act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in this part of Los Angeles County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
City of Lancaster Parks, Recreation, Open Space & Cultural Master Plan (October 2007)	
Goal 9: Encourage the Integration of Parks and Trails Into Overall Community Design, Planning, and Development Decisions.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 9.1: Pursue the development of a trails network that would connect destinations throughout Lancaster, including local schools and parks, places of business, and transit stops.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
City of Palmdale General Plan (January 1993)	
Noise Element (1993)	
Goal N1: Minimize the exposure of residents to excessive noise to the extent possible, through the land planning and the development review process.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Objective N1.2: Protect and maintain those areas having acceptable noise environments.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy N1.2.4: Where deemed appropriate based upon available information, acoustical analysis and appropriate mitigation for noise-sensitive land uses should be required in areas which may be adversely impacted by significant intermittent noise sources. Such noise sources may include but not be limited to railroads, racetracks, stadiums, aircraft overflights and similar uses.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Land Use Element (1993)	
Goal L1: Create a vison for long-term growth and development in the City of Palmdale which provides for orderly, functional patterns of land uses within urban areas, a unified and coherent urban form, and a high quality of life for its residents.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which would promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of Los Angeles County. The HSR project would enhance the quality of life for the citizens of this part of the county, including Palmdale, by providing access to regional and statewide transit systems and opportunities for economic growth in the area, which includes expanded job opportunities. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy L1.1.2: Provide incentives to promote infill development, in order to foster more cohesive neighborhoods, maximize use of infrastructure, consolidate development patterns and enhance community appearance.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which would promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of Los Angeles County. The HSR project would enhance the quality of life for the citizens of this part of the county, including Palmdale, by providing access to regional and statewide transit systems and opportunities for economic growth in the area, which includes expanded job opportunities. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective L2.3: Revitalize the core area of Palmdale so as to maintain and enhance its economic viability.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which would promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of Los Angeles County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Environmental Resources Element (1993)	
Policy ER 5.1.2: Reduce vehicle non-work trips through merchant transportation incentives, distance learning, and transit system improvements.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Circulation Element (1993)	
Policy C1.2.4: Promote development of regional arterial links within the community where needed to serve existing and future needs, including but not limited to the following: 1. Promote development of grade separations at railroad tracks, in particular, at Palmdale Boulevard. 2. Coordinate with Caltrans and other affected agencies to expedite rerouting of highway 138 and widening of State Route 14. 3. Coordinate with affected agencies and jurisdictions to address the potential for establishing a regional north-south transportation corridor within the west side of the Antelope Valley.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions and would provide grade separations at those crossings. The HSR project would provide for regional travel to/from urban centers in California and is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy and are, therefore, considered to be consistent with this policy.
Objective C1.4: Adopt policies and standards for street design and construction which promote safety, convenience and efficiency.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. In addition, as part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local officials to ensure emergency access to/from and around all project construction areas during construction. For example, during construction of grade-separated crossings, only one crossing per community would be closed at a time to avoid impacts to emergency access. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR facility to ensure the ability of emergency services providers to safely and quickly cross that facility. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy C1.4.1: Strive to maintain a Level of Service (LOS) C or better to the extent practical; in some circumstances, a LOS D may be acceptable for a short duration during peak hours.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could result in traffic effects on local streets providing access to/from the Palmdale Station as patrons travel to/from that station. Those effects would be managed with appropriate traffic controls on roads accessing the station. Local roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility. As a result, because the four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy, they are considered to be consistent with this policy.
Goal C2: Reduce the number of trips and vehicle miles traveled by individuals within the Planning Area, to meet regional transportation and air quality goals.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled. The HSR project is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this goal and are therefore considered to be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Objective C2.2: Increase the public transit opportunities available to Palmdale residents in order to reduce traffic impacts on streets and highways and provide travel alternatives.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy C2.2.2: Promote the use of public transit by facilitating dedication of access routes and construction of safe and convenient stops with sufficient parking.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would include a dedicated station in Palmdale served by an HSR alignment that would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California. The Palmdale Station site would include parking for HSR project patrons and would also be located in the vicinity of existing transit services in the city. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy C2.2.4: Encourage development of regional rail transit serving the Palmdale area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would include a dedicated station in Palmdale connected to an HSR alignment. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy C2.2.6: Establish a regional transportation center within the City, conveniently located to maximize access to downtown and major commercial centers, which will accommodate a variety of public transportation uses including rail, bus, and shuttle service.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would include a dedicated station in Palmdale on an HSR alignment which would provide connections to other surface transit services in the area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective C4.2: Encourage extension of passenger rail service to the City of Palmdale.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide HSR service to the city, including a dedicated station in Palmdale. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy C4.2.1: Support regional efforts to connect Palmdale Regional Airport to Los Angeles International Airport with a high-speed rail line.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an HSR rail transportation connection between Palmdale and other urban centers in California, including Union Station in Los Angeles. Although the HSR project would not provide an HSR connection to Los Angeles International Airport, the four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives are considered to be consistent with this policy.
Goal C5: Protect and promote a variety of air transportation services within the City of Palmdale.	**Consistent.** The Authority will coordinate the design, construction, and operation of the HSR project with the applicable airport land use plan to ensure that the HSR project would be a consistent land use in the airport influence area for Plant 42 and that it would not conflict with airport operations. The HSR project would not be impacted by aircraft operations noise and would not concentrate people or facilities in areas susceptible to aircraft accidents, or place facilities in areas that would adversely affect the use of navigable airspace. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Objective C5.1: Protect opportunities for full utilization and expansion of Air Force Plant 42.	**Consistent.** The Authority will coordinate the design, construction, and operation of the HSR project with the applicable airport land use plan to ensure that the HSR project would be a consistent land use in the airport influence area for Plant 42 and that it would not conflict with airport operations. The HSR project would not be impacted by aircraft operations noise and would not concentrate people or facilities in areas susceptible to aircraft accidents, or place facilities in areas that would adversely affect the use of navigable airspace. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Public Services Element (1993)	
Goal PS1: Ensure that adequate public services are available to support development in an efficient and orderly manner.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which is served by existing adequate public service infrastructure and services, and which could promote a more efficient land use pattern in this part of the city. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Objective PS1.3: Utilize land use strategies to maximize use of infrastructure facilities.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which is served by existing adequate public service infrastructure and services, and which could promote a more efficient land use pattern in this part of the city. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy PS1.3.3: Encourage development, which fully utilizes existing infrastructure systems, while decreasing the need for costly extensions of infrastructure into undeveloped areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which is served by existing adequate public service infrastructure and services. The HSR project could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in undeveloped areas in the city. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Parks, Recreation, and Trails Element (September 2003)	
Goal PRT4: Develop a system of multi-use trails which provide connections to the County trails system and the City of Lancaster trails system	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Palmdale design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Objective PRT4.1: Provide multi-use trails, for use by pedestrians, bicyclists and equestrians, connecting to existing or currently planned multi-use trails.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Palmdale design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Goal PRT5: Promote bicycling as an important mode of transportation and recreation in the City of Palmdale.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Palmdale design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Objective PRT5.1: Encourage bicycling use by developing a comprehensive bikeway network for the City.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Palmdale design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy PRT5.1.1: Establish Class I, II, and III bikeways throughout the planning area. Backbone Class I and II bikeways are shown on Exhibit PRT-2.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Palmdale design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
City of Palmdale Energy Action Plan (August 2011)	
Goal 4: Reduce Transportation emissions through alternative vehicles, trip reduction and consolidation, and efficient flow.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Measure 4.3: Improve Traffic Flow; Reduce Emissions from mobile sources through efficient vehicle flow.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled and emissions associated with those trips. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this measure.
Measure 4.7: Public Transit; Support the expansion of transit operations within the Antelope Valley.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative public transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled. The HSR project is not intended to address local transportation needs, such as those in the Antelope Valley, and would therefore not expand transit operations in that part of Los Angeles County. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this measure and are therefore considered to be consistent with this measure.

Source: California High Speed Rail (2016)

[1] Citations to the HSR project in this table should be interpreted to mean all of the Build Alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5).

AASHTO = American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority
Caltrans = California Department of Transportation
CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act
GTA = Greater Tehachapi Area
GTASCP = Greater Tehachapi Area Specific and Community Plan
HSR = high-speed rail
LOS = level of service
PCT = Pacific Crest Trail
SEAs = sensitive environmental areas
TIF = transportation impact fee
TRB = Transportation Research Board

Table 2-H-13 Consistency with Regional Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies—Socioeconomics and Communities

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Kern Council of Governments Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2014)	
Policy 8: Identify additions and alternatives that would improve the overall quality of transit service in Kern County.	**Consistent.** The HSR project and the Bakersfield Station would provide new rail facilities and services to accommodate existing and future demand with a cost-effective alternative transportation mode for travel to/from other urban centers in California. The HSR project would enhance the quality of transit service in Kern County by providing access to regional and statewide transit systems because the Bakersfield Station site is in the vicinity of existing transit service. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 8.8: Implement traffic flow improvements/railroad grade separations.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. The HSR project is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity and, therefore, would not implement improvements to the local circulation system in Kern County that are not included as part of the project. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy and are therefore considered to be consistent with this policy.
Policy 12: Create strategies to increase the visibility and importance of transit in Kern County.	**Consistent.** The HSR project and the Bakersfield Station would provide new rail facilities and services to accommodate existing and future demand with a cost-effective alternative transportation mode for travel to/from other urban centers in California. By doing so, the HSR project would increase the visibility and importance of transit in Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 30: Promote increased communication with neighboring jurisdictions on interregional land use issues, including the coordination of land use decisions and transportation systems.	**Consistent.** During the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority coordinated with the local jurisdictions which the HSR project would traverse to ensure land use decisions and transportation systems are coordinated. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 30.5: Continue to use CEQA review process to inform stakeholders and decision-makers of the impacts of sensitive land use developments near vital transportation infrastructure.	**Consistent.** The Authority will prepare an EIR/EIS that will address the potential impacts of the HSR project pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 32: Achieve national and state air quality standards for healthy air by the mandated deadlines	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled and emissions associated with those trips. The HSR project could improve air quality, which could help Kern County and the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin achieve the applicable national and state ambient air quality standards. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 33: Take a proactive in implementing Federal Title VI Environmental Justice requirements to ensure non-discrimination.	**Consistent.** During the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority coordinated with various stakeholder groups, including residents, businesses, and community groups, in the local jurisdictions which the HSR project would traverse to ensure the fair treatment of minority and low-income populations. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
2016–2040 SCAG RTP/SCS (2016)	
Guiding Policy 7: The RTP/SCS will encourage transportation investments that result in cleaner air, a better environment, a more efficient transportation system and sustainable outcomes in the long run.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide a cost-effective alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled and emissions associated with those trips. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Project List: California High-Speed Rail - Phase 1 (includes Metrolink and LOSSAN Corridor Speed Upgrades) (Project 7120010)	Phase 1 of the HSR project, which includes the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section, is a listed project in the financially constrained RTP/SCS project list.

Source: California High Speed Rail (2016)

[1] Citations to the HSR project in this table should be interpreted to mean all of the Build Alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5).

Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority
CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act
EIR/EIS = Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement
HSR = high-speed rail
LOSSAN = Los Angeles to San Diego (Corridor)
RTP/SCS = Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
SCAG = Southern California Association of Governments

Table 2-H-14 Consistency with Local Ordinances—Socioeconomics and Communities

Kern County	
Kern County Code of Ordinances, Title 19, Zoning (Kern County 2015)	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the permanent conversion of land regulated by local zoning ordinances to transportation use, including within unincorporated Kern County. However, aside from the land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent land regulated by local zoning ordinances. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with the Kern County Code of Ordinances.
City of Bakersfield	
Bakersfield Zoning Ordinance, Title 17, Zoning (City of Bakersfield 2010a)	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the permanent conversion of land regulated by local zoning ordinances to transportation use, including within the City of Bakersfield. However, aside from the land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent land regulated by local zoning ordinances. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with the City of Bakersfield Zoning Ordinance.
City of Tehachapi	
Tehachapi Municipal Code, Title 18, Zoning (City of Tehachapi 2011b)	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the permanent conversion of land regulated by local zoning ordinances to transportation use, including within the City of Tehachapi. However, aside from the land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent land regulated by local zoning ordinances. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with Title 18 of the Tehachapi Municipal Code.
Los Angeles County	
Los Angeles County Code, Title 22, Planning and Zoning (Los Angeles County n.d.)	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the permanent conversion of land regulated by local zoning ordinances to transportation use, including within unincorporated Los Angeles County. However, aside from the land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent land regulated by local zoning ordinances. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code.
City of Lancaster	
Lancaster Code of Ordinances, Title 1, Zoning (City of Lancaster n.d.)	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the permanent conversion of land regulated by local zoning ordinances to transportation use, including within the City of Lancaster. However, aside from the land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent land regulated by local zoning ordinances. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with Title 1 of the Lancaster Code of Ordinances.
City of Palmdale	
Palmdale Zoning Ordinance (City of Palmdale 1994)	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the permanent conversion of land regulated by local zoning ordinances to transportation use, including within the City of Palmdale. However, aside from the land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent land regulated by local zoning ordinances. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with the City of Palmdale Zoning Ordinance.

Source: California High Speed Rail (2016)

[1] Citations to the HSR project in this table should be interpreted to mean all of the Build Alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5).

n.d. = no date

Table 2-H-15 Consistency with Local Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies—Station Planning, Land Use, and Development

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Kern County General Plan (2007)	
Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element (2007)	
Goal 1.4-2: Promote an urban growth pattern in areas where adequate public service infrastructure exists or can be provided.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development in areas near the Bakersfield Station site, which is served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. This would support a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal: 1.6-2: Ensure the provision of safe and amenable living environments and the promotion of efficient and economical use of land.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which would support a more efficient and economical land use pattern in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 1.6-4: Promote higher-density residential development within the County of Kern in areas with adequate public services and infrastructure.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill residential development at higher densities near the Bakersfield Station site but would not be expected to result in higher-density residential development along the HSR project alignment in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 1.6-5: Discourage premature urban encroachment into areas of intense agriculture areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which would indirectly discourage new development from occurring in agricultural areas in unincorporated Kern County. Further, because the HSR project does not include any stations in or near agricultural areas in Kern County, it would be consistent with this policy. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 1.6-9: Development in areas without adequate infrastructure or development that places a burden on public services (i.e. fire, sheriff, parks, and libraries) shall be discouraged.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could make the areas immediately surrounding the Bakersfield Station site, which are already served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, more attractive for future development by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. This could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in outlying areas in unincorporated Kern County that currently lack adequate public services and infrastructure. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal 1.7-2: Pursue a strong economy through logical placement and distribution of commercial development within the rural and urban areas of Kern County.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including commercial development. This could indirectly discourage new commercial development from occurring in outlying areas in unincorporated Kern County that are not currently well supported by infrastructure. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in the Bakersfield area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 1.7-4: Diversify and broaden the commercial base within Kern County.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development and may attract new businesses to the area, including unincorporated Kern County, by improving regional transportation access in the Bakersfield area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 1.7-1: Kern County will promote a pattern of commercial development that contributes to the economic and physical development of existing unincorporated communities as well as to the incorporated cities.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development and may attract new businesses to Bakersfield and areas in unincorporated Kern County by improving regional transportation access in the Bakersfield area. The HSR project would support economic and physical development throughout Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal 1.8-2: Promote the future economic strength and well-being of Kern County and its residents without detriment to its environmental quality.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could promote a more efficient and economic overall land use pattern in Bakersfield and unincorporated Kern County. The HSR project would enhance the quality of life in Kern County by providing access to regional and statewide transit systems and opportunities for economic growth in the county. The HSR project could also reduce impacts on the environment by indirectly discouraging new development from occurring in outlying areas in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 1.8-5: Provide for the clustering of new industrial development adjacent to existing industrial uses and along major transportation corridors.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development and may attract new businesses to Bakersfield and areas in unincorporated Kern County by improving regional transportation access in the Bakersfield area. The HSR project would promote economic and physical development throughout Kern County as a whole. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal 1.9-1: To contain new development within an area large enough to meet generous projections of foreseeable need, but in locations which will not impair the economic strength derived from the petroleum, agriculture, rangeland, or mineral resources, or diminish the other amenities which exist in the County.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would avoid mining and mineral resource areas and would therefore be consistent with this goal to avoid impairing the economic value of mineral resources in unincorporated Kern County. The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of agricultural land in unincorporated Kern County to transportation use. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 1.9-2: Protect areas of important mineral, petroleum, and agricultural resource potential for future use.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would avoid mining and mineral resource areas and would therefore be consistent with this goal to avoid impairing the economic value of mineral resources in unincorporated Kern County. The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of agricultural land in unincorporated Kern County to transportation use. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal 1.9-4: Encourage safe and orderly energy development within the County, including research and demonstration projects, and to become actively involved in the decision and actions of other agencies as they affect energy development in Kern County.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to minimize conflicts with existing wind and solar energy-producing plants and planned energy projects in the project vicinity. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 1.9-5: Conserve prime agriculture lands from premature conversion.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of prime agricultural land in unincorporated Kern County to transportation use. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 1.9-8: Provide for the orderly expansion of new urban-scale infrastructure and development and the creation of new urban-scale centers in a manner that minimizes adverse effects on agriculture and natural resource uses.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in agricultural and natural resource areas in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal 1.10-1: Ensure that the County can accommodate anticipated future growth and development while maintaining a safe and healthful environment and a prosperous economy by preserving valuable natural resources, guiding development away from hazardous areas, and assuring the provision of adequate public services.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which would promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in Kern County. The HSR project could also indirectly discourage new development from occurring in outlying areas in unincorporated Kern County that are not well served by infrastructure, thereby preserving valuable natural resources in those areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 1.10-5: Higher density development and in-filling should be encouraged within urbanized and built-up areas of the County.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could make the areas immediately surrounding the Bakersfield Station site, which are already served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, more attractive for future infill and higher-density development by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 1.10-6: The County shall ensure the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, incomes and age groups with respect to the development, adoption, implementation and enforcement of land use and environmental programs.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project would support this policy by creating a more diverse transportation system capable of accommodating a diverse population's transportation needs. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 1.10-50: Employ land use policies that protect the County's businesses from physical degradation and ensure orderly growth, thereby, sustaining opportunities for current and future generations to enjoy economic vitality.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which would promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in Kern County. The HSR project would support existing businesses in the area and could act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in Bakersfield and the surrounding areas in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 1.10-54: Recognize the importance of major transportation corridors, airports, and rail lines as important economic tools for the establishment of commercial and industrial development and promotion.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in Bakersfield and the surrounding areas in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 1.10-57: Support and work closely with local jurisdictions and other organizations concerned with economic development to minimize inter-jurisdictional competition.	**Consistent.** During the planning and environmental studies for the HSR project, the Authority conducted extensive consultation and coordination with local jurisdictions along the alignment, including representatives from Kern County. The HSR project could act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in Bakersfield and surrounding areas in Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 1.10-63: Promote improved public transportation service between major job centers and areas of transit dependency and high unemployment.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would improve public transportation in areas immediately surrounding the Bakersfield Station site, including areas in unincorporated Kern County, and would be consistent with the existing public service infrastructure and services in those areas by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in Bakersfield and surrounding areas in unincorporated Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 1.10-64: Provide infrastructure and coordinate local land use, regulatory practices and job training to foster and maintain a robust economy.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in Kern County. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in the Bakersfield and Palmdale areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Circulation Element (2007)	
Goal 2.1-1: To make certain that transportation facilities needed to support development are available. To ensure that these facilities occur in a timely manner so as to avoid traffic degradation.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could make the areas immediately surrounding the Bakersfield Station site, which are already served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, more attractive for future development by improving regional transportation access in this part of Kern County. The HSR project would also support efficient movement of people so as to avoid traffic degradation. During construction of grade-separated crossings, only one crossing per community would be closed at a time to avoid traffic degradation. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 2.1-2: Kern County intends to provide plans for circulation infrastructure in support of the Land Use, Open Space and Conservation Element.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. In addition, as part of the

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
	planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local officials to ensure emergency access to/from and around all project construction areas during construction. For example, during construction of grade-separated crossings, only one crossing per community would be closed at a time to avoid impacts to emergency access. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR facility to ensure that emergency services providers are able to safely and quickly cross that facility. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 2.1-3: To plan for transportation modes available to all segments of the population, including people with restricted mobility.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project would support this goal by creating a more diverse, fully accessible transportation system that is more readily able to accommodate a diverse population's transportation needs, including those of people with restricted mobility. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 2.1-4: Kern County will plan for a reduction of environmental effects without accepting a lower quality of life in the process.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which would promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in Kern County. The HSR project would also provide safe and efficient mass transit, which reduces vehicle emissions and energy use compared to other regional transportation modes. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 2.1-7: Kern County through its representatives on the Kern COG Board of Directors shall coordinate with Kern County cities and Caltrans to develop more effective transportation planning and congestion management programs.	**Consistent.** During the planning and environmental studies for the HSR project, the Authority conducted extensive consultation and coordination with local jurisdictions along the alignment, including representatives from Kern County, the Kern Council of Governments, and Caltrans. The HSR project would make the areas immediately surrounding the Bakersfield Station site, which are served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, accessible to regional and statewide transit systems. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Kern County Economic Development Strategy Update (July 2010)	
Goal 1.2-1: Expand Jobs and Overall Prosperity	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which would promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in Kern County. The HSR project would enhance the quality of life for citizens of Kern County by providing access to regional and statewide transit systems and opportunities for economic growth in the area, including expanded job opportunities. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 1.2-2: Foster Inclusion and Increased Equity	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in Bakersfield and the surrounding areas in unincorporated Kern County. The HSR project would support inclusion and equity by increasing transportation options to serve a diverse population's transportation needs. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal 1.2-3: Promote Sustainability and High Quality of Life	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which would promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in Kern County. The HSR project would also provide safe and efficient mass transit, which would contribute to reduced vehicle emissions and energy use in comparison to other regional transportation modes. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Kern County Bicycle Master Plan and Complete Streets Recommendations (June 2012)	
Policy 9.1: Maintain and improve the quality, operation, and integrity of the bicycle and pedestrian network and support facilities.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (December 2007)	
Land Use Element (2007)	
Goal 1: Accommodate new development which captures the economic demands generated by the marketplace and establishes Bakersfield's role as the capital of the southern San Joaquin Valley	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield Station could attract growth, which would be expected to be consistent with economic demands in the city. The station would also support the city's role as the capitol of the southern San Joaquin Valley. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 10: Accommodate high and high-medium density residential adjacent to existing and planned commercial, multi-family, and principal transportation corridors.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield Station could attract growth, which could include high- and high-medium-density residential uses adjacent to the station and other nonresidential uses in the area. The station would be expected to support activities that would enhance the Golden State Avenue Corridor. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 39: Enhance existing and establish new centers as the principal focus of development and activity in the planning area, around which other land uses are grouped. Centers should be linked by adequate transportation facilities and may be linked to the Kern River, canals, or other resource amenities. Centers may be differentiated by functional activity, density/intensity, and physical character.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield Station would be a primary transportation facility, which could attract growth, including a variety of residential and nonresidential uses. This growth would be expected to enhance the Golden State Avenue Corridor. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 40: Provide for the enhancement and intensification of existing "centers" such as: a. Downtown b. California State University, Bakersfield c. Bakersfield Airpark/Casa Loma d. Meadows Field e. Highway 58/Weedpatch Highway f. Lamont g. Greenfield h. McAllister Ranch	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield Station could attract growth, including a variety of residential and nonresidential uses, and other activities that would enhance the Golden State Avenue Corridor on the edge of downtown Bakersfield. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
i. Northwest Bakersfield j. Rosedale Ranch	
Policy 71: Promote the establishment of attractive entrances into communities, major districts, and transportation terminals, centers, and corridors within the planning area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could make the areas immediately surrounding the Bakersfield Station site, which are served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, more attractive for future development by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Circulation Element (2007)	
Goal Streets-2: Provide for safe and efficient motorized, non-motorized, and pedestrian traffic movement.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the City of Bakersfield's design standards and requirements. The HSR project would also support safe and efficient movement of people, providing a new HSR passenger service that would be grade-separated from other modes of travel. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy Streets-22: Design transportation improvements to minimize noise impacts on adjacent uses.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy Streets-33: Provide new transportation facilities as needed based on existing usage and future demand.	**Consistent.** The HSR project and the Bakersfield Station would provide new rail facilities and services in the area to accommodate existing and future demand. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal Transit-1: Provide planning area residents with a choice of travel modes.	**Consistent.** The HSR project and the Bakersfield Station would provide new rail facilities and services to provide area residents with an additional travel mode for trips to/from other urban centers in California. The HSR project would also complete all approved and planned transportation improvements, including bike lanes and transportation facilities, where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment. The HSR project supports and is consistent with this goal by expanding transportation options and providing residents with a choice of travel modes.
Goal Transit-3: Provide cost effective public transportation services.	**Consistent.** The HSR project and the Bakersfield Station would provide new rail facilities and services to accommodate existing and future demand with a cost-effective alternative transportation mode for travel to/from other urban centers in California. The HSR project would also complete all approved and planned transportation improvements, including bike lanes and transportation facilities, where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment. The HSR project would support and be consistent with this goal by increasing transportation options to meet a diverse population's transportation needs, including access to economical means of transportation.
Goal Transit-5: Enhance rail service capacities and usage in the planning area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project and the Bakersfield Station would provide new HSR service in the area to accommodate existing and future demand. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy Transit-11: Work to provide grade separations at all arterial/railroad crossings.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide new rail passenger service on an alignment that would be grade-separated from other modes of travel. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy Transit-12: Support efforts to develop high-speed rail facilities to service the plan area.	**Consistent.** This policy indicates the City of Bakersfield's support for HSR. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal Bikeways-3: Provide a continuous easily-accessible bikeway system within the metro area.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street bikeways cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Bakersfield design standards and requirements. Existing and proposed trails that require temporary closures during construction of the HSR Build Alternatives would be detoured around the construction areas to maintain continuous access to the bikeway system. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Housing Element (December 2008)	
Objective 4-2: Reduce the incidence of displacement.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to refine the alignments to reduce the number of property acquisitions and displacements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy 4-2-1: In development of public projects, require an analysis of potential displacement of existing residences with an emphasis on minimizing both temporary displacement and relocation.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to refine the alignments to reduce the number of property acquisitions and displacements of residents and residential uses. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Conservation Element (2007)	
Goal Mineral Resources-3: Avoid conflicts between the productive use of mineral and energy resource lands and urban growth.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would require capping several oil production wells but would avoid other mining and mineral resource areas, including energy resources. As part of the planning and environmental studies for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to minimize conflicts with existing wind and solar energy-producing plants. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which could directly discourage new development from occurring in mineral and energy resource lands from future urban growth. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy Mineral Resources-5: Protect significant mineral and petroleum resource areas, including potential sand and gravel extraction areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would require capping several oil production wells but would avoid other mining and mineral resource areas, including sand and gravel extraction areas. However, capping these oil production wells would not affect future extraction from the affected oil field at nearby wells. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal Soils and Agriculture-1: Provide for the planned management, conservation, and wise utilization of agricultural land in the planning area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of agricultural land to transportation use. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal Air Quality-1: Promote air quality that is compatible with health, well-being, and minimizing vehicular trips to reduce air pollutants.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide efficient movement of people, which would reduce total vehicle miles traveled, thus reducing air pollutants. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy Air Quality-12: Encourage the use of mass transit, carpooling and other transportation options to reduce vehicle miles traveled.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy Air Quality-14: Establish park and ride facilities to encourage carpooling and the use of mass transit.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield Station would include parking for HSR project patrons and would also be in the vicinity of existing transit services in the city. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Open Space Element (2007)	
Goal 1: Conserve and enhance the unique aspects of open space within the planning area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing natural resources land use in Bakersfield and unincorporated Kern County within the planning area. Although vacant land would be impacted, it should not be considered open space. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Keene Ranch Specific Plan (December 1997)	
Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element (1997)	
Policy 2.1-5: Where fill-type drainage crossings are utilized and riparian habitat is disturbed, appropriate replacement or enhancement requirements shall occur.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding impacts associated with fill in drainages and impacts on riparian habitat, including mitigation requirements. As a result, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 2.6-1: Habitats of species listed by state or federal agencies as threatened or endangered shall be protected to the greatest extent possible.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding impacts on listed threatened and endangered species, including mitigation requirements. As a result, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 2.6-4: Significant wildlife habitats and important vegetation such as oak trees (6" specimens or larger) and all other trees (12" specimens or larger) shall be protected whenever practicable.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding significant wildlife habitats and important vegetation, including mitigation requirements. As a result, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 2.2-5: Utilize guidelines identified in the implementation section of [the Keene Ranch Specific Plan] to protect scenic viewsheds (see Figure 2-9 [of the Keene Ranch Specific Plan] for Scenic Viewshed Designation Areas).	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with the guidelines in the Keene Ranch Specific Plan regarding the protection of scenic viewsheds. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Circulation Element (1997)	
Goal 3-1: To provide an effective circulation system that is safe, reflects and complements the character of the project site, provides for a network of trails and minimizes effects on the environment.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. The HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project would support this goal by contributing to a more diverse and effective circulation system. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 3-3: All roads and bridges will be designed to safely carry project traffic and maintain the rural character of the surrounding area and proposed development.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. The designs of those facilities would be consistent with Kern County design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 3-5: The Circulation Plan includes trails for pedestrians, bicycles and horses whenever practical, separates them from roads.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street trails cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with Kern County design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
GTASCP (October 2010)	
Land Use Element (2010)	
Goal LU.2: Promote land use development that results in sustainable land use patterns and conservation of GTA resources.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which would promote a more efficient land use pattern and indirectly discourage new development from occurring in outlying natural resource areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy LU.10: Encourage new development to infill existing development areas such as bypassed parcels and provide for an orderly outward expansion of new urban development so that it maintains continuity of existing development, allows for the incremental expansion of infrastructure and public service, minimizes impacts on natural environmental resources, and provides a high-quality environment for residents and businesses.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which would promote a more efficient land use pattern and indirectly discourage new development from occurring in outlying natural resource areas. The HSR project would also enhance the quality of life for the residents of this part of Kern County by providing access to regional and statewide transit systems and opportunities for economic growth in the area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal LU.14: Preserve the rural and agricultural character of the GTA.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of agricultural land to transportation use. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land and would not affect the rural and agricultural character of the GTA. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas in the GTA. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal LU.18: Conserve prime agriculture lands, as defined by CEQA (Public Resources Code section 21060.1), from premature conversion.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of agricultural land to transportation use. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land, including prime agricultural land. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy LU.28: Preserve existing agricultural areas, including charted Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Farmland of Local Importance which can support a variety of agricultural uses based on soil characteristics, topography, and location from premature conversion.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of agricultural land to transportation use. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land, including prime agricultural land (e.g., Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance). Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy LU.37: Areas along rivers and streams will be conserved where feasible to enhance drainage, flood control, recreational, and other beneficial uses while acknowledging existing land use patterns. All surface waters, including rivers, streams, drainages, washes, ponds, pools, or wetlands shall be conserved from permanent and intermittent impacts.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding impacts associated with protecting drainage, flood control, recreational, and other beneficial uses of rivers and streams, including mitigation requirements. As a result, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Conservation and Open Space Element (2010)	
Goal COS.3: Preserve and protect scenic and natural resources and open space within the GTA.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing natural resources land use in Tehachapi and unincorporated Kern County within the planning area. Although vacant land would be impacted, it should not be considered open space. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy COS.23: Comply with dark sky lighting guidelines as established by the Kern County Zoning Ordinance to preserve night-time views, prevent light pollution, and minimize impacts on wildlife.	**Consistent.** The design and operation of the HSR project would comply with the Kern County Zoning Ordinance dark sky lighting guidelines. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal COS.4: Continue to protect threatened and endangered plant and wildlife species, habitats, and wetlands throughout the GTA.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding threatened and endangered species, habitats, and wetlands, including mitigation requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal COS.5: Preserve and maintain open space, natural habitat, and vegetation communities that support native plants and animals.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding maintaining open space, natural habitat, and vegetation communities that support native plants and animals, threatened and endangered species, habitats, and wetlands, including mitigation requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy COS.24: Protect threatened and endangered plant and wildlife species, habitats, and wetlands in accordance with State and federal laws.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding threatened and endangered species, habitats, and wetlands, including mitigation requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal COS.7: Promote the protection of archeological and historic resources that are important to the culture and history of the GTA.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding the protection of archeological and historic resources, including mitigation requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy COS.30: Encourage the preservation of cultural and historic resources which provide ties with the past and constitute a heritage value to residences and visitors.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding the preservation of cultural and historic resources, including mitigation requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal COS.9: Protect and improve air quality in the Greater Tehachapi Area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an HSR alternative for travel to/from urban centers in California, which would provide an alternative travel mode for those trips that would be expected to beneficially affect air quality. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal COS.13: Promote the safe and orderly development of wind and solar energy as a clean method of generating electricity while providing for the protection of the environment.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to minimize conflicts with existing wind and solar energy-producing plants and planned energy projects in the vicinity of the HSR project. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy COS.43: Support efforts to provide the necessary infrastructure and transmission capacity to accommodate renewable energy resources, such as wind energy farms, photovoltaic panels on structures, and commercial solar projects, and support efforts to create a "smart grid" energy system.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to minimize conflicts with existing wind and solar energy-producing plants and planned energy projects in the vicinity of the HSR project. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Circulation Element (2010)	
Goal CIR.1: Provide a safe and efficient circulation system that serves local needs and meets forecast demands of residents and visitors, while reducing the potential for traffic congestion.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for regional travel to/from urban centers in California and is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this goal and are therefore considered to be consistent with this goal.
Goal CIR.2: Maintain a level of service (LOS) C or better on roadways within the identified Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) areas within the GTA, and LOS D for all areas outside of the TIF areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could result in traffic effects on local streets providing access to/from the Bakersfield Station as patrons travel to/from that station. Because the station is not within an identified TIF in the GTA, the HSR project would not affect the LOS on streets in the GTA. Local roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility. As a result, because the four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this goal, they are considered to be consistent with this goal.
Policy CIR.4: Maintain a minimum Level of Service (LOS) C on all circulation system segments within the identified Transportation Impact Fee Areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could result in traffic effects on local streets providing access to/from the Bakersfield Station as patrons travel to/from that station. Because the station is not within an identified TIF in the GTA, the HSR project would not affect the LOS on streets in the GTA. Local roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility. As a result, because the four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy, they are considered to be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy CIR.6: All new development along State and local roadways shall consider access management principles (e.g., minimize new points of ingress and egress) based on American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standards and the Transportation Research Board (TRB) Access Management Manual. Caltrans (if a state highway) and the Kern County Roads and Planning and Community Development Departments will consult to determine the optimal access configuration.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to consider access management principles based on the AASHTO standards and the TRB Access Management Manual. As a result, because the four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy, they are considered to be consistent with this policy.
Policy CIR.9: Support City of Tehachapi to provide a new interchange at State Route 58 and Dennison Road.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not conflict with the ability of the City of Tehachapi to implement this proposed interchange. As a result, because the four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy, they are considered to be consistent with this policy.
Policy CIR.10: The County shall work with various agencies and support efforts to improve emergency access within the Greater Tehachapi Area.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local officials to ensure emergency access to/from and around all project construction areas during construction. For example, during construction of grade-separated crossings, only one crossing per community would be closed at a time to avoid impacts to emergency access. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR facility to ensure the ability of emergency services providers to safely and quickly cross that facility. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal CIR.7: Provide a useful, enjoyable, safe, and efficient regional trail system for hikers, bicyclists, and equestrians that links communities, recreational areas, public lands, and activity centers	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street trails cross the proposed HSR alignment the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy CIR.11: Promote the creation and/or expansion of non-vehicular circulation systems (bikeways, walkways, equestrian trials, etc.) that create linkages within the GTA and encourage new development to include provisions for such facilities.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy CIR.12: Encourage street network connectivity and "complete streets" designed to accommodate multiple transportation modes such as, but not limited to, those routes identified in the Kern County Bicycle Facilities Plan as identified in Figure 4-3 [of the Greater Tehachapi Area Specific and Community Plan].	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project would support this policy by creating a more diverse transportation system that can accommodate a diverse population's transportation needs. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal CIR.8: Provide for increased transit services to allow residents of the GTA access to outlying communities such as Bakersfield, Mojave, and Lancaster.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. However, the HSR project would not meet local or subregional transit needs such as connections in the GTA to outlying areas. Because the HSR project would not conflict with this goal, the four Build Alternatives are considered to be consistent with this goal.
Policy CIR.18: The County shall encourage transit purveyors to increase the frequency of services between the GTA and the adjacent communities such as Bakersfield, Mojave, and Lancaster such services as funding and ridership demand allows.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. However, the HSR project would not meet local or subregional transit needs such as connections in the GTA to outlying areas. Because the HSR project would not conflict with this policy, the four Build Alternatives are considered to be consistent with this policy.
Goal CIR.11: Promote land use compatibility for new uses adjacent to high speed rail lines.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development in areas near the Bakersfield Station site, which is served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. This would support a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in unincorporated Kern County. Because there are no stations in the GTA, it is unlikely that land use changes in response to the HSR project would occur in the GTA. Because the HSR project would not conflict with this goal, the four Build Alternatives are considered to be consistent with this goal.
Policy CIR.22: The County shall encourage purveyors of transit services between the GTA and adjacent communities such as Bakersfield, Mojave, and Lancaster to increase the frequency of such services as funding allows by those providers.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. However, the HSR project would not meet local or subregional transit needs such as connections in the GTA to outlying areas. Because the HSR project would not conflict with this policy, the four Build Alternatives are considered to be consistent with this policy.
Policy CIR.23: Support the development of high-speed rail where consistent with existing land uses throughout the GTA.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project would be consistent with existing land uses where the GTA allows for transportation uses. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives are considered to be consistent with this policy.
Safety Element (2010)	
Goal SAF.2: Minimize injuries and loss of life and reduce property damage.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to ensure that the design, construction, and operation of the HSR project minimize the potential for injuries, loss of life, and property damage based on existing applicable design and operations standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal SAF.5: Ensure the availability and effective response of emergency services following a catastrophic event.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local officials to ensure emergency access to/from and around all project construction areas during construction. For example, during construction of grade-separated crossings, only one crossing per community would be closed at a time to avoid impacts to emergency access. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR facility to ensure the ability of emergency services providers to safely and quickly cross that facility following a catastrophic event. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy SAF.4: The County shall encourage extra precautions be taken for the design of significant lifeline installations, such as highways, utilities, and petrochemical pipelines.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local officials and utility providers to ensure that the design, construction, and operation of the HSR project are consistent with applicable standards to minimize the potential for effects on lifeline installations. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal SAF.11: Ensure that infrastructure (emergency water sources, road access, address displays, etc.) are sufficient to protect residents and structures against wildland fires.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local fire and other emergency services officials to ensure that the design, construction, and operation of the HSR project are consistent with applicable standards to minimize risks associated with wildfires. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Noise Element (2010)	
Goal NOI.1: Protect the health and welfare of GTA residents from both long-term operational noise impacts (e.g., traffic noise) and short-term construction related noise impacts.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal NOI.2: Maintain the predominantly lower ambient noise levels reflective of the rural and agricultural character of the GTA and its various communities.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy NOI.1: The County shall not support proposed projects that generate noise emissions that are not compatible to the standards established in the GTASCP and other applicable County regulatory documents.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Sustainability Element (2010)	
Goal SUS.1: Encourage alternatives to use of gas-powered vehicles.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an HSR alternative for travel to/from urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy SUS.1: Provide for alternative modes of transportation such as walking, biking, carpools, vanpools, and public transportation to reduce emissions associated with automobile use.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an HSR alternative for travel to/from urban centers in California. Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Tehachapi General Plan 2035 (January 2012)	
Mobility Element (2012)	
Objective 1: Connect as many streets as possible.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions and would provide grade-separated crossings at those locations. Because the HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this objective, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy M3: Increase regional roadway connections to improve mobility.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions and would provide grade-separated crossings at those locations. Because the HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this policy, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective 6: Enhance regional transportation access.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an HSR alternative for travel to/from urban centers in California, which would enhance regional transportation access in the city. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Public Realm Element (2012)	
Objective 2: Enhance Access and Walkability	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions and would provide grade-separated crossings at those locations. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy PR7: Maintain bicycle access-types (class 1, 2, or 3) on all thoroughfare types including grade-separations	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. In addition, where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, grade separations would be provided at crossings. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Natural Resources Element (2012)	
Objective A-1: Improve Air Quality	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an HSR alternative for travel to/from urban centers in California, which would provide an alternative travel mode for those trips that would be expected to beneficially affect air quality. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Objective A-3: Support Kern County's Policies to Maintain Open Space around Tehachapi	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing natural resources land uses in Tehachapi and unincorporated Kern County within the planning area. Although vacant land would be impacted, it should not be considered open space. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy NR11: Support the economic viability of agriculture by maintaining a compatible relationship with agricultural operations pursuant to the Greater Tehachapi Specific Plan	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of agricultural land in Tehachapi to transportation use. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural operations. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas in and around Tehachapi. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Objective A-4: Minimize Light Pollution	**Consistent.** The design and operation of the HSR project would comply with the Tehachapi dark sky protocol. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy NR14: Enforce Tehachapi's 'dark sky' protocol to preserve nighttime views, prevent light pollution, reduce light spillage upward and onto adjoining properties.	**Consistent.** The design and operation of the HSR project would comply with the Tehachapi dark sky protocol. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective B-2: Enable prime and unique farmland to operate effectively.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in the permanent conversion of agricultural land in Tehachapi to transportation use, which would be consistent with this objective. However, aside from the agricultural land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land, including prime and unique farmland. Additionally, the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site, which could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in natural resource areas in Tehachapi. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Objective C-1: Protect important natural habitat for it to function appropriately in support of wildlife.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding impacts on natural habitats and wildlife, including mitigation requirements. As a result, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy NR28: Protect and/or restore identified resources and areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding the protection and/or restoration of impacted resources/areas, including mitigation requirements. As a result, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective C-3: Improve access to natural areas for enjoyment by the community.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions and would provide grade separations at those crossings. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy NR32: Maintain standards that: a. prohibit walls form blocking views of, or access into, natural areas b. reflect the intended physical context(s) to which the standards are to be applied c. require appropriate and contextually responsive connections between urban and rural areas d. treat paths, trails, etc., as an integral part of the adjacent, intended physical context	**Consistent.** The Authority has adopted design standards and guidelines established to create a minimum aesthetic quality impact for a long-lasting infrastructure. The Authority's *Urban Design Guidelines for the California High Speed Train Project* (Authority 2011) discusses the principles of context-sensitive solutions to guide the design of stations. This approach is equally applicable to elevated guideways and would be employed to mitigate visual impacts through context-sensitive design. The Authority Technical Memorandum *Aesthetic Guidelines for Non-Station Structures* (Authority 2011b) also guides the design of the HSR components. The Authority's *Aesthetic Design Review Process for Non-Station Structures* (Authority 2014) would guide the development of mitigation for nonstation-area structures. These standards and guidelines work to minimize and avoid aesthetic effects on the adjacent surroundings where possible. During design, the Authority will work collaboratively with local agencies, stakeholders, and contractors to address aesthetic issues. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective D-1: Protect Mineral Resources	**Consistent.** The HSR project would avoid mining and mineral resource areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy NR33: Avoid allowing use or development in areas identified with important mineral resources. For sites outside of Tehachapi's Sphere of Influence, represent this policy to Kern County as part of the review process.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would avoid mining and mineral resource areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective E2: Protect Archaeological and Paleontological Resources	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding the protection of archaeological and paleontological resources, including mitigation requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy NR42: Maintain a step in the development process for evaluating the potential for archaeological and paleontological resources.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations and processes regarding the protection of archaeological and paleontological resources, including mitigation requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy NR43: Maintain that excavation, exploration and documentation of archaeological and paleontological sites be conducted only by recognized authorities by applicable State laws.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations and processes regarding the excavation, exploration, and documentation of archaeological and paleontological sites by recognized authorities only. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy NR44: Maintain that in the event of discovering an archaeological or paleontological site, that the appropriate authorities and parties be notified according to established procedures and applicable State laws.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations and procedures regarding notification of appropriate authorities and parties in the event of discovering an archaeological or paleontological site. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Community Safety Element (2012)	
Objective 2: Improve Tehachapi's Noise Environment	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy CS63: Incorporate noise considerations into planning and development decision-making, and guide the location and design of transportation facilities to minimize the effects of noise on adjacent and nearby land uses.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Tehachapi Municipal Airport Master Plan Update (August 2004)	
Revenue-Supporting Objectives, Opportunities, and Constraints	
Objective: The project should be coordinated with adjacent land use plans and existing and planned circulation and infrastructure improvements	**Consistent.** The Authority will coordinate the design, construction, and operation of the HSR project with the Airport Master Plan to ensure that the HSR project will not conflict with airport operations. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Cameron Canyon Specific Plan (June 1986)	
Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element (1986)	
Goal VI-4: To ensure that any earthwork or grading is adequately designed for drainage and erosion control and site rehabilitation.	**Consistent.** The design, construction, and operation of the HSR project will be conducted consistent with applicable engineering and design standards to ensure that the project drainage and erosion control features meet or exceed applicable standards. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy VI-2: Rivers and streams in the County are important visual and recreational resources and wildlife habitats. Areas of riparian vegetation along rivers and streams will, therefore, be preserved.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding impacts associated with recreational and visual resources, and wildlife habitat of rivers and streams, including mitigation requirements. As a result, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy VI-5: Use of the Pacific Crest Trail for recreational hiking and horseback riding will be supported.	**Consistent.** Grade separations will be provided where the HSR project alignments cross the Pacific Crest Trail to ensure continued use of those segments of the Pacific Crest Trail for hiking and horseback riding. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Willow Springs Specific Plan (April 2008)	
Circulation Element (2008)	
Goal 1: To provide for greater efficiency of circulation within the plan area by providing more direct routes between populated areas of the community.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for regional travel to/from urban centers in California and is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this goal and are therefore considered to be consistent with this goal.
Goal 5: To maintain public safety within the plan area by providing a more direct and efficient circulation system for law enforcement and fire protection vehicles.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local officials to ensure emergency access to/from and around all project construction areas during construction. For example, during construction of grade-separated crossings, only one crossing per community would be closed at a time to avoid impacts to emergency access. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR facility to ensure the ability of emergency services providers to safely and quickly cross that facility. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 9: The proposed circulation pattern as shown on the Rosamond-Willow Springs Circulation Map, included in [the Circulation Element of the Willow Springs Specific Plan], is presently considered necessary and adequate to service the community growth pattern presented in the Land Use Element of the Willow Springs Specific Plan.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. The HSR project would also support safe and efficient movement of people, providing a new HSR passenger service that would be grade-separated from other modes of travel. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Cultural Resources Element (2008)	
Goal: To preserve cultural resources contained on sensitive sites located within the Willow Springs Specific Plan area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding the preservation of cultural resources, including mitigation requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Biological Resources Element(2008)	
Goal 1: Preserve biological resources within the Specific Plan area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding preservation of biological resources, including mitigation requirements. As a result, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Rosamond Specific Plan (April 2008)	
Land Use Element (October 2010)	
General Goal 3: To achieve proper relationships and compatibility between various types of land uses.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Bakersfield Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including commercial development. This could indirectly discourage new commercial development from occurring in outlying areas in unincorporated Kern County that are not currently well supported by infrastructure and that may not be consistent with existing uses in those outlying areas. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Circulation Element (2008)	
Goal 2: To reduce time spent in travel within the plan area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for regional travel to/from urban centers in California and would be expected to reduce travel times to/from those urban centers. However, the HSR project is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity and would therefore not reduce travel times within the plan area itself. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this goal and are therefore considered to be consistent with this goal.
Goal 3: To maintain adequate traffic safety.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will be designed, constructed, and operated consistent with applicable traffic control, management, and safety requirements and standards. In addition, as part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local officials to ensure emergency access to/from and around all project construction areas during construction. For example, during construction of grade-separated crossings, only one crossing per community would be closed at a time to avoid impacts to emergency access. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR facility to ensure the ability of emergency services providers to safely and quickly cross that facility following a catastrophic event. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 4: To maintain public safety within the plan area by providing a more direct and efficient circulation system for law enforcement and fire protection vehicles.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local officials to ensure emergency access to/from and around all project construction areas during construction. For example, during construction of grade-separated crossings, only one crossing per community would be closed at a time to avoid impacts to emergency access. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR facility to ensure the ability of emergency services providers to safely and quickly cross that facility following a catastrophic event. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal 6: To provide for [a] circulation system which will support planned land uses.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for regional travel to/from urban centers in California and would be expected to reduce travel times to/from those urban centers. The HSR project is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity and would therefore not address circulation system needs within the plan area itself. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this goal and are therefore considered to be consistent with this goal.
Policy 1: The proposed circulation pattern as shown on the Rosamond-Willow Springs Circulation Map, included in [the Circulation Element of the Rosamond Specific Plan], is presently considered necessary and adequate to service the community growth pattern presented in Land Use Element of the Rosamond Specific Plan.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Open Space/Conservation Element (2008)	
Goal 2: To conserve those open space areas of the community which, because of unique qualities of history and geography, should be preserved for the enjoyment of the entire community and the public as a whole.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing natural resources land uses in Rosamond and unincorporated Kern County within the planning area. Although vacant land would be impacted, it should not be considered open space. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 3: To maintain the open space qualities of the plan area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing natural resources land uses in Rosamond and unincorporated Kern County within the planning area. Although vacant land would be impacted, it should not be considered open space. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Noise Element (2008)	
Goal 2: To minimize disruption to the quality of life resulting from excessive noise.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Los Angeles County General Plan (October 2015)	
Land Use Element (2015)	
Goal LU3: A development pattern that discourages sprawl, and protects and conserves areas with natural resources and SEAs.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development in areas near the Palmdale Station site, which is served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. This would support a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of unincorporated Los Angeles County and could minimize effects on SEAs in the project vicinity. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy LU3.1: Encourage the protection and conservation of areas with natural resources, and SEAs.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development in areas near the Palmdale Station site, which is served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. This would support a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of unincorporated Los Angeles County and could minimize effects on SEAs in the project vicinity. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy LU3.2: Discourage development in areas with high environmental resources and/or severe safety hazards.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will be in existing developed areas and could support infill development in areas near the Palmdale Station site. This would support a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of unincorporated Los Angeles County and could minimize effects on SEAs and other areas with environmental resources and/or safety hazards in the project vicinity. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy LU3.3: Discourage development in undeveloped areas where infrastructure and public services do not exist, or where no major infrastructure projects are planned, such as state and/or federal highways.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development in areas near the Palmdale Station site, which is served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. This would support a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of unincorporated Los Angeles County and would discourage development in unincorporated county areas where infrastructure and public services are limited or nonexistent. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal LU4: Infill development and redevelopment that strengthens and enhances communities.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development in areas near the Palmdale Station site, which is served by existing adequate public service infrastructure, that would be expected to strengthen and enhance Palmdale while minimizing pressure for development in adjacent areas of unincorporated Los Angeles County. This would support a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of unincorporated Los Angeles County and would discourage development in unincorporated county areas where infrastructure and public services are limited or nonexistent. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy LU4.1: Encourage infill development in urban and suburban areas on vacant, underutilized, and/or brownfield sites.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development on vacant, underutilized, and/or brownfield sites near the Palmdale Station site while minimizing pressure for development in adjacent areas of unincorporated Los Angeles County. This would support a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of unincorporated Los Angeles County and would discourage development in unincorporated county areas where infrastructure and public services are limited or nonexistent. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy LU4.3: Encourage transit-oriented development in urban and suburban areas with the appropriate residential density along transit corridors and within station areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development in areas near the Palmdale Station site with increased residential densities, which would require approval by the City of Palmdale. Because there are no stations on the segment of the HSR project in unincorporated Los Angeles County, there would be no need for transit-oriented development along that alignment. Because the HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this policy, the four Build Alternatives would be considered consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal LU7: Compatible land uses that complement neighborhood character and the natural environment.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development in areas near the Palmdale Station site, but would not be expected to result in pressure to develop new land uses in unincorporated Los Angeles County in the vicinity of the City of Palmdale because there are no stations on the segment of the HSR project in unincorporated Los Angeles County. Because the HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this goal, the four Build Alternatives would be considered consistent with this goal.
Policy LU7.6: Ensure that proposed land uses located within Airport Influence Areas are compatible with airport operations through compliance with airport land use compatibility plans.	**Consistent.** The Authority will coordinate the design, construction, and operation of the HSR project with the Airport Master Plan to ensure that the HSR project would be a consistent land use in the Airport Influence Areas and that it would not conflict with airport operations. The HSR project would not be impacted by aircraft operations noise and would not concentrate people or facilities in areas susceptible to aircraft accidents, or place facilities in areas that would adversely affect the use of navigable airspace. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Mobility Element (2015)	
Goal M1: Street designs that incorporate the needs of all users.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. All road improvements would be designed and constructed consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy M1.1: Provide for the accommodation of all users, including pedestrians, motorists, bicyclists, equestrians, users of public transit, seniors, children, and persons with disabilities when requiring or planning for new, or retrofitting existing, transportation corridors/networks whenever appropriate and feasible.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. All road improvements would be designed and constructed consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal M2: Interconnected and safe bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly streets, sidewalks, paths and trails that promote active transportation and transit use.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Los Angeles County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project would support this goal by creating a more diverse transportation system that can accommodate a diverse population's transportation needs. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy M2.1: Provide transportation corridors/networks that accommodate pedestrians, equestrians and bicyclists, and reduce motor vehicle accidents through a context-sensitive process that addresses the unique characteristics of urban, suburban, and rural communities whenever appropriate and feasible.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal M4: An efficient multimodal transportation system that serves the needs of all residents.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide one component of a multimodal circulation system to address transportation needs in this part of Los Angeles County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy M4.1: Expand transportation options that reduce automobile dependence.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide a new regional HSR transportation option that would be expected to reduce dependence on automobiles for trips to/from other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy M4.3: Maintain transit services within the unincorporated areas that are affordable, timely, cost-effective, and responsive to growth patterns and community input.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide one component of a circulation system to address transportation needs in this part of Los Angeles County. The HSR project is not intended to address local transit needs in unincorporated Los Angeles County. The HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this policy. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy M4.4: Ensure expanded mobility and increase transit access for underserved transit users, such as seniors, students, low income households, and persons with disabilities.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for regional travel to/from urban centers in California and would be expected to reduce travel times to/from those urban centers. The HSR project is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity and would therefore not address circulation system needs for underserved transit users in this part of Los Angeles County. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy and are therefore considered to be consistent with this policy.
Policy M4.5: Encourage continuous, direct routes through a connected system of streets, with small blocks and minimal dead ends (cul-de-sacs), as feasible.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with Los Angeles County design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy M4.9: Ensure the participation of all potentially affected communities in the transportation planning and decision-making process.	**Consistent.** The planning and environmental processes for the HSR project have provided, and will continue to provide, extensive opportunities for members and representatives of affected communities to participate in the planning, evaluation, and decision-making processes for this project. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy M4.10: Support the linkage of regional and community-level transportation systems, including multimodal networks.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide a new component in the regional transit system. In addition, the Palmdale Station site is in an area with existing adequate public service infrastructure and services. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy M4.11: Improve the efficiency of the public transportation system with bus lanes, signal prioritization, and connections to the larger regional transportation network.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide a new component in the regional transit system, including connections to existing transit services in the vicinity of the Palmdale Station site. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy M4.12: Work with adjacent jurisdictions to ensure connectivity and the creation of an integrated regional network.	**Consistent.** During the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority coordinated with the local jurisdictions the HSR project would traverse to ensure connectivity and an integrated regional transportation network. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal M7: Transportation networks that minimizes negative impacts to the environment and communities.	**Consistent.** During the planning, conceptual design, and environmental evaluation for the HSR project, the Authority coordinated with the local jurisdictions the HSR project would traverse to minimize environmental and community impacts. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy M7.2: Encourage the creation of wildlife underpasses and overpasses, fencing, signage, and other measures to minimize impacts to wildlife at junctures where transit infrastructure passes through or across sensitive habitats.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would incorporate wildlife crossings as identified based on the detailed biological resource study conducted for the project. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy M7.4: Where the creation of new or the retrofit of roadways or other transportation systems is necessary in areas with sensitive habitats, particularly SEAs, use best practice design to encourage species passage and minimize genetic diversity losses.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding sensitive impacts, including the use of best management practices and design, to minimize impacts on species passage and losses of genetic diversity. As a result, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Conservation and Natural Resources Element (2015)	
Goal C/NR1: Open space areas that meet the diverse needs of Los Angeles County.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing natural resources land uses in Los Angeles County within the planning area. Although vacant land would be impacted, it should not be considered open space. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy C/NR1.2: Protect and conserve natural resources, natural areas, and available open spaces.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing natural resources land uses in Los Angeles County within the planning area. Although vacant land would be impacted, it should not be considered open space. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal C/NR3: Permanent, sustainable preservation of genetically and physically diverse biological resources and ecological systems including: habitat linkages, forests, coastal zone, riparian habitats, streambeds, wetlands, woodlands, alpine habitat, chaparral, shrublands, and SEAs.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding impacts on the types of biological resources and ecological systems listed in this goal, including the use of best management practices and design, and mitigation to minimize impacts on those resources. As a result, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy C/NR3.1: Conserve and enhance the ecological function of diverse natural habitats and biological resources.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding impacts on natural habitats and biological resources, including the use of best management practices and design, and mitigation to minimize impacts on those resources. As a result, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal C/NR5: Protected and useable local surface water resources.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding potential effects on surface water resources, including mitigation requirements. As a result, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy C/NR5.7: Actively support the design of new and retrofit of existing infrastructure to accommodate watershed protection goals, such as roadway, railway, bridge, and other— particularly—tributary street and greenway interface points with channelized waterways.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding potential effects on surface water resources, including project features that would support watershed protection goals. As a result, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal C/NR8: Productive farmland that is protected for local food production, open space, public health, and the local economy.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would avoid agricultural areas in unincorporated Los Angeles County. In addition, because the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, it could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in agricultural areas in unincorporated Los Angeles County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy C/NR8.1: Protect ARAs, and other land identified as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance by the California Department of Conservation, from encroaching development and discourage incompatible adjacent land uses.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would avoid land in unincorporated Los Angeles County that is identified as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance. In addition, because the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, it could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in agricultural areas in unincorporated Los Angeles County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy C/NR14.3: Support the preservation and rehabilitation of historic buildings.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding the preservation and rehabilitation of historic resources, including mitigation requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy C/NR14.6: Ensure proper notification and recovery processes are carried out for development on or near historic, cultural, and paleontological resources.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding the proper notification and recovery processes for development on or near historic, cultural, and paleontological resources, including mitigation requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Noise Element (2015)	
Policy N1.7: Utilize traffic management and noise suppression techniques to minimize noise from traffic and transportation systems.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy N1.8: Minimize noise impacts to pedestrians and transit-riders in the design of transportation facilities and mobility networks.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers or other noise reduction features in the design of the Palmdale Station to reduce noise effects on station patrons and pedestrians. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Economic Development Element (2015)	
Goal ED1: An economic base and fiscal structures that attract and retain valuable industries and businesses.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development and may attract new businesses to the area, including unincorporated Los Angeles County, by improving regional transportation access in the Palmdale area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy ED1.6: Develop, advance, and promote competitive advantages for economic development and growth.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development and may attract new businesses to the area, including unincorporated Los Angeles County, by improving regional transportation access in the Palmdale area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal ED2: Land use practices and regulations that foster economic development and growth.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development and may attract new businesses to the area, including unincorporated Los Angeles County, by improving regional transportation access in the Palmdale area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy ED2.7: Incentivize economic development and growth along existing transportation corridors and in urbanized areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development and may attract new businesses to the area, including unincorporated Los Angeles County, by improving regional transportation access in the Palmdale area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal ED3: An expanded and improved infrastructure system to support economic growth and development.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could make the areas immediately surrounding the Palmdale Station site, which are served by existing adequate public service infrastructure and services, more attractive for future development by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy ED3.3: Work with state agencies dedicated to financing important critical infrastructure and economic development projects.	**Consistent.** The Authority is working with federal and state agencies at all levels to plan the HSR project, including pursuing funding for the design and construction of the project. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy ED4.4: Incentivize infill development in urban and suburban areas that revitalizes underutilized commercial and industrial areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including commercial development. The HSR project could also act as a catalyst for economic development and may attract new businesses to the area, including unincorporated Los Angeles County, by improving regional transportation access in the Palmdale area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy ED4.6: Retrofit and reuse vacant and underutilized industrial and commercial sites in urban and suburban areas for emerging and targeted industries.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development on vacant and underutilized sites near the Palmdale Station site and could indirectly support a mix of land uses in those areas, including targeted industries. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan (December 2011)	
Goal 1: Expanded, improved, and interconnected system of county bikeways and bikeway support facilities to provide a viable transportation alternative for all levels of bicycling abilities, particularly for trips of less than five miles.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street bikeways cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those crossings would be grade-separated. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 1.1: Construct the bikeways proposed in 2012 County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan over the next 20 years.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street bikeways cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those crossings would be grade-separated. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Fox Field Industrial Corridor Specific Plan (May 1996)	
Goal Circulation a: Provide for the efficient movements of goods and people into and throughout the project area, establishing adequate access to individual land uses.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for regional travel to/from urban centers in California and would be expected to reduce travel times to/from those urban centers. The HSR project is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity and, therefore, would not address circulation system needs identified in this specific plan. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this goal and are therefore considered to be consistent with this goal.
City of Lancaster General Plan 2030 (July 2009)	
Plan for the Natural Environment (2009)	
Objective 3.3: Preserve acceptable air quality by striving to attain and maintain national, state and local air quality standards.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide efficient movement of people, which would reduce total vehicle miles traveled, thus reducing air pollutants. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy 3.3.1: Minimize the amount of vehicular miles traveled.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 3.3.2: Facilitate the development and use of public transportation and travel modes such as bicycle riding and walking.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Lancaster design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective 3.4: Identify, preserve and maintain important biological systems within the Lancaster sphere of influence, and educate the general public about these resources, which include the Joshua Tree – California Juniper Woodlands, areas that support endangered or sensitive species, and other natural areas of regional significance.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding preservation and maintenance of important biological systems, including mitigation requirements. As a result, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy 3.4.1: Ensure the comprehensive management of programs for significant biological resources that remain within the Lancaster sphere of influence.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing management programs regarding significant biological resources, including mitigation requirements. As a result, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 3.4.2: Preserve significant desert wash areas to protect sensitive species that utilize these habitat areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding preservation of significant desert wash areas and the species that use those areas, including mitigation requirements. As a result, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 3.5.3: Protect lands currently in agricultural production from the negative impacts created when urban and rural land uses exist in close proximity, while recognizing the possibility of their long-term conversion to urban and rural use.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would avoid agricultural areas in unincorporated Los Angeles County. In addition, because the HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, it could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in agricultural areas in unincorporated Los Angeles County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Objective 3.6: Encourage efficient use of energy resources through the promotion of efficient land use patterns and the incorporation of energy conservation practices into new and existing development, and appropriate use of alternative energy.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill development in areas near the Palmdale Station site, which is served by existing energy utility providers. That infill development would be expected to include energy-efficiency features and to not require substantial new infrastructure. The HSR project itself will be operated using efficient electrical systems. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy 3.6.1: Reduce energy consumption by establishing land use patterns which would decrease automobile travel and increase the use of energy efficient modes of transportation	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled. The HSR project could also indirectly encourage new infill development in the vicinity of the Palmdale Station, which could promote a more efficient land use pattern. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective 3.8: Preserve and enhance important views within the City, and significant visual features which are visible from the City of Lancaster.	**Consistent.** The HSR project does not impact any important views within the City of Lancaster or significant visual features visible from the City of Lancaster, and the magnitude of any aesthetic and visual impacts within city limits related to the four Build Alternatives have been identified as neutral. The Authority has committed to incorporating context-sensitive design and mitigation strategies during construction where feasible. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy 3.8.1: Preserve views of surrounding ridgelines, slope areas and hilltops, as well as other scenic vistas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project does not impact any views of surrounding ridgelines, slope areas, or hilltops, or other scenic vistas in the City of Lancaster, and the magnitude of any aesthetic and visual impacts within city limits related to the four Build Alternatives have been identified as neutral. The Authority has committed to incorporating context-sensitive design and mitigation strategies during construction where feasible. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Plan for Public Health and Safety (2009)	
Policy 4.3.2: Wherever feasible, manage the generation of single event noise levels (SENL) from motor vehicles, trains, aircraft, commercial, industrial, construction, and other activities such that SENL levels are no greater than 15 dBA above the noise objectives included in the plan for Public Health and Safety.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 4.4.2: Limit the uses surrounding airport facilities at Fox Field, Edwards Air Force Base, and Plant 42 to ensure their continued safe operation.	**Consistent.** The Authority will coordinate the design, construction, and operation of the HSR project with the Airport Master Plan for Plant 42 to ensure that the HSR project will not conflict with operations at that airport. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Plan for Active Living (2009)	
Objective 10.2: Through the adoption and implementation of a Master Plan of trails, establish and maintain a hierarchical system of trails (including equestrian, bicycle, and pedestrians trails) providing recreation opportunities and an alternative means of reaching schools, parks and natural areas, and places of employment, and connecting to regional trail systems.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street trails cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy 10.2.1: Establish and maintain a Master Plan of Trails which designates trail status and approximate locations, providing for the following types of trails: • Urban Trails: multi-purpose pedestrian/ bicycle trails which connect residential areas to other residential areas, regional and community parks, schools, and commercial and industrial employment areas. • Rural Trails: multi-purpose equestrian/pedestrian/ bicycle trails which connect residential areas to other residential areas, regional and community parks, schools, and commercial and industrial employment areas. • Bicycle Right of Way: integrates with the urban and rural trails and provides additional access to residential, recreational, educational, and commercial/industrial employment areas.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street trails cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 10.2.4: Facilitate the use of bicycles as an alternative form of transportation, as well as a form of recreation.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street trails cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective 12.1: Identify and preserve and/or reserve those features of cultural, historical, or architectural significance	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding the identification and preservation of features of cultural, historical, or architectural significance, including mitigation requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 12.1.1: Preserve features and sites of significant historical and cultural value consistent with their intrinsic and scientific values.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding the preservation of features and sites of significant historical and cultural value, including mitigation requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Plan for Physical Mobility (2009)	
Objective 14.1: Maintain a hierarchical system which balances the need for free traffic flow with economic realities, such that streets are designed to handle normal traffic flows with tolerances to allow for potential short-term delays at peak hours.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads and off-street trails cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy 14.1.6: Work with regional partners to ensure that the regional circulation system provides adequate connections across the Antelope Valley for convenient circulation and rapid emergency access.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for regional travel to/from urban centers in California and would be expected to reduce travel times to/from those urban centers. The HSR project is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity and, therefore, would not address circulation system needs in this part of Los Angeles County. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy and are therefore consistent with this policy.
Objective 14.4: Reduce reliance of the use of automobiles and increase the average vehicle occupancy by promoting alternatives to single-occupancy auto use, including ridesharing, non-motorized transportation (bicycle, pedestrian), and the use of public transit.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for high-speed regional rail travel to/from urban centers in California and would be expected to reduce dependence on automobiles for those trips. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this objective and are, therefore, consistent with this objective and this policy.
Policy 14.4.1: Under the guidance of the Transportation Master Plan, support and encourages the various public transit companies, ridesharing programs and other incentive programs, that allow residents to utilize modes of transportation other than the private automobile, and accommodate those households within the Urbanizing Area of the City that rely on public transit.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for high-speed regional rail travel to/from urban centers in California and would be expected to reduce dependence on automobiles for those trips. That service would be accessible from the Palmdale Station, which would serve the City of Lancaster. The four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 14.4.2: Promote the use of alternative modes of transportation through the development of convenient and attractive facilities that support and accommodate the services.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for high-speed regional rail travel to/from urban centers in California and would be expected to reduce dependence on automobiles for those trips. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this objective and are, therefore, consistent with this objective and this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Plan for Economic Development Vitality (2009)	
Objective 16.1: Implement the four Pillars of the Lancaster Economic Development/Redevelopment Strategic Plan in order to achieve a more vibrant, energetic and prosperous Lancaster.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which would promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of Los Angeles County, including the City of Lancaster. The HSR project would support existing businesses in the area and could also act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in this part of Los Angeles County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy 16.1.1: Promote a jobs/housing balance that places an emphasis on the attraction of high-paying jobs which will enable the local workforce to achieve the standard of living necessary to both live and work within the community.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which could promote more jobs in Lancaster and this part of Los Angeles County. The HSR project could support existing businesses in the area and could also act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in this part of Los Angeles County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective 16.3: Foster development patterns and growth which contributes to, rather than detracts from net fiscal gains to the City.	**Consistent.** Because there is no station in the City of Lancaster, the HSR project is not expected to result in substantial land use changes in the city. Property acquisition would result in a reduction in tax revenues generated in the city. However, the HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this objective. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be considered to be consistent with this objective.
Policy 16.3.1: Promote development patterns which will minimize the costs of infrastructure development, public facilities development and municipal service cost delivery.	**Consistent.** Because there is no station in the City of Lancaster, the HSR project is not expected to result in substantial land use changes or increases in infrastructure, public facilities, or municipal services costs. However, the HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this policy. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be considered to be consistent with this policy.
Objective 16.4: Promote the revitalization of Downtown Lancaster as the Urban Center of the Antelope Valley creating a mix of cultural, recreational, social, economic and residential activities.	**Consistent.** Because there is no station in the City of Lancaster, the HSR project is not expected to result in substantial land use changes in the city. However, the HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this objective. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be considered to be consistent with this objective.
Policy 16.4.1: Continue to promote the creation of a transit village development district around the Metrolink commuter rail station to provide opportunities for transit-oriented development, including mixed-use housing, shopping, public services, employment opportunities and cultural/recreational activities within a safe, pedestrian-friendly environment.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in the relocation of the Lancaster Metrolink station; however, it would not affect the ability of the city to implement a transit development district around the relocated Metrolink station. The HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this policy and, therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Housing Element (2014–2021) (October 2013)	
Goal 6: To promote sufficient housing to meet the diverse housing needs of all economic segments of the present and future City of Lancaster.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in a substantial number of residential displacements in Lancaster; however, sufficient replacement housing sites are available in the surrounding area to accommodate the relocation of the residents displaced by the project. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 6.1.2: Promote infill housing development within areas presently approved for urban density residential development, as well as areas which have been committed to urban development.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could support infill housing development in areas near the Palmdale Station site with increased residential densities, which would require approval by the City of Palmdale. Because there are no stations on the HSR project alignment in Lancaster, there would be no need for transit-oriented development along that alignment. Because the HSR project would not conflict with the achievement of this policy, the four Build Alternatives would be considered consistent with this policy.
Goal 7: To preserve existing housing stock within areas for which a desirable living environment can be provided; to promote conversion of such residential areas for which a desirable living environment cannot be sustained.	**Not Consistent.** The HSR project would remove some existing housing in Lancaster. While sufficient replacement housing sites are available in the surrounding area to accommodate the relocation of the residents displaced by the project, the HSR project would result in the loss of housing stock in the city. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be inconsistent with this goal.
City of Lancaster Master Plan of Trails and Bikeways (October 2011)	
Goal 1: Provide a safe, connected, and convenient street environment where people of all ages and physical abilities can travel throughout Lancaster without a vehicle.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Lancaster by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 2: Create a network of off-street shared-use paths and trails within the City that is well located, safe, and secure.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Lancaster by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 1: The City will actively accommodate and encourage safe and convenient bicycle and pedestrian commuting throughout Lancaster.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Lancaster by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 2: The City will actively accommodate and encourage safe and convenient bicycle and pedestrian utilitarian trips to schools, stores, parks and other destinations throughout Lancaster.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Lancaster by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 7: The City will develop a trails system along available rights of way and in new development.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Lancaster by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Lancaster Business Park Phase III Specific Plan (January 1991)	
Economic Objective	
Help the City reach a jobs/housing balance as required by the Air Quality Management District. The project will provide employment opportunities for those people seeking to relocate to the Lancaster area, and for those living in the Lancaster area who now commute to outlying employment centers.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which could promote more jobs in Lancaster and this part of Los Angeles County. The HSR project could support existing businesses in the area and could also act as a catalyst for economic development by improving regional transportation access in this part of Los Angeles County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
City of Lancaster Parks, Recreation, Open Space & Cultural Master Plan (October 2007)	
Policy 3.3: Expand trail connections and pathways.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal 9: Encourage the Integration of Parks and Trails Into Overall Community Design, Planning, and Development Decisions.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 9.1: Pursue the development of a trails network that would connect destinations throughout Lancaster, including local schools and parks, places of business, and transit stops.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
City of Palmdale General Plan (January 1993)	
Noise Element (1993)	
Goal N1: Minimize the exposure of residents to excessive noise to the extent possible, through the land planning and the development review process.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Objective N1.2: Protect and maintain those areas having acceptable noise environments.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy N1.2.4: Where deemed appropriate based upon available information, acoustical analysis and appropriate mitigation for noise-sensitive land uses should be required in areas which may be adversely impacted by significant intermittent noise sources. Such noise sources may include but not be limited to railroads, racetracks, stadiums, aircraft overflights and similar uses.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers in the project design to mitigate noise impacts where feasible. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Land Use Element (1993)	
Goal L1: Create a vison for long-term growth and development in the City of Palmdale which provides for orderly, functional patterns of land uses within urban areas, a unified and coherent urban form, and a high quality of life for its residents.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which would promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of Los Angeles County. The HSR project would enhance the quality of life for the citizens of this part of the county, including Palmdale, by providing access to regional and statewide transit systems and opportunities for economic growth in the area, which includes expanded job opportunities. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy L1.1.2: Provide incentives to promote infill development, in order to foster more cohesive neighborhoods, maximize use of infrastructure, consolidate development patterns and enhance community appearance.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which would promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of Los Angeles County. The HSR project would enhance the quality of life for the citizens of this part of the county, including Palmdale, by providing access to regional and statewide transit systems and opportunities for economic growth in the area, which includes expanded job opportunities. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Objective L2.3: Revitalize the core area of Palmdale so as to maintain and enhance its economic viability.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which would promote a more efficient and economical overall land use pattern in this part of Los Angeles County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Community Design Element (December 1994)	
Policy CD 2.3.2: Identify and preserve unique cultural and historic buildings and features in order to enhance community character.	**Consistent.** The HSR project will comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding the identification and preservation or protection of cultural and historic buildings and features, including mitigation requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Environmental Resources Element (1993)	
Policy ER 5.1.2: Reduce vehicle non-work trips through merchant transportation incentives, distance learning, and transit system improvements.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Circulation Element (1993)	
Policy C1.2.4: Promote development of regional arterial links within the community where needed to serve existing and future needs, including but not limited to the following: 1. Promote development of grade separations at railroad tracks, in particular, at Palmdale Boulevard. 2. Coordinate with Caltrans and other affected agencies to expedite rerouting of highway 138 and widening of State Route 14. 3. Coordinate with affected agencies and jurisdictions to address the potential for establishing a regional north-south transportation corridor within the west side of the Antelope Valley.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions and would provide grade separations at those crossings. The HSR project would provide for regional travel to/from urban centers in California and is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy and are therefore considered to be consistent with this policy.
Objective C1.4: Adopt policies and standards for street design and construction which promote safety, convenience and efficiency.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. In addition, as part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is committed to working with local officials to ensure emergency access to/from and around all project construction areas during construction. For example, during construction of grade-separated crossings, only one crossing per community would be closed at a time to avoid impacts to emergency access. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR facility to ensure the ability of emergency services providers to safely and

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
	quickly cross that facility. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy C1.4.1: Strive to maintain a Level of Service (LOS) C or better to the extent practical; in some circumstances, a LOS D may be acceptable for a short duration during peak hours.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could result in traffic effects on local streets providing access to/from the Palmdale Station as patrons travel to/from that station. Those effects would be managed with appropriate traffic controls on roads accessing the station. Local roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility. As a result, because the four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy, they are considered to be consistent with this policy.
Goal C2: Reduce the number of trips and vehicle miles traveled by individuals within the Planning Area, to meet regional transportation and air quality goals.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled. The HSR project is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this goal and are therefore considered to be consistent with this goal.
Objective C2.2: Increase the public transit opportunities available to Palmdale residents in order to reduce traffic impacts on streets and highways and provide travel alternatives.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy C2.2.2: Promote the use of public transit by facilitating dedication of access routes and construction of safe and convenient stops with sufficient parking.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would include a dedicated station in Palmdale served by an HSR alignment that would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California. The Palmdale Station site would include parking for HSR project patrons and would also be located in the vicinity of existing transit services in the city. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy C2.2.4: Encourage development of regional rail transit serving the Palmdale area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would include a dedicated station in Palmdale connected to an HSR alignment. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy C2.2.6: Establish a regional transportation center within the City, conveniently located to maximize access to downtown and major commercial centers, which will accommodate a variety of public transportation uses including rail, bus, and shuttle service.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would include a dedicated station in Palmdale on an HSR alignment which would provide connections to other surface transit services in the area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective C4.2: Encourage extension of passenger rail service to the City of Palmdale.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide HSR service to the city, including a dedicated station in Palmdale. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy C4.2.1: Support regional efforts to connect Palmdale Regional Airport to Los Angeles International Airport with a high-speed rail line.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an HSR rail transportation connection between Palmdale and other urban centers in California, including Union Station in Los Angeles. Although the HSR project would not provide an HSR connection to Los Angeles International Airport, the four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives are considered to be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal C5: Protect and promote a variety of air transportation services within the City of Palmdale.	**Consistent.** The Authority will coordinate the design, construction, and operation of the HSR project with the applicable airport land use plan to ensure that the HSR project would be a consistent land use in the airport influence area for Plant 42 and that it would not conflict with airport operations. The HSR project would not be impacted by aircraft operations noise and would not concentrate people or facilities in areas susceptible to aircraft accidents, or place facilities in areas that would adversely affect the use of navigable airspace. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Objective C5.1: Protect opportunities for full utilization and expansion of Air Force Plant 42.	**Consistent.** The Authority will coordinate the design, construction, and operation of the HSR project with the applicable airport land use plan to ensure that the HSR project would be a consistent land use in the airport influence area for Plant 42 and that it would not conflict with airport operations. The HSR project would not be impacted by aircraft operations noise and would not concentrate people or facilities in areas susceptible to aircraft accidents, or place facilities in areas that would adversely affect the use of navigable airspace. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Public Services Element (1993)	
Goal PS1: Ensure that adequate public services are available to support development in an efficient and orderly manner.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which is served by existing adequate public service infrastructure and services, and which could promote a more efficient land use pattern in this part of the city. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Objective PS1.3: Utilize land use strategies to maximize use of infrastructure facilities.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which is served by existing adequate public service infrastructure and services, and which could promote a more efficient land use pattern in this part of the city. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy PS1.3.3: Encourage development, which fully utilizes existing infrastructure systems, while decreasing the need for costly extensions of infrastructure into undeveloped areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR project could encourage new infill development near the Palmdale Station site, which is served by existing adequate public service infrastructure and services. The HSR project could indirectly discourage new development from occurring in undeveloped areas in the city. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Parks, Recreation, and Trails Element (September 2003)	
Goal PRT4: Develop a system of multi-use trails which provide connections to the County trails system and the City of Lancaster trails system	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Palmdale design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Objective PRT4.1: Provide multi-use trails, for use by pedestrians, bicyclists and equestrians, connecting to existing or currently planned multi-use trails.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Palmdale design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal PRT5: Promote bicycling as an important mode of transportation and recreation in the City of Palmdale.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Palmdale design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Objective PRT5.1: Encourage bicycling use by developing a comprehensive bikeway network for the City.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Palmdale design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy PRT5.1.1: Establish Class I, II, and III bikeways throughout the planning area. Backbone Class I and II bikeways are shown on Exhibit PRT-2.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Palmdale design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
City of Palmdale Energy Action Plan (August 2011)	
Goal 4: Reduce Transportation emissions through alternative vehicles, trip reduction and consolidation, and efficient flow.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Measure 4.3: Improve Traffic Flow; Reduce Emissions from mobile sources through efficient vehicle flow.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled and emissions associated with those trips. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this measure.
Measure 4.7: Public Transit; Support the expansion of transit operations within the Antelope Valley.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative public transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled. The HSR project is not intended to address local transportation needs, such as those in the Antelope Valley, and would therefore not expand transit operations in that part of Los Angeles County. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this measure and are therefore considered to be consistent with this measure.

Source: California High Speed Rail (2016)

[1] Citations to the HSR project in this table should be interpreted to mean all of the Build Alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5).

AASHTO = American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority
Caltrans = California Department of Transportation
CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act
GTA = Greater Tehachapi Area
GTASCP = Greater Tehachapi Area Specific and Community Plan
HSR = high-speed rail
LOS = level of service
PCT = Pacific Crest Trail
SEAs = sensitive environmental areas
TIF = transportation impact fee
TRB = Transportation Research Board

Table 2-H-16 Consistency with Regional Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies—Station Planning, Land Use, and Development

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Kern Council of Governments Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2014)	
Policy 8: Identify additions and alternatives that would improve the overall quality of transit service in Kern County.	**Consistent.** The HSR project and the Bakersfield Station would provide new rail facilities and services to accommodate existing and future demand with a cost-effective alternative transportation mode for travel to/from other urban centers in California. The HSR project would enhance the quality of transit service in Kern County by providing access to regional and statewide transit systems because the Bakersfield Station site is in the vicinity of existing transit service. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 8.8: Implement traffic flow improvements/railroad grade separations.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. The HSR project is not intended to address local transportation needs in the project vicinity and, therefore, would not implement improvements to the local circulation system in Kern County that are not included as part of the project. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this policy and are therefore considered to be consistent with this policy.
Policy 12: Create strategies to increase the visibility and importance of transit in Kern County.	**Consistent.** The HSR project and the Bakersfield Station would provide new rail facilities and services to accommodate existing and future demand with a cost-effective alternative transportation mode for travel to/from other urban centers in California. By doing so, the HSR project would increase the visibility and importance of transit in Kern County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 30: Promote increased communication with neighboring jurisdictions on interregional land use issues, including the coordination of land use decisions and transportation systems.	**Consistent.** During the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority coordinated with the local jurisdictions which the HSR project would traverse to ensure land use decisions and transportation systems are coordinated. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 30.5: Continue to use CEQA review process to inform stakeholders and decision-makers of the impacts of sensitive land use developments near vital transportation infrastructure.	**Consistent.** The Authority will prepare an EIR/EIS that will address the potential impacts of the HSR project pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 32: Achieve national and state air quality standards for healthy air by the mandated deadlines	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled and emissions associated with those trips. The HSR project could improve air quality, which could help Kern County and the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin achieve the applicable national and state ambient air quality standards. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Policy 33: Take a proactive in implementing Federal Title VI Environmental Justice requirements to ensure non-discrimination.	**Consistent.** During the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority coordinated with various stakeholder groups, including residents, businesses, and community groups, in the local jurisdictions which the HSR project would traverse to ensure the fair treatment of minority and low-income populations. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
2016–2040 SCAG RTP/SCS (2016)	
Guiding Policy 7: The RTP/SCS will encourage transportation investments that result in cleaner air, a better environment, a more efficient transportation system and sustainable outcomes in the long run.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide a cost-effective alternative transportation mode to automobiles for travel to/from urban centers in California, which could reduce total vehicle miles traveled and emissions associated with those trips. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Project List: California High-Speed Rail - Phase 1 (includes Metrolink and LOSSAN Corridor Speed Upgrades) (Project 7120010)	Phase 1 of the HSR project, which includes the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section, is a listed project in the financially constrained RTP/SCS project list.

Source: California High Speed Rail (2016)

[1] Citations to the HSR project in this table should be interpreted to mean all of the Build Alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5).

Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority
CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act
EIR/EIS = Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement
HSR = high-speed rail
LOSSAN = Los Angeles to San Diego (Corridor)
RTP/SCS = Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
SCAG = Southern California Association of Governments

Table 2-H-17 Consistency with Local Ordinances—Station Planning, Land Use, and Development

Kern County	
Kern County Code of Ordinances, Title 19, Zoning (Kern County 2015)	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the permanent conversion of land regulated by local zoning ordinances to transportation use, including within unincorporated Kern County. However, aside from the land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent land regulated by local zoning ordinances. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with the Kern County Code of Ordinances.
City of Bakersfield	
Bakersfield Zoning Ordinance, Title 17, Zoning (City of Bakersfield 2010a)	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the permanent conversion of land regulated by local zoning ordinances to transportation use, including within the City of Bakersfield. However, aside from the land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent land regulated by local zoning ordinances. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with the City of Bakersfield Zoning Ordinance.
City of Tehachapi	
Tehachapi Municipal Code, Title 18, Zoning (City of Tehachapi 2011b)	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the permanent conversion of land regulated by local zoning ordinances to transportation use, including within the City of Tehachapi. However, aside from the land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent land regulated by local zoning ordinances. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with Title 18 of the Tehachapi Municipal Code.
Los Angeles County	
Los Angeles County Code, Title 22, Planning and Zoning (Los Angeles County n.d.)	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the permanent conversion of land regulated by local zoning ordinances to transportation use, including within unincorporated Los Angeles County. However, aside from the land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent land regulated by local zoning ordinances. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code.
City of Lancaster	
Lancaster Code of Ordinances, Title 1, Zoning (City of Lancaster n.d.)	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the permanent conversion of land regulated by local zoning ordinances to transportation use, including within the City of Lancaster. However, aside from the land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent land regulated by local zoning ordinances. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with Title 1 of the Lancaster Code of Ordinances.
City of Palmdale	
Palmdale Zoning Ordinance (City of Palmdale 1994)	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the permanent conversion of land regulated by local zoning ordinances to transportation use, including within the City of Palmdale. However, aside from the land directly impacted by the project footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent land regulated by local zoning ordinances. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with the City of Palmdale Zoning Ordinance.

Source: California High Speed Rail (2016)

[1] Citations to the HSR project in this table should be interpreted to mean all of the Build Alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5).

n.d. = no date

Table 2-H-18 Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis—Agricultural Farmland and Forest Land

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Kern County General Plan (2009): Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element	
Resource Goal 1: Contain new development within an area large enough to meet generous projections of foreseeable need in locations which will not impair the economic strength of identified resources, including agriculture.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would provide a critical link to points north and south of the project section to meet regional transportation needs. The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of Important Farmland and Williamson Act Contract Land, including land zoned for agricultural uses. However, the project section would not impair the economic strength of agricultural land within Kern County as a whole.
Resource Goal 2: Protect areas of important resources, including agriculture, for future use.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of Important Farmland, including Important Farmland under a Williamson Act Contract and/or Important Farmland zoned for agricultural uses. However, aside from the agricultural farmland directly impacted by the project section footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land. For example, the Authority is taking steps to protect important agricultural areas and resources outside the project footprint through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not create farmland but would protect existing Important Farmland in the region that could be converted to a nonagricultural use in the future. In addition, the Authority's farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF 3) would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels that otherwise may not be economical to farm. Therefore, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with the resource goal of protecting agricultural areas for future use.
Resource Goal 3: Ensure the development of resource areas to minimize effects on neighboring resource land (including agriculture).	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section design features and mitigation measures have been developed to minimize effects on neighboring agricultural land.
Resource Goal 5: Conserve prime agriculture land from premature conversion.	**Not Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of Important Farmland, including Prime Farmland. This is not consistent with the resource goal of protecting prime agricultural land from conversion. However, the Authority is taking steps to protect prime agricultural land outside the project footprint through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not create farmland but would protect existing Important Farmland in the region that could be converted to a nonagricultural use. In addition, the Authority's farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF 3) would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels that otherwise may not be economical to farm.
Resource Policy 1: Encourage appropriate resource uses, including agriculture, as desirable and consistent interim uses in undeveloped portions of the County regardless of General Plan designation.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect Kern County's policy of promoting agriculture as a desirable and consistent interim use of land in undeveloped portions of the county.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Resource Policy 3: The County will support programs and policies that provide tax and economic incentives to ensure the long-term retention of resource land, including agriculture.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect Kern County's support of programs and policies that provide tax and economic incentives to ensure the long-term retention of agricultural land.
Resource Policy 5: Areas of low intensity agriculture use (Resource Reserve, Extensive Agriculture, and Resource Management) should be of an economically viable size in order to participate in the State Williamson Act Program/Farmland Security Zone Contract.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would traverse Grazing Land under Non-Prime Williamson Act contracts and would create smaller remnant parcels that would be rendered ineligible for a Williamson Act contract. The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not impact any land under Farmland Security Zone contracts. However, the Authority is taking steps to protect areas of low-intensity agricultural use currently under Williamson Act contracts through the farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF 3), which would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels that otherwise may not be economic to maintain in agricultural use The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section, therefore, is consistent with this resource policy, which seeks to ensures that areas of low-intensity agricultural use are of an economically viable size to participate in the Williamson Act program.
Resource Policy 7: Areas designated for agricultural use, which include Class I and II and other enhanced agricultural soils with surface delivery water systems, should be protected from incompatible residential, commercial, and industrial subdivision and development activities.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section is a regional transportation project; it is not a residential, commercial, or industrial subdivision/development project. Furthermore, with implementation of the proposed design features and mitigation measure, the project section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land.
Resource Policy 8: Provide for the orderly expansion of new urban-scale infrastructure and development and creation of new urban-scale centers in a manner that minimizes adverse effects on agriculture and natural resource uses.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would follow existing transportation corridors as much as possible in order to provide for the orderly expansion of new urban-scale infrastructure. Because there are no passenger stations proposed as part of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section, the HSR project is not anticipated to result in urban encroachment on agricultural land in the form of urban-scale development and the creation of new urban-scale centers (Section 3.12, Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use).
Resource Policy 12: Areas identified by the NRCS as having high range-site value shall be conserved for Extensive Agricultural uses or as Resource Reserve, if located within a County water district.	**Not Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of Important Farmland identified by the NRCS as having high range-site value, including land that has been zoned for Extensive Agricultural uses. This is not consistent with the resource policy calling for the conservation of areas identified by the NRCS as having high range-site value through the Extensive Agricultural zoning district. However, the Authority is taking steps to conserve areas identified by the NRCS as having high range-site values through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not create new farmland but would protect existing Important Farmland in the region that could be converted to a nonagricultural use in the future. In addition, the Authority's farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF 3) would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels that otherwise may not be economical to farm.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Resource Policy 24: Urban residential or commercial development on property contiguous to property designated Map Code 8.1 (Intensive Agriculture) shall employ landscaping, lot size, open space buffering, increased building setbacks, or other techniques to reduce the potential for land use conflicts when it can be demonstrated that such measures will provide for public welfare and benefit and promote continued agricultural resources.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section is not an urban residential or commercial project. Furthermore, with implementation of the project design features and mitigation measure, the project section would not conflict with adjacent agricultural land uses.
Kern County Code of Ordinances	
Title 19, Chapter 19.12: The Exclusive Agriculture District designates areas suitable for agricultural uses and prevents the encroachment of incompatible uses onto agricultural land and the premature conversion of such land to nonagricultural uses. Uses in the Exclusive Agriculture District are limited primarily to agricultural uses and other activities compatible with agricultural uses such as growing and harvesting crops, breeding and raising animals, and agricultural industries.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would use agricultural land zoned Exclusive Agriculture for a nonagricultural use. Aside from the agricultural farmland directly impacted by the project section footprint, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land. For example, the Authority is taking steps to protect agricultural uses outside the project footprint through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not create new farmland but would protect Important Farmland in the region that is currently zoned for agricultural use and could be converted to nonagricultural use in the future. In addition, the Authority's farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF 3) would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels, including land that is zoned Exclusive Agriculture. Therefore, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section is consistent with the county's Exclusive Agricultural District.
Title 19, Chapter 19.14: The Limited Agricultural District designates areas suitable for a combination of estate-type residential development, agricultural uses and other compatible uses.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would use land zoned Limited Agriculture for a nonagricultural use. The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section is consistent with agricultural uses and therefore is consistent with the county's Limited Agricultural District. Furthermore, the Authority is taking steps to protect agricultural uses outside the project footprint through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not create new farmland but would protect existing agricultural uses in the region. In addition, the Authority's farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF 3) would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels, including land that is zoned Limited Agriculture and otherwise may not be economic to maintain as agricultural land.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Breckenridge Hills Specific Plan (Kern County)	
Land Use Element – Resource Goal 1: Conserve and protect agricultural activities and prime agricultural land from urban encroachment. Discourage the cancellation of Williamson Act Land contracts.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would follow existing transportation corridors as much as possible in order to provide for the orderly expansion of new urban-scale infrastructure. The HSR project is not anticipated to result in urban encroachment on agricultural land in the form of urban-scale development and the creation of new urban-scale centers (Section 3.12, Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use). Therefore, while the project section would result in the loss of land with existing agricultural activities and prime agricultural land, this loss of agricultural land would not result from urban encroachment. In addition, the Authority is taking steps to conserve and protect agricultural activities and prime agricultural land outside the project footprint through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not create farmland but would protect existing Important Farmland in the region. In addition, the Authority's farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF 3) would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels that otherwise may not be economical to farm.
Land Use Element – Resource Policy 1: Maintain intensive agricultural use on all prime (NRCS Class I or II) agricultural land with established water service, regardless of whether the land is currently cropped.	**Not Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of prime agricultural land with established water service and associated intensive agricultural use. However, the Authority is taking steps to conserve and protect agricultural activities and prime agricultural land outside the project footprint through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not create farmland but would protect existing prime agricultural land in the region. In addition, the Authority's farmland consolidation program would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels, including prime agricultural land, that otherwise may not be economical to farm (AG-IAMF 3).
Land Use Element – Resource Policy 2: Land now in agricultural use will continue in that use until it is deemed necessary for development or it can be documented that the land is unprofitable to farm.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of land currently in agricultural use. However, the project section includes agricultural farmland IAMFs and a mitigation measure to help ensure the project section avoid impacts to agricultural farmlands where feasible. Therefore, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section is consistent with maintaining land in agricultural use until it is deemed necessary for development. .

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Conservation and Open Space Element – Soil Erosion Goal 4: Productive soils should be retained for agricultural or related agricultural uses, as recommended.	**Not Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of Important Farmland, including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance, which contain productive soils. This is not consistent with the goal of retaining productive soils for agriculture or related land uses. However, the Authority is taking steps to protect land with productive soils outside the project footprint through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not create farmland but would protect existing Important Farmland in the region that could be converted to a nonagricultural use in the future. In addition, the Authority's farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF 3) would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels that otherwise may not be economical to farm.
Conservation and Open Space Element – Soil Erosion Policy 2: Discretionary projects should be referred to NRCS for review and comment.	**Consistent.** The NRCS was consulted through the submission and completion of the Farmland Conversion Impact Rating for Corridor Type Projects (NRCS-CPA-106) form.
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan – Unincorporated Planning Area	
Conservation Element - Soils and Agriculture Goal 5.C.1: Provide for the planned management, conservation, and wise utilization of agricultural land in the planning area.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of agricultural land. However, the loss of Important Farmland would be mitigated through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1, which would help provide for the management, conservation, and wise utilization of agricultural land in the planning area.
Conservation Element - Soils and Agriculture Goal 5.C.2: Promote soil conservation and minimize development of prime agricultural land as defined by the following criteria: • Capability Class I and/or II irrigated soils • 80-100 story Index rating • Gross crop return of $200 or more per acre per year • Annual carrying capacity of one animal per unit per acre per year	**Not Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of Important Farmland, Williamson Act Contract Land, and crop land. All of these types of land potentially fall within the General Plan's definition of prime agricultural land. This is not consistent with the conservation goal of promoting soil conservation and minimizing development of prime agricultural land. However, the Authority is taking steps to protect prime agricultural land outside the project footprint through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not create farmland but would protect existing Important Farmland in the region that could be converted to a nonagricultural use. In addition, the Authority's farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF 3) would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of Important Farmland, Williamson Act Contract Land, and crop land on the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels that otherwise may not be economical to farm.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Conservation Element - Soils and Agriculture Goal 5.C.3: Establish urban development patterns and practices that promote soil conservation and that protect areas of agricultural production of food and fiber crops, and nursery products.	**Consistent.** While the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of some areas currently in agricultural production, the project section would follow existing transportation corridors as much as possible to follow established urban development patterns and minimize impacts to agricultural areas from urban sprawl. Furthermore, the Authority is taking steps to protect areas of agricultural production outside the project footprint through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not create farmland but would protect existing Important Farmland in the region that could be converted to a nonagricultural use. In addition, the Authority's farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF 3) would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels that otherwise may not be economical to farm.
Conservation Element - Soils and Agriculture Policy 5.C.1: Determine the extent and location of all prime agricultural land within the study area.	**Consistent.** This section of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Draft Project EIR/EIS provides a qualitative and quantitative analysis of agricultural land, including prime agricultural land (as defined by the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan). This analysis includes figures and tables demonstrating the location and extent, respectively, of Important Farmland, Williamson Act Contract Land, and crop cover within a 100-foot radius from the project footprint. All of these types of land are potentially prime agricultural land, as defined in the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan and stated in Conservation Element – Soils and Agriculture Goal 5.C.2, above.
Conservation Element - Soils and Agriculture Policy 5.C.2: Review projects that propose subdividing or urbanizing prime agricultural land to ascertain how continued commercial agricultural production in the project vicinity will be affected.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section is a regional transportation project and not a subdivision or an urban development; although it is an urban-scale type of infrastructure. The project section would follow existing transportation corridors as much as possible in order to minimize impacts to undeveloped agricultural land. Furthermore, the project will implement design features and mitigation measures, to ensure that the project section would be consistent with adjacent agricultural land. While the county is not an agency with jurisdiction over the project, the county would be consulted during the public review process.
Conservation Element - Soils and Agriculture Policy 5.C.3: Protect areas designated for agricultural use, which include Class I and II agricultural soils having surface delivery water systems, from the encroachment of residential and commercial subdivision development activities.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section is a regional transportation project; it is not a residential or commercial subdivision/development project.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Conservation Element - Soils and Agriculture Policy 5.C.4: Monitor the amount of prime agricultural land taken out of production for urban uses or added within the plan area.	**Consistent.** This section of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Draft Project EIR/EIS provides a quantitative analysis of agricultural land, including prime agricultural land (as defined by the Conservation Element). This analysis includes figures and tables demonstrating the location and extent, respectively, of impacts to Important Farmland and Williamson Act Contract Land within a 100-foot radius of the project footprint, which could be used by the county to monitor changes in the amount of prime agricultural land within its plan area. All of these types of land are potentially prime agricultural land, as defined in the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan and stated in Conservation Element – Soils and Agriculture Goal 5.C.2, above.
Open Space Element Goal 6.1: Conserve and enhance the unique aspects of open space (which includes agriculture) within the planning area.	**Not Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of agricultural land, which is identified as a type of open space resource within the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan. This is not consistent with the resource goal of conserving and enhancing the unique aspects of open space (which includes agriculture) within the planning area. However, the Authority is taking steps to protect agricultural land outside the project footprint through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not create farmland but would protect existing Important Farmland in the region that could be converted to a nonagricultural use. In addition, the Authority's farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF 3) would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels that otherwise may not be economical to farm.
Open Space Element Policy 6.1.b: Promote the establishment, maintenance and protection of the planning area's open space resources, including the managed production of resources (which includes agriculture).	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of agricultural land, which is identified as a type of open space resource within the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan. However, the project section would follow existing transportation corridors as much as possible in order to minimize impacts to undeveloped agricultural land. Furthermore, the Authority is taking steps to protect agricultural land outside the project footprint through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not create farmland but would protect existing Important Farmland in the region that could be converted to a nonagricultural use. In addition, the Authority's farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF 3) would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels that otherwise may not be economical to farm. Therefore, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section is consistent with the resource policy of promoting the establishment, maintenance, and protection of the planning area's open space resources (which include agriculture).

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
City of Bakersfield Municipal Code	
Title 17, Chapter 17.32 A and A 20-A Agricultural Zone: Permitted uses in the A Agricultural Zone include any use permitted in the R-1 zone; accessory agricultural buildings and uses, hatching, raising and fattening of chickens, turkeys, other fowl, poultry, rabbits, fish or frogs for domestic or commercial uses; agricultural and horticultural uses, and keeping of bovine animals, horses, mules, sheep, goats and hogs. Permitted uses in the A 20-Agricultural Zone are the same as for the A Agricultural Zone. The A 20-A Agricultural zone requires a minimum parcel size of 20 acres.	**Not Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would use agricultural land zoned under the A and A 20-A Agricultural Zones for nonagricultural use. This is not consistent with the City of Bakersfield's A and A 20-A Agricultural Zones, which limit land uses in these zones to a mixture of residential development, accessory agricultural buildings, and agricultural activities or other activities consistent with these land uses. However, the Authority is taking steps to protect agricultural uses outside the project footprint through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not create new farmland but would protect Important Farmland in the region that is currently zoned for agricultural use and could be converted to nonagricultural use in the future. In addition, the Authority's farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF 3) would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels, including land that is zoned A Agricultural Zone or A 20-A Agricultural Zone that otherwise may not be economical to farm.
City of Tehachapi General Plan	
Economic Vitality Element Objective 6: Support the sphere of influence's role as town-defining nature and agriculture.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of agricultural land, including Prime Farmland, Grazing Land, and Unique Farmland, within the City of Tehachapi's sphere of influence. The project section would result in the loss of some agricultural land; however, the project section is a linear transportation project that would traverse the sphere of influence but would not adversely impact the character of the city's sphere of influence, and it is consistent with the city's objective of supporting agriculture in the sphere of influence to help define the character of the city. In addition, the Authority is taking steps to protect agricultural land outside the project footprint through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not create new farmland but would protect existing Important Farmland in the city's sphere of influence that could otherwise be converted to a nonagricultural use. In addition, the Authority's farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF 3) would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels within the city's sphere of influence that otherwise may not be economical to farm.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Economic Vitality Element Policy EV18: The unincorporated land within Tehachapi's adopted Sphere of Influence (the planning area for the General Plan, which includes areas within and outside of Tehachapi's incorporated boundaries) can serve as an agricultural reserve for the town providing a needed transition between the town itself and adjacent unincorporated land uses. Land uses that are compatible with agricultural activities should be the primary economic use for this area. Over time, if portions of this reserve are annexed to town, policies governing land use will apply in the same manner as in the district to which the portions are being attached. Examples of beneficial land uses that are to be encouraged in the reserve area are: • Parking facilities • Agricultural production • Agricultural storage • Eco/agri-tourism and "value added" agricultural uses	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of agricultural land, including Prime Farmland, Grazing Land, and Unique Farmland, within the City of Tehachapi's sphere of influence. The project section would result in the loss of some agricultural land; however, the project section is a linear transportation project that would traverse the sphere of influence but would not adversely impact one of the roles of the city's sphere of influence, which is to serve as an agricultural reserve and urban transition area. Furthermore, the Authority is taking steps to protect agricultural land outside the project footprint through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not create new farmland but would protect existing Important Farmland in the city's sphere of influence that could be otherwise be converted to a nonagricultural use. In addition, the Authority's farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF 3) would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels that otherwise may not be economical to farm.
Natural Resources Element – Open Space and Agriculture Objective 1: Secure a greenbelt of open space within the Tehachapi's sphere of influence with the anticipated results of 1) ensuring a physical buffer and transition between the City, its Sphere of Influence, and the adjacent lands outside of the sphere of influence; and 2) creating a compact and walkable town-scale footprint that minimizes or eliminates the need to convert open space to urban uses.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of agricultural land, including Prime Farmland, Grazing Land, and Unique Farmland, within the City of Tehachapi's sphere of influence. However, the project section is a linear transportation project that would traverse the sphere of influence but would not adversely impact the greenbelt's purpose of providing an open-space buffer or creating a compact and walkable town-scale footprint.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Natural Resources Element – Open Space and Agriculture Objective 2: Enable prime and unique farmland to operate effectively.	**Consistent.** There is no Prime Farmland or Unique Farmland within the City of Tehachapi; however, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of Prime Farmland within the city's sphere of influence. The loss of farmland would be minimal and would not interfere with the effective operation of primate and unique farmland within the city. Furthermore, the Authority is taking steps to protect Prime Farmland outside the project footprint through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not create farmland but would protect existing Important Farmland in the city's sphere of influence that could be converted to a nonagricultural use. In addition, the Authority's farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF 3) would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels within the city's sphere of influence that otherwise may not be economical to farm.
Natural Resources Element – Open Space and Agriculture Policy NR16: Work with Kern County to maintain a viable and attractive greenbelt around Tehachapi's urban area that is comprised of diverse and connected natural habitats, and produce agricultural land reflecting Tehachapi's water resources and topography. Identify such land as an 'open' sector 01 or 02 in the Community Structure Plan.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the City of Tehachapi's policy of working with Kern County to maintain a diverse, viable, and attractive greenbelt around Tehachapi's urban area.
Natural Resources Element – Open Space and Agriculture Policy NR18: Work with Kern County to maintain a diverse network of open land encompassing particularly valuable rural and agricultural resources, connected with the landscape around the urban area. Particularly valuable resources related to agriculture include prime agricultural soils and economically viable farmland.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the City of Tehachapi's policy of working with Kern County to maintain a diverse network of land encompassing rural and agricultural resources.
Natural Resources Element – Open Space and Agriculture Policy NR19: Maintain a viable list of permitted uses for prime and unique farmland.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the City of Tehachapi's policy of maintaining a viable list of permitted uses for Prime and Unique Farmland.
Natural Resources Element – Open Space and Agriculture Policy NR20: Maintain a "right to farm" ordinance.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the City of Tehachapi's policy of maintaining a "right to farm" ordinance.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
Natural Resources Element – Open Space and Agriculture Policy NR21: Require adjacent nonagricultural development to provide the appropriate land use interface and compatibility in a way that does not diminish viable agriculture.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section design features and mitigation measures have been developed to minimize effects on neighboring agricultural land and would be consistent with adjacent urban land. Therefore, although the City of Tehachapi is not an agency with jurisdiction over the project and would not have the authority to dictate requirements to ensure the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would provide appropriate land use interface and compatibility with adjacent agricultural uses, the Authority is striving for consistency with this policy. The county would be consulted during the public review process.
Natural Resources Element – Open Space and Agriculture Policy NR22: Prioritize infill development over expansion development, which is consistent with the community structure plan.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section is a regional transportation project that is not characterized as expansion development and thus would be consistent with the community structure plan.
Civic Health and Culture Element Objective 9: Integrate agriculture with tourism to enhance economic viability and support the local economy and town-defining open space.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the City of Tehachapi's policy of integrating agriculture with tourism to enhance economic viability.
Civic Health and Culture Element Policy CH35: Promote visitor-oriented agricultural uses such as Tehachapi's Farmer's market and other "agri-tourism" activities such as wine tasting, ranch vacations, 'pick-your-own-produce', bed-and-breakfast inns, and recreation-oriented uses such as horseback riding to enhance agricultural viability.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the City of Tehachapi's policy of promoting visitor-oriented agricultural uses to enhance agricultural viability.
Civic Health and Culture Element Policy CH36: Through zoning regulations, promote the distinction and line of demarcation between rural and agricultural land as clearly distinct from the town to maintain the integrity of agriculture within a district and appealing rural physical context.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the City of Tehachapi's policy of using zoning to distinguish boundaries between rural and agricultural land.
City of Tehachapi Municipal Code	
Title 18, Chapter 18.12 – Agricultural (A) District: The purpose of the A District is to preserve land best suited for agriculture and agricultural uses and to limit urban encroachment into agricultural areas. In addition, the A district is intended to discourage premature conversion of agricultural land to nonagricultural uses.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would use land zoned Agriculture for a nonagricultural use. This is not consistent with the City of Tehachapi's Agricultural District. However, the project section would follow existing transportation corridors as much as possible in order to maximize its utilization of existing urban development patterns and minimize impacts to agricultural areas from urban sprawl. Furthermore, the Authority is taking steps to protect agricultural uses outside the project footprint through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not create new farmland but would protect existing agricultural uses in Tehachapi. In addition, the

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
	Authority's farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF 3) would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels, including land that is zoned Agriculture and otherwise may not be economical to farm. Therefore, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section is consistent with the intent of the city's Agricultural District.
Los Angeles County General Plan	
Conservation and Natural Resources Element – Agricultural Resources Goal C/NR 8: Protect productive farmland that provides for local food production, open space, public health, and the local economy.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not traverse any Important Farmland or Williamson Act Contract Land in the County of Los Angeles. The project section would traverse two small parcels zoned for agricultural use. However, this would not conflict with the goals and policies outlined in the Los Angeles County General Plan pertaining to the protection of farmland. Therefore, the project section is consistent with all policies in the Los Angeles County General Plan pertaining to agricultural land.
Conservation and Natural Resources Element – Agricultural Resources Goal C/NR 9: Sustainable agricultural practices.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not traverse any Important Farmland or Williamson Act Contract Land in the County of Los Angeles. The project section would traverse two small parcels zoned for agricultural use. However, this would not conflict with the goals and policies outlined in the Los Angeles County General Plan pertaining to the protection of farmland. Therefore, the project section is consistent with all policies in the Los Angeles County General Plan pertaining to agricultural land.
Conservation and Natural Resources Element – Agricultural Resources Policy C/NR 9.3: Support farmers markets, farm stands, and community-supported agriculture.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not traverse any Important Farmland or Williamson Act Contract Land in the County of Los Angeles. The project section would traverse two small parcels zoned for agricultural use. However, this would not conflict with the goals and policies outlined in the Los Angeles County General Plan pertaining to the protection of farmland. Therefore, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section is consistent with all policies in the Los Angeles County General Plan pertaining to agricultural land.
Conservation and Natural Resources Element – Agricultural Resources Policy C/NR 9.4: Support countywide community garden and urban farming programs.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not traverse any Important Farmland or Williamson Act Contract Land in the County of Los Angeles. The project section would traverse two small parcels zoned for agricultural use. However, this would not conflict with the goals and policies outlined in the Los Angeles County General Plan pertaining to the protection of farmland. Therefore, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section is consistent with all policies in the Los Angeles County General Plan pertaining to agricultural land.
Los Angeles County Code of Ordinances	
Title 22, Chapter 22.24 – Agricultural Zones: The agricultural zones (A-1, A-2 and A-2-H) are established to permit a comprehensive range of agricultural use in areas particularly suited for agricultural activities. Permitted uses are intended to encourage agricultural pursuits and such other uses required for, or desired by, the inhabitants of the community. An area so zoned may provide the land necessary to permit low-density single-family residential	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would use two parcels of agricultural land zoned Heavy Agriculture for a nonagricultural use, which is not an explicitly permitted use within Los Angeles County's Heavy Agricultural Zone. However, the intent of the zoning is to permit agricultural uses particularly suited for agricultural activities as well as some additional uses that would not conflict with the intent of the zoning designation, such as public and institutional facilities. The HSR project is a public facility that would be consistent with agricultural uses. The Authority is taking steps to protect agricultural uses outside the project footprint through the purchase of agricultural conservation easements as prescribed in Mitigation Measure AG-MM 1. Purchasing agricultural easements on agricultural land that is not currently protected would not

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
development, and outdoor recreational and needed public and institutional facilities.	create new farmland but would protect existing agricultural uses in the county. In addition, the Authority's farmland consolidation program (AG-IAMF3) would aim to provide for continued agricultural use of the maximum feasible number of remnant parcels, including land that is zoned Heavy Agriculture and otherwise may not be economical to farm.
City of Lancaster General Plan 2030	
Goal 3: To identify the level of natural resources needed to support existing and future development within the City and its sphere of influence, and ensure that these resources are managed and protected.	**N/A.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not traverse any Important Farmland, Williamson Act Contract Land, or land zoned for agricultural use in the City of Lancaster.
Objective 3.5: Preserve land resources (including agricultural uses) through the application of appropriate soils management techniques and the protection and enhancement of surrounding landforms and open space.	**N/A.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not traverse any Important Farmland, Williamson Act Contract Land, or land zoned for agricultural use in the City of Lancaster.
Policy 3.5.3 Protect land currently in agricultural production from the negative impacts created when urban and rural land uses exist in close proximity, recognizing the possibility of their long-term conversion to urban or rural uses.	**N/A.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not traverse any Important Farmland, Williamson Act Contract Land, or land zoned for agricultural use in the City of Lancaster.
City of Palmdale General Plan	
Environmental Resources Element Goal ER 8: Avoid the premature conversion of agricultural land to urban uses.	**N/A.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not traverse any Important Farmland, Williamson Act Contract Land, or land zoned for agricultural use in the City of Palmdale.
Environmental Resources Element Objective ER 8.1: Identify significant farmland pursuant to the State of California Important Farmland inventory and provide for their preservation as an interim use within the Planning Area.	**N/A.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not traverse any Important Farmland, Williamson Act Contract Land, or land zoned for agricultural use in the City of Palmdale.
Environmental Resources Element Policy ER 8.1: Encourage the preservation of agricultural land in non-urban areas and as an interim use where urban development is not anticipated for several years	**N/A.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not traverse any Important Farmland, Williamson Act Contract Land, or land zoned for agricultural use in the City of Palmdale.
Environmental Resources Element Policy ER 8.2: Preserve agricultural uses as a means of retaining aquifer recharge both naturally and through treated water sources.	**N/A.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not traverse any Important Farmland, Williamson Act Contract Land, or land zoned for agricultural use in the City of Palmdale.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Consistency
City of Palmdale Zoning Ordinance	
Chapter 3 – Agricultural Zones, Article 30 – Light Agriculture (Zone A-1): The A-1 zone designation has a minimum lot size of approximately one or more acres where rural and limited agricultural uses are existing or desired. Permitted land uses include field, tree, bush, berry and row crops, riding, hiking and bicycle trails and appurtenant facilities, apiaries, keeping of permitted animals as an accessory use, temporary storage of construction materials and equipment, temporary and permanent facilities for the detention, retention and conveyance of stormwater runoff, and small=scale solar energy systems as an accessory use.	**N/A.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not traverse any land zoned for agricultural use in the City of Palmdale.

Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority
EIR = environmental impact report
EIS = environmental impact statement
HSR = high-speed rail
IAMF = impact avoidance and minimization feature
N/A = not applicable

Table 2-H-19 Consistency with Local Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies—Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
City of Bakersfield Recreation and Parks Master Plan (2007)	
Park Acceptance Policy 1: Require that neighborhood parks be developed at a minimum ratio of 2.5 acres per 1,000 population. This requirement may be met all or in part by on-site recreation for such developments as Planned Unit Developments. The City of Bakersfield may allow credit to meet the neighborhood parks requirement.	**Consistent.** The HSR project is a transportation project, and would not directly introduce development in the City of Bakersfield. No land from existing or planned parks in the City of Bakersfield would be acquired as part of the four HSR Build Alternatives. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Park Acceptance Policy 23: Enforce dedication requirements and the development of the City of Bakersfield's specific trails plan.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing or proposed Class I (off-street) bicycle or trail facilities in the City of Bakersfield. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Park Acceptance Policy 43: Strive to ensure that all park facilities be developed consistent with policies in applicable planning documents and elements of the General Plan.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not result in changes to existing or planned park facilities in the City of Bakersfield. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
City of Bakersfield Bicycle Transportation Plan (2013)	
Goal 1: Increase bicycle mobility. AND Goal 2: Maintain the bikeway network.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing or proposed Class I (off-street) bicycle facilities in the City of Bakersfield. Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Bakersfield design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would not conflict with these goals.
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (adopted 2002, amended 2010)	
Circulation Element (Amended 2010)	
Goal Streets-2: Provide for safe and efficient motorized, non-motorized, and pedestrian traffic movement.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the City of Bakersfield's design standards and requirements. The HSR project would also support safe and efficient movement of people, providing a new HSR passenger service that would be grade-separated from other modes of travel. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal Bikeways-3: Provide a continuous easily-accessible bikeway system within the metro area.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Bakersfield design standards and requirements. Existing and proposed trails that require temporary closures during construction of the

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
	HSR Build Alternatives would be detoured around the construction areas to maintain continuous access to the bikeway system. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy Bikeways-11: Construct bike lanes in conjunction with all street improvement projects that coincide with the Bikeway Master Plan.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing or planned Class I (off-street) bicycle facilities in the City of Bakersfield. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would not conflict with this policy.
Open Space Element (2002)	
Policy 1: Promote the establishment, maintenance and protection of the planning area's open space resources, including the following: c) Outdoor recreation • Parks (refer to Chapter XI-Parks) • Kern River corridor (refer to Chapter II-Land Use, Chapter V-Conservation, and Chapter XII-Kern River Plan Element)	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing park facilities, designated open space, or natural resources in the City of Bakersfield. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would not conflict with this policy.
Parks Element (2002)	
Goal 2: Supply neighborhood parks at a minimum of 2.5 acres per 1,000 persons throughout the plan area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project is a transportation facility and would not directly introduce development in the City of Bakersfield. No land from existing or planned parks in the City of Bakersfield would be acquired as part of the HSR project. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 25: Promote the preservation of existing parks and encourage the development of other facilities near downtown.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing park facilities in the City of Bakersfield. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would not conflict with this policy.
Policy 52: Ensure that all park facilities be developed consistent with policies in applicable planning documents and elements of the General Plan.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not impact existing park facilities and would not develop new park facilities in the City of Bakersfield. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
County of Kern Parks and Recreation Department: Parks and Recreation Master Plan (May 2010)	
Goal 2 - Provide a minimum standard of 5 acres of park land per 1,000 residents. This standard would apply to regional parks serving the entire County, as well as local parks in unincorporated areas of the County not served by a local park district.	**Consistent.** The HSR project is a transportation project, and would not directly introduce development in the County of Kern. No land from existing or planned parks in the County of Kern would be acquired as part of the four HSR Build Alternatives. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal 4 - Expand trail connections and pathways throughout Kern County.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would cross planned trail connections and pathways in Kern County. The RCSD Potential Recreation Resources include planned trail alignments that would be crossed at-grade in the vicinity of Rosamond. If the planned trails are not operational prior to the initiation of construction of the HSR facility, the proposed trail alignments would be modified from their planned alignments. The FRA and the Authority would coordinate and consult with relevant jurisdictions regarding planned trails in the vicinity of the HSR project. The Authority would provide for potential compensation or planning for, or replacement or enhancement of, the planned recreation resource affected by the HSR project improvements. Therefore, with mitigation, the four HSR Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Kern County General Plan (2009)	
Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element	
Public Facilities and Services Policy 4: The provision of parks and recreational facilities of varying size, function, and location to serve County residents will be encouraged. Special attention will be directed to providing linear parks along creeks, rivers, and streambeds in urban areas. AND **Public Facilities and Services Policy 5:** Seek to provide recreational facilities where deficiencies have been identified.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would cross planned trail connections and pathways in Kern County. The RCSD Potential Recreation Resources include planned trail alignments that would be crossed at-grade in the vicinity of Rosamond. If the planned trails are not operational prior to the initiation of construction of the HSR facility, the proposed trail alignments would be modified from their planned alignments. The FRA and the Authority would coordinate and consult with relevant jurisdictions regarding planned trails in the vicinity of the HSR project. The Authority would provide for potential compensation or planning for, or replacement or enhancement of, the planned recreation resources affected by the HSR project improvements. Therefore, with mitigation, the four HSR Build Alternatives would be consistent with these policies.
Circulation Element	
Goal 2.1-2: Kern County intends to provide plans for circulation infrastructure in support of the Land Use, Open Space and Conservation Element.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Kern County Bicycle Master Plan and Complete Streets Recommendations (June 2012)	
Policy 9.1: Maintain and improve the quality, operation, and integrity of the bicycle and pedestrian network and support facilities.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Kern County Parks Master Plan (May 2010)	
Goal 2 - Provide a minimum standard of 5 acres of park land per 1,000 residents. This standard would apply to regional parks serving the entire County, as well as local parks in unincorporated areas of the County not served by a local park district.	**Consistent.** The HSR project is a transportation facility and would not directly introduce development in the County of Kern. No land from existing or planned parks in County of Kern would be acquired as part of the four HSR Build Alternatives. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal 4 - Expand trail connections and pathways throughout Kern County.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the City of Bakersfield's design standards and requirements. The HSR project would also support safe and efficient movement of people, providing a new HSR passenger service that would be grade-separated from other modes of travel. In addition, the Pacific Crest Trail would remain operational during construction and operation of the HSR Project. The Pacific Crest Trail would be detoured during temporary construction activities and a viaduct would span over the trail segment in the resource study area. No permanent acquisition would be required from the FRA, but a maintenance easement would be required to access the viaduct structure. The HSR project would cross planned trail connections and pathways in Kern County. The RCSD Potential Recreation Resources include planned trail alignments that would be crossed at-grade in the vicinity of Rosamond. If the planned trails are not operational prior to the initiation of construction of the HSR facility, the proposed trail alignments would be modified from their planned alignments. The FRA and the Authority would coordinate and consult with relevant jurisdictions regarding planned trails in the vicinity of the HSR project. The Authority would provide for potential compensation or planning for, or replacement or enhancement of, the planned recreation resource affected by the HSR project improvements. Therefore, with mitigation, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Kern County Bicycle Facilities Plan (2001)	
Goal: Provide safe, accessible and convenient bicycling facilities. AND **Policy:** Plans and development proposals for land adjacent to existing or proposed transportation projects should evaluate possible effects on the surrounding circulation network. AND **Policy:** Encourage bicycle-friendly railway track crossings.	**Consistent.** This EIR/EIS analysis evaluates the impacts to parks, recreation, and school play areas. For this analysis, Class I (off-street) bicycle paths are considered recreational. Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable jurisdiction's design standards and requirements. Existing and proposed trails that require temporary closures during construction of the HSR Build Alternatives would be detoured around the construction areas to maintain continuous access to the bikeway system. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal and these policies.
Policy: Install bikeway projects in conjunction with street improvement projects.	**Not Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with applicable design standards and requirements. Therefore, because the cross-sections of the proposed roadway improvements would be the same as existing conditions, planned bikeways would not be incorporated into the design of the four HSR Build Alternatives, and the project would be inconsistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Greater Tehachapi Area Specific & Community Plan (October 2010)	
Circulation Element (2010)	
Goal CIR.7: Provide a useful, enjoyable, safe, and efficient regional trail system for hikers, bicyclists, and equestrians that links communities, recreational areas, public lands, and activity centers. AND **Policy CIR.11:** Promote the creation and/or expansion of non-vehicular circulation systems (bikeways, walkways, equestrian trials, etc.) that create linkages within the Greater Tehachapi Area and encourage new development to include provisions for such facilities.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal and this policy.
Policy CIR.12: Encourage street network connectivity and "complete streets" designed to accommodate multiple transportation modes such as, but not limited to, those routes identified in the Kern County Bicycle Facilities Plan as identified in Figure 4-3 [of the Greater Tehachapi Area Specific and Community Plan].	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project would support this policy by creating a more diverse transportation system that can accommodate a diverse population's transportation needs. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Sustainability Element (2010)	
Policy SUS.1: Provide for alternative modes of transportation such as walking, biking, carpools, vanpools, and public transportation to reduce emissions associated with automobile use.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide an HSR alternative for travel to/from urban centers in California. Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Conservation and Open Space Element (2010)	
Goal COS.14: Improve parks and recreational availability in the Greater Tehachapi Area.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would impact the proposed Greenways (Antelope Run) in Tehachapi and unincorporated Kern County. Although vacant land proposed for this open space type would be impacted, there are no existing recreational facilities in place at the time of this analysis. Therefore, if the proposed Greenways (Antelope Run) are operational at the initiation of construction of the HSR Build Alternatives, the Authority would compensate property owners for the land crossed by the HSR Build Alternatives. The Greenways (Antelope Run) areas outside the HSR temporary and permanent impact areas would remain designated as open space types and the function of those areas would not change. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Keene Ranch Specific Plan (December 1997)	
Circulation Element (1997)	
Goal 3-1: To provide an effective circulation system that is safe, reflects and complements the character of the project site, provides for a network of trails and minimizes effects on the environment.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. The HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project would support this goal by contributing to a more diverse and effective circulation system. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy 3-3: All roads and bridges will be designed to safely carry project traffic and maintain the rural character of the surrounding area and proposed development.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. The designs of those facilities would be consistent with Kern County design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 3-5: The Circulation Plan includes trails for pedestrians, bicycles and horses whenever practical, separates them from roads.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with Kern County design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element (1997)	
Policy 10: All park and trail facilities are private and for the use of project residents only, except for play fields associated with the school site in the Crofton area.	**Consistent.** No land from existing or planned parks or trails in the Community of Keene would be acquired as part of the four HSR Build Alternatives. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Tehachapi Valley Recreation and Parks District Master Plan (2013)	
Goal 2: Increase access to Neighborhood Parks, Community Parks, and Recreation Facility Opportunities for all residents throughout the District.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Access to parks and recreation facilities in the Tehachapi Valley Recreation and Parks District would be maintained under all four HSR Build Alternatives. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Goal 3: Work with regional partners to increase current park capacity to achieve the District's adopted standard of 3 acres of local parkland per 1,000 residents.	**Consistent.** The HSR project is a transportation project, and would not directly introduce development in the Tehachapi Valley Recreation and Parks District. No land from existing or planned parks in the Tehachapi Valley Recreation and Parks District would be acquired as part of the four HSR Build Alternatives. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal 15: Expand and improve multiuse trails systems.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. The designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable jurisdiction's design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Tehachapi General Plan 2035 (January 2012)	
Mobility Element (2012)	
Objective 8: Enhance the pedestrian and bicycle network. AND **Policy M18:** Maintain a bicycle network that connects bikeways, including multiuse trails, with activity centers.	**Consistent.** Where transportation facilities would cross the proposed HSR alignment, those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility. Connections to the proposed Challenger Path would be provided at the intersection of Challenger Drive and Burnett Road/Dennison Drive. The designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Tehachapi design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective and this policy.
Public Realm Element (2012)	
Policy PR7: Maintain bicycle access-types (class 1, 2, or 3) on all thoroughfare types including grade-separations.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. In addition, where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, grade-separations would be provided at crossings. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Objective 3: Maintain a network of open space types.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would impact the proposed Greenways (Antelope Run) in Tehachapi and unincorporated Kern County. Although vacant land proposed for this open space type would be impacted, there are no existing recreational facilities in place at the time of this analysis. Therefore, if the proposed Greenways (Antelope Run) are operational at the initiation of construction of the HSR Build Alternatives, the Authority would compensate property owners for the land crossed by the HSR Build Alternatives. The Greenways (Antelope Run) areas outside the HSR temporary and permanent impact areas would remain designated as open space types and the function of those areas would not change. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Natural Resources Element (2012)	
Policy NR32: Maintain standards that: a. Prohibit walls form blocking views of, or access into, natural areas b. Reflect the intended physical context(s) to which the standards are to be applied c. Require appropriate and contextually responsive connections between urban and rural areas d. Treat paths, trails, etc., as an integral part of the adjacent, intended physical context	**Consistent.** The Authority has adopted design standards and guidelines established to create a minimum aesthetic quality impact for a long-lasting infrastructure. The Authority's *Urban Design Guidelines for the California High Speed Train Project* (Authority 2011) discusses the principles of context-sensitive solutions to guide the design of stations. This approach is equally applicable to elevated guideways and would be employed to mitigate visual impacts through context-sensitive design. The Authority's Technical Memorandum *Aesthetic Guidelines for Non-Station Structures* (Authority 2011b) also guides the design of the HSR components. The Authority's *Aesthetic Design Review Process for Non-Station Structures* (Authority 2014) would guide the development of mitigation for non-station area structures. These standards and guidelines work to minimize and avoid aesthetic effects on the adjacent surroundings, where possible. During design, the Authority will work collaboratively with local agencies, stakeholders, and contractors to

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
	address aesthetic issues. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Tehachapi Bicycle Master Plan (2012)	
Objective 1.1: Expand the existing bicycle network to provide a comprehensive network of Class I, Class II, and Class III facilities. AND **Policy 1.1-3:** Plan and install new bicycle paths along railroad tracks and in utility corridors, and the extension of existing bicycle paths. AND **Objective 4.1:** Integrate consideration of bicycle travel into all roadway planning, design, and construction.	**Consistent.** Where transportation facilities would cross the proposed HSR alignment, those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility. In the City of Tehachapi, connections to the proposed Class I (off-street) Challenger Path would be provided at the intersection of Challenger Drive and Burnett Road/Dennison Drive. The designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Tehachapi design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with these objectives.
Cameron Canyon Specific Plan (June 1986)	
Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element (1986)	
Policy VI-5: Use of the Pacific Crest Trail for recreational hiking and horseback riding will be supported.	**Consistent.** Grade separations will be provided where the HSR project alignments cross the Pacific Crest Trail to ensure continued use of those segments of the Pacific Crest Trail for hiking and horseback riding. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Rosamond Specific Plan (April 2008)	
Public Facilities Element (2008)	
Goal 5: The establishment of parks and recreational facilities of varying size, function, and location to serve Rosamond residents.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would cross plan trail connections and pathways in Kern County. The RCSD Potential Recreation Resources include planned trail alignments that would be crossed at-grade in the vicinity of Rosamond. If the planned trails are not operational prior to the initiation of construction of the HSR facility, the proposed trail alignments would be modified from their planned alignments. The FRA and the Authority would coordinate and consult with relevant jurisdictions regarding planned trails in the vicinity of the HSR project. The Authority would provide for potential compensation or planning for, or replacement or enhancement of, the planned recreation resource affected by the HSR project improvements. Therefore, with mitigation, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Rosamond Community Services District: Park System Master Plan (2007)	
Goal 1: To acquire, develop and maintain an adequate number of neighborhood and community parks and facilities for the leisure-time enjoyment of Rosamond CSD residents. AND **Goal 2:** To provide a variety of quality park and recreational experiences for a rapidly expanding and diverse population.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would cross plan trail connections and pathways in Kern County. The RCSD Potential Recreation Resources include planned trail alignments that would be crossed at-grade in the vicinity of Rosamond. If the planned trails are not operational prior to the initiation of construction of the HSR facility, the proposed trail alignments would be modified from their planned alignments. The FRA and the Authority would coordinate and consult with relevant jurisdictions regarding planned trails in the vicinity of the HSR project. The Authority would provide for potential compensation or planning for, or replacement or enhancement of, the planned recreation resource affected by the HSR projects improvements. Therefore, with mitigation, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Los Angeles County General Plan (2015)	
Mobility Element (2015)	
Goal M1: Street designs that incorporate the needs of all users. AND **Policy M1.1:** Provide for the accommodation of all users, including pedestrians, motorists, bicyclists, equestrians, users of public transit, seniors, children, and persons with disabilities when requiring or planning for new, or retrofitting existing, transportation corridors/networks whenever appropriate and feasible.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. All road improvements would be designed and constructed consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal and this policy.
Goal M2: Interconnected and safe bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly streets, sidewalks, paths and trails that promote active transportation and transit use.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Los Angeles County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project would support this goal by creating a more diverse transportation system that can accommodate a diverse population's transportation needs. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy M2.1: Provide transportation corridors/networks that accommodate pedestrians, equestrians and bicyclists, and reduce motor vehicle accidents through a context-sensitive process that addresses the unique characteristics of urban, suburban, and rural communities whenever appropriate and feasible.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal M4: An efficient multimodal transportation system that serves the needs of all residents.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide one component of a multimodal circulation system to address transportation needs in this part of Los Angeles County. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Policy M4.1: Expand transportation options that reduce automobile dependence.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide a new regional HSR transportation option that would be expected to reduce dependence on automobiles for trips to/from other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy M4.10: Support the linkage of regional and community-level transportation systems, including multimodal networks.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide a new component in the regional transit system. In addition, the Palmdale Station site is in an area with existing adequate public service infrastructure and services. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Parks and Recreation Element (2015)	
Policy P/R 3.1: Acquire and develop local and regional parkland to meet the following County goals: 4 acres of local parkland per 1,000 residents in the unincorporated areas and 6 acres of regional parkland per 1,000 residents of the total population of Los Angeles County.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not directly introduce development in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. No land from existing or planned parks in unincorporated Los Angeles County would be acquired as part of the four HSR Build Alternatives. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal P/R 4: Improved accessibility and connectivity to a comprehensive trail system including rivers, greenways, and community linkages.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with applicable design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Noise Element (2015)	
Policy N1.8: Minimize noise impacts to pedestrians and transit-riders in the design of transportation facilities and mobility networks.	**Consistent.** The Authority would incorporate noise barriers or other noise reduction features in the design of the Palmdale Station to reduce noise effects on station patrons and pedestrians. Noise generated during construction would be managed based on local jurisdiction noise ordinance requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan (2012)	
Goal 1: Expanded, improved, and interconnected system of county bikeways and bikeway support facilities to provide a viable transportation alternative for all levels of bicycling abilities, particularly for trips of less than five miles. AND **Policy 1.1:** Construct the bikeways proposed in 2012 County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan over the next 20 years.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those crossings would be grade-separated. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal and this policy.
IA 1.1.3: Implement bikeways proposed in this Plan when reconstructing or widening existing streets.	**Not Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with applicable design standards and requirements. Therefore, because the cross-sections of the proposed roadway improvements would be the same as existing conditions, planned bikeways would not be incorporated into the design of the four HSR Build Alternatives and the project would be inconsistent with this objective.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Goal 2: Increased safety of roadways for all users.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. In the long term, grade separations of local roads will be provided at their crossings of the HSR facility to ensure the ability of emergency services providers to safely and quickly cross that facility. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Antelope Valley Area Plan, Town and Country (2015)	
Mobility Element (2015)	
Policy M 2.4: Develop multi-modal transportation systems that offer alternatives to automobile travel by implementing the policies regarding regional transportation, local transit, bicycle routes, trails, and pedestrian access contained in this Mobility Element.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Los Angeles County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project would support this goal by creating a more diverse transportation system that can accommodate a diverse population's transportation needs. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Goal M 9: A unified and well-maintained bicycle transportation system throughout the Antelope Valley with safe and convenient routes for commuting, recreation, and daily travel.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with applicable design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Conservation and Open Space Element (2015)	
Policy COS 18.5: Provide parks and recreational facilities, as directed in the policies of the Public Safety, Services, and Facilities Element.	**Consistent.** No land from existing or planned parks in unincorporated Los Angeles County would be acquired as part of the four HSR Build Alternatives. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Public Safety, Services and Facilities Element (2015)	
Policy PS 8.3: Provide new parks as additional development occurs or as the population grows, with a goal of four acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not directly introduce development in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. No land from existing or planned parks in unincorporated Los Angeles County would be acquired as part of the four HSR Build Alternatives. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy PS 8.7: Provide trails, bikeways, and bicycle routes for recreational purposes, as directed in the policies of the Mobility Element.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with applicable design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
City of Lancaster Parks, Recreation, Open Space & Cultural Master Plan (2007)	
Policy 1.2: Pursuant to the Lancaster General Plan, a standard of five (5) acres of parkland per 1,000 residents shall be applied to all development projects.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not directly introduce development in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. Land from Whit Carter Park in the City of Lancaster would be permanently acquired under Alternative 5. The Authority would provide compensation or land, or both, for all permanent acquisitions of property for HSR improvements from publicly owned parks, consistent with the requirements of the California Park Preservation Act of 1971. Therefore, with mitigation, the effects of the proposed acquisition at Whit Carter Park would be addressed and the compensation/land would not reduce the parkland standard. The four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 3.3: Expand trail connections and pathways.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy 3.3.2: Complete trail connections between neighborhoods, schools, and employment areas to encourage walking or bicycling to school and work.	**Not Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. The existing and proposed segments of the Sierra Highway Bike Path in the resource study areas for all four HSR Build Alternatives would be incorporated into the cross-section for the relocated Sierra Highway. The proposed Class I (off-street) bike paths in the City of Lancaster that intersect with Sierra Highway would maintain their connectivity to the Sierra Highway Bike Path with operation of the HSR facility under all four Build Alternatives. All four HSR Build Alternatives would realign Sierra Highway west of the UPRR right of-way. The Avenue K-8 Bike Path Bridge is a proposed bike path bridge intended to connect the Avenue K-8 Bike Path (west of existing Sierra Highway) to the Class II (on street) bike lane east of the UPRR right of-way. With the realignment of Sierra Highway to the west and the terminus of the Avenue K-8 Bike Path at realigned Sierra Highway, the proposed bridge over the UPRR/ existing Sierra Highway would no longer be needed. Therefore, the Avenue K-8 Bike Path Connection over Sierra Highway and the UPRR would not be constructed, and all four Build Alternatives would be inconsistent with this policy.
Goal 9: Encourage the Integration of Parks and Trails Into Overall Community Design, Planning, and Development Decisions. AND **Policy 9.1:** Pursue the development of a trails network that would connect destinations throughout Lancaster, including local schools and parks, places of business, and transit stops.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal and this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
City of Lancaster Master Plan of Trails and Bikeways (2012)	
Goal 1: Provide a safe, connected, and convenient street environment where people of all ages and physical abilities can travel throughout Lancaster without a vehicle. AND **Goal 2:** Create a network of off-street shared-use paths and trails within the City that is well located, safe, and secure. AND **Policy 1:** The City will actively accommodate and encourage safe and convenient bicycle and pedestrian commuting throughout Lancaster. AND **Policy 2:** The City will actively accommodate and encourage safe and convenient bicycle and pedestrian utilitarian trips to schools, stores, parks and other destinations throughout Lancaster. AND **Policy 7:** The City will develop a trails system along available rights of way and in new development.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Lancaster by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with these goals and policies.
City of Lancaster General Plan 2030 (2009)	
Plan for the Natural Environment (2009)	
Policy 3.3.2: Facilitate the development and use of public transportation and travel modes such as bicycle riding and walking.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Lancaster design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Plan for Active Living (2009)	
Objective 10.1: Provide sufficient neighborhood and community park facilities such that a rate of 5.0 acres of park land per 1,000 residents is achieved and distributed so as to be convenient to Lancaster residents.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not directly introduce development in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. Land from Whit Carter Park in the City of Lancaster would be permanently acquired under Alternative 5. The Authority would provide compensation or land, or both, for all permanent acquisitions of property for HSR improvements from publicly owned parks, consistent with the requirements of the California Park Preservation Act of 1971. Therefore, with mitigation, the effects of the proposed acquisition at Whit Carter Park would be addressed, and the compensation/land would not reduce the parkland standard. The four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Objective 10.2: Through the adoption and implementation of a Master Plan of trails, establish and maintain a hierarchical system of trails (including equestrian, bicycle, and pedestrians trails) providing recreation opportunities and an alternative means of reaching schools, parks and natural areas, and places of employment, and connecting to regional trail systems. AND **Policy 10.2.1:** Establish and maintain a Master Plan of Trails which designates trail status and approximate locations, providing for the following types of trails: a. Urban Trails: multi-purpose pedestrian/ bicycle trails which connect residential areas to other residential areas, regional and community parks, schools, and commercial and industrial employment areas. b. Rural Trails: multi-purpose equestrian/pedestrian/ bicycle trails which connect residential areas to other residential areas, regional and community parks, schools, and commercial and industrial employment areas. c. Bicycle Right of Way: integrates with the urban and rural trails and provides additional access to residential, recreational, educational, and commercial/industrial employment areas. AND **Policy 10.2.4**: Facilitate the use of bicycles as an alternative form of transportation, as well as a form of recreation.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective and these policies.
Plan for Physical Mobility (2009)	
Objective 14.4: Reduce reliance of the use of automobiles and increase the average vehicle occupancy by promoting alternatives to single-occupancy auto use, including ridesharing, non-motorized transportation (bicycle, pedestrian), and the use of public transit. AND **Policy 14.4.2:** Promote the use of alternative modes of transportation through the development of convenient and attractive facilities that support and accommodate the services.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would provide for high-speed regional rail travel to/from urban centers in California and would be expected to reduce dependence on automobiles for those trips. The four Build Alternatives would not conflict with the achievement of this objective and are, therefore, consistent with this objective and this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Plan for Physical Development (2009)	
Policy 19.2.5: Create a network of attractive paths and corridors that encourage a variety of modes of transportation within the city (see also Policy 3.8.1).	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Lancaster design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
City of Palmdale General Plan (January 1993)	
Circulation Element (1993)	
Policy C2.2.6: Establish a regional transportation center within the City, conveniently located to maximize access to downtown and major commercial centers, which will accommodate a variety of public transportation uses including rail, bus, and shuttle service.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would include a dedicated station in Palmdale on an HSR alignment, which would provide connections to other surface transit services in the area. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Parks, Recreation, and Trails Element (September 2003)	
Policy PRT1.1.1: Of the 5 acres/1,000 population, active park land must comprise no less than 3 acres per 1,000 population; open space may comprise 1 acre per 1,000 population; and the remainder can be composed of other public recreational facilities including Desert Aire Golf Course, portions of school sites which provide recreation facilities or play fields accessible to the public, or other comparable facilities. Of the 3 acre/1,000 population standard for active park land, develop 2 acres as community or specialty parks and 1 acre as neighborhood parks.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would not directly introduce development in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. The entire Dr. Robert C St. Clair Parkway and the recreation areas at Rex Parris High School in the City of Palmdale would be permanently acquired under Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5. The access driveway and parking areas at the Hammack Activity Center would be permanently impacted under all four HSR Build Alternatives. The Authority would provide compensation or land, or both, for all permanent acquisitions of property for HSR improvements from publicly owned parks, consistent with the requirements of the California Park Preservation Act of 1971. Therefore, with mitigation, the effects of the proposed acquisition at Dr. Robert C St. Clair Parkway, Rex Parris High School, and the Hammack Activity Center would be addressed and the compensation/land would not reduce the parkland standard. The four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Policy PRT1.6.1: Provide trail linkages through active park sites to connect nearby equestrian and multi-use trails, and bikeways. AND **Goal PRT4:** Develop a system of multi-use trails which provide connections to the County trails system and the City of Lancaster trails system. AND **Objective PRT4.1:** Provide multi-use trails, for use by pedestrians, bicyclists and equestrians, connecting to existing or currently planned multi-use trails. AND **Policy PRT4.2.1:** Require dedication of trail easements and/or construction of trail improvements as a condition of approval	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For roads that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Palmdale design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
of development, to the extent allowed by law. AND **Goal PRT5:** Promote bicycling as an important mode of transportation and recreation in the City of Palmdale. AND **Objective PRT5.1:** Encourage bicycling use by developing a comprehensive bikeway network for the City. AND **Policy PRT5.1.1:** Establish Class I, II, and III bikeways throughout the planning area. Backbone Class I and II bikeways are shown on Exhibit PRT-2.	
Policy PRT5.3.5: Where feasible, bikeways should be physically separated from traffic lanes by landscaped areas, grade changes, or physical barriers to enhance bicyclist safety.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. For off-street bike paths that are operational when construction of the HSR is completed and that would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, the designs of those facilities would be consistent with City of Palmdale design standards and requirements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

[1] Citations to the HSR project in this table should be interpreted to mean all of the Build Alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5).
Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority
FRA = Federal Railroad Administration
HSR = high-speed rail
RCSD = Rosamond Community Services District
UPRR = Union Pacific Railroad

Table 2-H-20 Consistency with Regional and Local Policies—Aesthetics and Visual Resources

Plan	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (2016): Land Use Element	City of Bakersfield	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	Consistent
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (Unincorporated Planning Area) (2007): Land Use Element	Unincorporated Kern County/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	Consistent
Kern County General Plan (2009): Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element and Circulation Element	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	Consistent
City of Tehachapi General Plan (2012): Town Form Element and Natural Resources Element	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	Consistent
Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan (2015): Land Use Element and Conservation and Open Space Element	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	Consistent
City of Lancaster General Plan (2009): Plan for the Natural Environment, Plan for Public Health and Safety, and Plan for Physical Development	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	Consistent
City of Palmdale General Plan (2013): Land Use Element, Environmental Resources Element, and Community Design Element	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Palmdale Station	Consistent

Table 2-H-21 Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis—Aesthetics and Visual Resources

Kern County General Plan (Kern County Planning Department 2009a)	
Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element Section 1.8 (Industrial) Policy 6: Encourage upgrading the visual character of existing industrial areas through the use of landscaping, screening, or buffering.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section design features and mitigation measures have been developed to ensure that HSR features would be consistent with the adjacent streetscape. The Authority has adopted design standards and guidelines intended to minimize negative aesthetic quality impacts for a long-lasting infrastructure.
Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element Section 1.8 (Industrial) Policy 7: Require that industrial uses provide design features such as screen walls, landscaping, increased height and/or setbacks, and lighting restrictions between the boundaries of adjacent residential land use designations so as to reduce impacts on residences due to light, noise, sound, and vibration.	
Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element Section 1.10.7 (Light and Glare) Policy 47: Ensure that light and glare from discretionary new development projects are minimized in rural as well as urban areas.	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 3.16.6.4 under AVQ Impact #2, overhead lights on the HSR guideway are not proposed. Headlights from passing trains would only be fleeting at any one exposure and would be directed towards the tracks. HSR tracks and trains would not create new sources of substantial light or glare, and would not create glare effects on neighboring properties.
Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element Section 1.10.7 (Light and Glare) Policy 48: Encourage the use of low-glare lighting to minimize nighttime glare effects on neighboring properties.	
Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element Section 1.10.10 (Oak Tree Conservation) Policy 66: Promote the conservation of oak tree woodlands for their environmental value and scenic beauty.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section design features and mitigation measures have been developed to ensure oak trees are protected or replaced where appropriate. **[May also refer to bio mitigation regarding oak tree replacement once available]**
Circulation Element Section 2.3.9 (Scenic Route Corridors) Policy 1: Kern County should consider designating local scenic highway routes, where appropriate, throughout the County.	**Consistent.** No specific routes are designated by the county in the plan or have been designated by the county since adoption of the plan. As discussed under AVQ Impact #2, the HSR project would not affect designated Scenic Highway corridors because no officially designated State Scenic Highways exist near the Build Alternatives. Design features and mitigation actions proposed would maintain local visual quality in a way that would not inhibit the future designation of potential local Scenic Highways.
Circulation Element Policy 2: Various methods of protecting, and enhancing the scenic qualities of land and uses within corridor boundaries must be devised and carried out.	
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (Kern County 2007)	
Land Use Element Policy 70: Encourage landscaping the banks of flood control channels, canals, roadways and other public improvements with trees to provide a strong visual element in the planning area.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section design features and mitigation measures have been developed to ensure proper landscaping along the HSR corridor. Mitigation Measure AVQ-MM#2a would integrate trees and landscaping into streetscapes to soften and buffer the appearance of guideways and columns. In addition, Mitigation Measure AVQ-MM#2c would screen at-grade and elevated guideways with trees adjacent to residential areas.

Land Use Element Policy 71: Promote the establishment of attractive entrances into communities, major districts, and transportation terminals, centers, and corridors within the planning area.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section design features and mitigation measures have been developed to promote the establishment of attractive entrances to HSR stations and corridors.
Land Use Element Policy 71: Encourage landscaping the banks of flood control channels, canals, roadways and other public improvements with trees to provide a strong visual element in the planning area.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section design features and mitigation measures have been developed to ensure proper landscaping along the HSR corridor. Mitigation Measure AVQ-MM#2a would integrate trees and landscaping into streetscapes to soften and buffer the appearance of guideways and columns. In addition, Mitigation Measure AVQ-MM#2c would screen at-grade and elevated guideways with trees adjacent to residential areas.
Land Use Element Policy 72: Promote the establishment of attractive entrances into communities, major districts, and transportation terminals, centers, and corridors within the planning area.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section design features and mitigation measures have been developed to promote the establishment of attractive entrances to HSR stations and corridors.
Tehachapi General Plan (City of Tehachapi 2012a)	
Town Form Element Objective 1: Preserve Tehachapi's natural beauty to enhance the small mountain town character.	**Consistent.** The HSR Build Alternatives would not traverse the Tehachapi town center but would pass approximately 1 mile to the east. Therefore, the HSR project would not substantially detract from the town's small, mountain town character. The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section design features and mitigation measures have been developed to protect the public realm.
Town Form Element Objective 3. Interconnect Tehachapi through an appropriately scaled and detailed public realm.	
Natural Resources Element Section A: Air Quality, Views, and Dark Skies – Objective 2: Protect views of the mountains.	**Consistent.** KVP 14 represents scenic views of the mountain ridges surrounding the city of Tehachapi. As shown on Figure 3.16-27, the HSR project would not significantly impact hillside views. The HSR Build Alternatives would not have a substantial adverse effect on valley-wide or within-town viewsheds, or on Tehachapi's small, mountain-town character.
Natural Resources Element Policy NR5: Maintain Tehachapi's small mountain town character through appropriate development standards that reflect the various intended physical contexts throughout the Planning Area.	
Natural Resources Element Policy NR6: Review development proposals with the approach that viewsheds are of two types: a) Valley-wide (natural) and, b) Within Town (urban and suburban) Accordingly, 'Valley-wide' viewsheds are from outside of town across the Planning Area while the second type 'Within Town' are primarily along streetscapes. This distinction is to be reflected in the appropriate development standards.	

Natural Resources Element Policy NR8: Support Kern County's efforts to make segments of SR 58 a scenic highway and as scenic as possible through corresponding thoroughfare and land use standards.	**Consistent.** No specific segments of SR 58 have been designated as a Scenic Highway. As discussed under AVQ Impact #2, the HSR project would not affect designated Scenic Highway corridors because no officially designated, State Scenic Highways exist near the Build Alternatives. Effects from certain viewpoints along SR 58 are discussed under AVQ Impact #3. With mitigation, all impacts from KVPs along SR 58 would be less than significant under CEQA and not adverse under NEPA. Consequentially, the HSR project would not inhibit the potential future designation of Scenic Highway status along SR 58.
Natural Resources Element Policy NR10. Promote streetscape standards that reflect the 'town' type of view-shed, including the issue of terminated vistas or open vistas depending upon the physical context and actual location within Tehachapi.	**Consistent.** Because the HSR Build Alternatives would be located outside the town center, they would not affect any major streetscapes in the City of Tehachapi.
Natural Resources Element Objective 4: Minimize Light Pollution	**Consistent.** As discussed under AVQ Impact #2, overhead lights on the HSR guideway are not proposed, and headlights from passing trains would only be fleeting at any one exposure and would be directed toward the tracks. The HSR project would not create new sources of substantial light or glare, and would not create glare effects on neighboring properties.
Natural Resources Element Policy NR14: Enforce Tehachapi's 'dark sky' protocol to preserve nighttime views, prevent light pollution, reduce light spillage both upward and onto adjoining properties.	
Natural Resources Element Policy NR15: Require that outdoor lighting not create or worsen incompatible situations.	
Tehachapi Zoning Code (Chapter 4.20.070 Hillside Development Standards)	
Provides for the reasonable use of hillsides and mountainous areas in non-transect zones while preventing the loss of aesthetic value. Requires that grading respect the natural contour of the existing terrain wherever possible and that all proposed drainage facilities respect the natural terrain, preserve major drainage channels in their natural state, and be designed in such a manner as to minimize soil erosion.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section design features and mitigation measures have been developed to ensure the reasonable grading of hillsides and mountainous areas. Mitigation Measure AVQ-MM#2i would minimize vertical cut slopes in the Tehachapi Mountains with retaining walls. The texture and color of these retaining walls would be designed to minimize visual contrast with the surrounding setting.
City of Lancaster General Plan 2030 (City of Lancaster 2009)	
Chapter 2, Plan for the Natural Environment: (Objective 3.8: Preserve and enhance important views within the city, and significant visual features that are visible from the city of Lancaster.	**Consistent.** As discussed under AVQ Impact #3 and illustrated in KVPs 22 through 25, none of the HSR Build Alternatives would block views of surrounding ridgelines or affect significant visual features. For all Build Alternatives, the HSR project would be built within or adjacent to an existing transportation corridor through the City of Lancaster.
Chapter 2, Plan for the Natural Environment: (Policy 3.8.1: Preserve views of surrounding ridgelines, slope areas and hilltops, and other scenic vistas.	
Chapter 2, Plan for the Natural Environment: (Specific Actions for Policy 3.8.1(a): Encourage the creation of vistas and view corridors of community or neighborhood value during the development review process, through the siting of buildings to avoid blocking views and view corridors.	

Chapter 2, Plan for the Natural Environment: (Policy 3.8.2: Explore the potential for establishing scenic corridors within the study area.	**Consistent.** The Lancaster General Plan does not establish any scenic corridors in the city, and none have been established since the plan's adoption. As described below, the Lancaster Master Environmental Assessment identifies local roadways that could potentially serve as scenic routes. The identified roadways are all over 1 mile from the proposed HSR Build Alternatives. Therefore, the HSR Build Alternatives would not affect views of, or from, these corridors should they ever be designated as scenic corridors by the city.
Chapter 3, Plan for Public Health and Safety Policy 4.3.3: Ensure that the provision of noise attenuation does not create significant negative visual impacts.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section design features and mitigation measures have been developed to ensure that sound walls do not create negative visual impacts. Mitigation Measure AVQ-MM#2g would provide sound barrier treatments so that sound walls do not reduce visual quality. Sound barriers can be made from transparent materials or could include surface design enhancements, such as landscaping, to blend with the area's visual context. Design considerations would be made during the final design stages.
Chapter 3, Plan for Public Health and Safety Specific Action for Policy 4.3.3(a): Site Design: Require landscaping treatment to be provided in conjunction with noise barriers to provide visual relief and to reduce aesthetic impacts.	
Chapter 8, Plan for Physical Development Policy 19.2.4: Provide buffers to soften the interface between conflicting land uses and intensities.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section design features and mitigation measures have been developed to provide visual buffers. Mitigation Measure AVQ-MM#2a would integrate trees and landscaping into the design of elevated guideways and roadway overcrossings to soften and buffer the appearance of these HSR features. In addition, Mitigation Measure AVQ-MM#2c would screen at-grade and elevated guideways with trees adjacent to residential areas. Mitigation Measure AVQA-MM#2b also would have the Authority work with affected jurisdictions to develop a project site and landscape design plan for areas disturbed by the project.
Lancaster Master Environmental Assessment (City of Lancaster 2009)	
Lists five scenic resources in the city: Foothills Area, Quartz Hill, Little Buttes, Piute Ponds, and Little Rock Wash. Identifies local roadways which could potentially serve as scenic routes: Antelope Valley Freeway between Avenues A to M, Avenue K from the Antelope Valley Freeway to 110th Street West, Avenue M between the Antelope Valley Freeway and 60th Street West, 60th Street West between Avenues K and M, and 90th Street West.	**Consistent.** As discussed under AVQ Impact #3, the HSR Build Alternatives would not affect any of the scenic resources listed. In addition, the identified roadways are all located over 1 mile from the proposed HSR Build Alternatives. Therefore, the HSR Build Alternatives would not affect views of, or from, these corridors should they ever be designated as scenic corridors by the city.
City of Palmdale General Plan (City of Palmdale 1993)	
Land Use Element Policy L1.4.3 protects visually prominent hillsides and ridgelines from inappropriate development and grading that would detract from the scenic character of these resources.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not involve development in the scenic San Gabriel, Sierra Pelona, Ritter, and Portal ridges south of Palmdale. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure AVQ-MM#2i would minimize vertical cut slopes in the Tehachapi Mountains to the north of Palmdale with retaining walls where appropriate. All HSR Build Alternatives also would be at- or below-grade through Palmdale and would not affect scenic viewsheds or alter the scenic backdrop of the city.

Environmental Resources Element Goal ER 1: Preserve significant natural and man-made open space areas that give Palmdale its distinct form and identity.	**Consistent.** All HSR Build Alternatives would be at- or below-grade through Palmdale and would not affect scenic viewsheds or alter the scenic backdrop of the city.
Environmental Resources Element Objective ER1.2: Protect scenic viewsheds both to and from the City of Palmdale.	
Environmental Resources Element Policy ER1.2.1: New development with the potential to substantially obscure or negatively alter the scenic backdrop to the City should be discouraged. "Scenic backdrop" refers to the significant ridgelines of the San Gabriels, the Sierra Pelona and the Ritter and Portal Ridges that form the City's skyline views.	
Community Design Element, Policies CD 1.1.1 through CD 10.9.2 discuss specific guidelines related to building design, materials, colors, placement, and architectural style in relation to surrounding buildings, as well as the appearance of walls, fences, and lighting proposed through the development process to improve the functional and aesthetic quality of the built environment.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section design features and mitigation measures have been developed to ensure context-sensitive design of HSR features.
Community Design Element, Prohibits removal of Joshua trees and other desert vegetation which add to community identity from any public or private property in the city except as provided by the Ordinance (Palmdale Municipal Code Section 14.04.040). Requires desert vegetation preservation plans for development proposals on sites containing native desert vegetation (Palmdale Municipal Code Section 14.04.050). *Palmdale Native Desert Vegetation Ordinance* (City of Palmdale Municipal Code, Chapter 14.04)	**Consistent.** The HSR Build Alternatives in Palmdale may involve the removal of Joshua trees and other native desert vegetation. Palmdale Municipal Code Section 14.04.040 would require that a desert vegetation preservation plan be submitted, including a site plan that depicts the location of each Joshua tree and California juniper, a site landscaping plan showing the proposed location of such desert vegetation, and a long-term maintenance program any desert vegetation preserved on-site. A minimum number of Joshua trees and California junipers must be preserved or transplanted to an off-site location or, as a last resort, an in-lieu fee for the preservation of native desert vegetation may be paid.
Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan (Los Angeles County 2015)	
Land Use Element , Policy LU 2.2: Except within economic opportunity areas, limit the amount of potential development within Scenic Resource Areas, including water features, significant ridgelines, and Hillside Management Areas, through appropriate land use designations, as indicated in the Land Use Policy Map (Map 2.1) of this Area Plan.	**Consistent.** The HSR Build Alternatives would not affect any Scenic Resource Areas identified in the Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan Land Use Element.
Conservation and Open Space Element, Goal COS 5: The Antelope Valley's scenic resources, including scenic drives, water features, significant ridgelines, buttes, and Hillside Management Areas, are enjoyed by future generations.	**Consistent.** The HSR Build Alternatives would not affect any scenic resources in the Antelope Valley as defined in Goal COS 5.

Conservation and Open Space Element, Policy COS 5.1: Identify and protect natural landforms and vistas with significant visual value, such as the California Poppy Preserve, by designating them as Scenic Resource Areas.	**Consistent.** The HSR Build Alternatives would not affect any natural landforms or vistas designated as Scenic Resource Areas.
Conservation and Open Space Element, Policy COS 5.2: Except within economic opportunity areas, limit the amount of potential development in Scenic Resource Areas through appropriate land use designations with very low densities in order to minimize negative impacts from future development.	
Conservation and Open Space Element, Policy COS 5.6: Restrict development on buttes and designated significant ridgelines by requiring appropriate buffer zones.	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not involve development on any buttes or designated significant ridgelines.
Conservation and Open Space Element, Policy COS 5.7: Ensure that incompatible development is discouraged in designated Scenic Drives by developing and implementing development standards and guidelines for development within identified viewsheds of these routes (Map 4.2: Antelope Valley Scenic Drives).	**Consistent.** There are no designated Scenic Drives in the vicinity of the Build Alternatives. The Build Alternatives would not affect views from any designated Scenic Drives.

Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority
CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act
HSR = high-speed rail
KVP = key viewpoint
NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act
SR = State Route

Table 3.1.A-22 Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis—Cultural Resources

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Kern County General Plan (2009), Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element			
General Provisions, Section 1.10.3, Policy 25: Promote the preservation of cultural and historic resources that constitute a heritage value to residents and visitors.	Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Not Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would affect cultural and historic resources. Therefore, the project is inconsistent with the county's policy of promoting preservation. This is not consistent with the policy calling for the preservation of cultural and historic resources with a heritage value. However, the Authority and the FRA are taking steps to identify and protect cultural and historic resources where possible during construction and operation of the project section, as outlined in General Mitigation Measures #1 and #2.
Kern County Municipal Code (2016)			
Title 17: Building and Construction			
17.48.370: A conditional use permit is required on Open Space (OS) districts to conduct scientific study of sites for the systematic exploration and classification of archaeological, anthropological, or historic artifacts or remains.	Kern County	All Build Alternatives	**Not Applicable.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section does not include a scientific study of sites for the systematic exploration and classification of cultural resources. In addition, as a state transportation project, the project section is not within the jurisdiction of the county to require a conditional use permit.
Title 19: Zoning			
19.64.130: Prior to the issuance of a construction permit on Wind Energy Combining Districts (WE), a plot plan must be prepared for review and approval by the Planning Director, which will include the location and extent of archaeological sites.	Kern County	N/A	**Not Applicable.** The city is not an agency with jurisdiction over the project to require a plot plan. However, the city would be consulted during the public review process. **[need local GIS data on zoning overlays to determine consistency status]**
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (2007), Land Use Element			
Policy 5: Provide for streetscape improvements, landscape, and signage which uniquely identify major and/or historic residential neighborhoods (I-8).	Bakersfield	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect Kern County's policy of providing for streetscape improvements, landscaping, and signage to identify historic residential neighborhoods within the metropolitan Bakersfield planning area.
Policy 7: Provide for the retention of historic residential neighborhoods as identified in the Historical Resources Element if adopted by the City of Bakersfield (I-1, I-6, I-8).	Bakersfield	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect Kern County's policy of providing for the retention of historic residential neighborhoods within the metropolitan Bakersfield planning area.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy 27: Require that new commercial uses maintain visual compatibility with single-family residences in areas designated for historic preservation (I-1, I-6, I-8).	Bakersfield	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section is a regional transportation project; it is not a commercial development project.
Policy 72: Promote the creation of both residential and commercial historic districts, and encourage the upgrading of historic structures (I-1, I-6, I-8).	Bakersfield	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect Kern County's policy of promoting the creation of both residential and commercial historic districts, and encouraging the upgrading of historic structures.
Policy 104: As part of the environmental review procedure, an evaluation of the significance of paleontological, archaeological, and historical resources and the impact of proposed development on those resources shall be conducted and appropriate mitigation and monitoring included for development projects.	Bakersfield	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** This section of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Draft EIR/EIS provides an evaluation of the significance of archaeological and historical resources, and the project section's impact on those resources. The evaluation of significant resources and impacts on these resources in this section is based on the confidential ASR, as well as the HASR (Appendix A) prepared for the project section. An evaluation of paleontological resources has been undertaken in Section 3.9, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources, of this EIR/EIS. Furthermore, the Authority and FRA have established mitigation measures as part of the environmental review procedure, which includes archaeological training and monitoring during construction **[insert MM numbers when analysis is complete]**.
Policy 105: Development on land containing known archaeological resources (i.e., high sensitivity areas) shall utilize methodology set forth, as described necessary by a qualified archaeologist, to locate proposed structures, paving, landscaping, and fill dirt in such a way as to preserve these resources undamaged for future generations when it is the recommendation of a qualified archaeologist that said resources be preserved in situ.	Bakersfield	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** This section of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Draft EIR/EIS identifies land containing known archaeological resources that may be impacted by the project section and methodology to preserve these resources. The identification of high-sensitivity areas provided in this section is based on the confidential ASR prepared for the project section. The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would incorporate the recommendations of a qualified archaeologist if development would occur within areas with known archaeological resources (i.e., high-sensitivity areas).

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy 106: The preservation of significant historical resources as identified on Table 4.10-1 shall be encouraged by developing and implementing incentives such as building and planning application permit fee waivers, Mills Act contracts, grants and loans, implementing the State Historic Building Code and other incentives as identified in the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance.	Bakersfield	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the City of Bakersfield's policy of encouraging the preservation of significant historical resources by developing and implementing incentives.
Policy 107: The preservation of significant historical resources shall be promoted and other public agencies or private organizations shall be encouraged to assist in the purchase and/or relocation of sites, buildings, and structures deemed to be of historical significance.	Bakersfield	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the county's policy of promoting the preservation of significant historical resources and encouraging public agencies or private organizations to assist in the preservation of sites, buildings, and structures deemed to be of historical significance.
City of Bakersfield Municipal Code			
Title 15, Chapter 15.72: The Historic Preservation Commission must approve alteration or demolition of a designated cultural resource or of property within a historic district to ensure that it would not adversely affect the special character or special historical, architectural or aesthetic interest of the structure and its neighboring structures and surroundings.	Bakersfield	All Build Alternatives	**Not Consistent.** While the city is not an agency with jurisdiction over the project, the city would be consulted during the public review process. If the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section results in the alteration or demolition of a cultural resource or property within a historic district, the Authority would take steps to minimize or mitigate adverse effects to the property's special character or historical, architectural, or aesthetic interest in compliance with Section 106, CEQA, and NEPA. These steps are outlined in General Avoidance Measures #1 and #2 and General Mitigation Measures #1 and #2.
City of Arvin General Plan Update, Conservation and Open Space Element (2012)			
Policy CO-2.7: Encourage conservation and promotion of the City's historical and cultural resources as a part of the City's broader goal to develop public spaces for the enjoyment and well-being of residents.	Arvin	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of encouraging conservation of and promoting the city's historical and cultural resources as part of the city's broader goal to develop public spaces for the enjoyment and well-being of residents.
City of Arvin Municipal Code			
Title 15, Chapter 15.32.050: Historic structures are defined.	Arvin	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not result in a change to the definitions of historic structures as provided in Title 15 of the municipal code.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Golden Hills Specific Plan (1986), Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element			
Policy 5: Construction must be stopped if buried remains are unearthed during construction until a qualified archaeologist has had the opportunity to evaluate the find and make necessary recommendations.	Golden Hills	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Work would be halted in the event of a discovery during construction of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate and make recommendations. These are outlined in IAMFs #1 through #5 and General Mitigation Measures #3 through #5.
Rosamond Specific Plan (2008), Land Use Element			
Policies 1.14, 2.19, 3.16: Require cultural resources report for those areas with a high probability for prehistoric activity.	Rosamond	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The cultural resources analysis in this section is based on the confidential ASR, as well as the HASR (Appendices A and B), each of which qualifies as a cultural resources report, and would be completed as part of the environmental review of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section.
Mojave Specific Plan (2003), Housing and Community Development Element			
Objective 7.2: Preserve and expand historical and community resources in Mojave.	Mojave	All Build Alternatives	**Not Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of historical resources in Mojave. **[confirm impact once the analysis has been completed].** This is not consistent with the objective of preserving and expanding cultural and historic resources in Mojave. However, the Authority and FRA are taking steps to identify and protect cultural and historic resources during construction and operation of the project section, in compliance with federal and state regulations, by conducting cultural resource inventories; implementing protective measures (including conducting archaeological training and monitoring during construction and preserving sites in place where feasible); conducting archaeological test excavations; and undertaking building stabilization or historic structure relocation, as outlined in General Mitigation Measures #1 through #5.
Policy 7.2.1: Support private efforts to enhance and promote historical and community resources	Mojave	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the community of Mojave's policy of supporting private efforts to enhance and promote historical and community resources.
Policy 7.2.2: Encourage participation by all members of the community	Mojave	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect Mojave's policy of encouraging community members to participate in the preservation and expansion of historical and community resources.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
City of Tehachapi General Plan (2012), Natural Resources Element			
Objective 1: Asserts that archaeological and paleontological resources are important and integral to Tehachapi's future	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The lead agencies of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section recognize the importance of archaeological and paleontological resources to Tehachapi and would incorporate measures to mitigate any potential impacts to these resources. An evaluation of archaeological resources has been undertaken in this section. Furthermore, an evaluation of paleontological resources has been undertaken in Section 3.9, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources, of this EIR/EIS.
Objective 2: Protect archaeological and paleontological resources	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not result in impacts to known archaeological resources within the city. However, unknown or unrecorded archaeological resources that are not observable when conducting standard surface archaeological inspection, including subsurface buried archaeological deposits, may exist within urbanized or rural areas. This is not consistent with the objective of protecting archaeological resources. The Authority and the FRA are taking steps to identify and protect cultural and historic resources during construction and operation of the project section, in compliance with federal and state regulations, by conducting cultural resource inventories; implementing protective measures (including conducting archaeological training and monitoring during construction and preserving sites in place where feasible); conducting archaeological test excavations; and undertaking building stabilization or historic structure relocation, as outlined in General Mitigation Measures #1 through #5. Furthermore, an evaluation of paleontological resources has been undertaken in Section 3.9, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources, of this EIR/EIS.
Policy NR40: Incorporate archaeological and paleontological resources into public space, as practical.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of incorporating archaeological and paleontological resources into public space, as practical. For information on paleontological resources, refer to Section 3.9, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources, of this EIR/EIS.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy NR41: Incorporate archaeological and paleontological resources into the community's identity and marketing.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of incorporating archaeological and paleontological resources into the community's identity and marketing. For information on paleontological resources, refer to Section 3.9, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources, of this EIR/EIS.
Policy NR42: Maintain a step in the development process for evaluating the potential for archaeological and paleontological resources.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** This section of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Draft EIR/EIS provides an evaluation of the potential for archaeological and paleontological resources. The evaluation of significant resources and impacts on these resources in this section is based on the confidential ASR, as well as the HASR (Appendix A). An evaluation of paleontological resources has been undertaken in Section 3.9, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources, of this EIR/EIS. Furthermore, the Authority and the FRA have established mitigation measures (General Mitigation Measures #1 through #5) as part of the environmental review procedure, which includes archaeological training and monitoring during construction
Policy NR43: Maintain that excavation, exploration and documentation of archaeological and paleontological sites be conducted only by recognized authorities by applicable State laws.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Archaeological and paleontological sites have been explored and documented by a qualified archaeologist. The evaluation of significant resources and impacts on these resources in this section is based on the confidential ASR, as well as the HASR (refer to Appendix A. An evaluation of paleontological resources has been undertaken in Section 3.9, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources, of this EIR/EIS. Furthermore, the Authority and the FRA have established mitigation measures (General Mitigation Measures #1 through #5) as part of the environmental review procedure, which includes archaeological training and monitoring during construction. Excavation, if necessary, will be conducted by a qualified archaeologist.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy NR44: Maintain that in the event of discovering an archaeological or paleontological site, that the appropriate authorities and parties be notified according to established procedures and applicable State laws.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** In the event of an archaeological discovery during construction of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section, work would be halted and a qualified archaeologist would be notified to begin an evaluation of its significance per established state procedure (General Mitigation Measures #3 through #5). Consistent with Stipulation XIII of the Section 106 PA, if human remains are discovered on state-owned or private lands, the Authority shall contact the relevant county coroner or medical examiner, and shall contact the NAHC to identify the appropriate tribal representative if the remains are of Native American origin. An evaluation of paleontological resources has been undertaken in Section 3.9, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources, of this EIR/EIS.
City of Tehachapi General Plan (2012), Civic Health and Culture Element			
Objective 6: Appropriately manage archaeological and paleontological sites important to the community's heritage.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of appropriately managing archaeological sites important to the community's heritage. The evaluation of significant resources and impacts on these resources in this section is based on the confidential ASR, as well as the HASR (Appendix A). An evaluation of paleontological resources has been undertaken in Section 3.9, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources, of this EIR/EIS. Furthermore, the Authority and the FRA have established mitigation measures as part of the environmental review procedure, which includes archaeological training and monitoring during construction (General Mitigation Measures #3 through #5).
Policy CH20: Regularly update and reflect in all appropriate documents, any mapping regarding archaeological and paleontological sites.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of regularly updating city mapping documents.
Policy CH21: Integrate the preservation of archaeological and paleontological resources into the planning and development process as early as possible.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The identification and assessment of archaeological resources was initiated early in the planning process and is intended to integrate the preservation of archaeological resources into the planning process for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section. Furthermore, the Authority and FRA have established mitigation measures as part of the environmental review procedure, which includes archaeological training and monitoring during construction. An evaluation of paleontological resources has been undertaken in Section 3.9, Geology, Soils,

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
			Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources, of this EIR/EIS.
Policy CH22: Manage the discovery of human remains and the protection of archaeological deposits in accordance with local, State, and Federal requirements as well as through communication with descendant communities.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** In the event of archaeological discovery during construction, work would be halted and an archaeologist would begin an evaluation of its significance per established state and federal procedures. Consistent with Stipulation XIII of the PA, if human remains are discovered on state-owned or private lands, the Authority shall contact the relevant county coroner or medical examiner, and shall contact the NAHC to identify the appropriate descendant communities if the remains are of Native American origin (General Mitigation Measures #3 through #5).
Policy CH23: Maintain the City zoning code to reflect current local, State and Federal requirements for the discovery of human remains.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of maintaining the zoning code for consistency with local, state, and federal requirements for the discovery of human remains.
Policy CH24: Maintain local requirements for archaeological and historical analyses, studies and reports.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of maintaining local requirements for archaeological and historical analyses, studies, and reports.
Policy CH25: Provide for the passive interpretation of paleontology and prehistoric and historical archaeology throughout town, as physically appropriate.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of providing for the passive interpretation of prehistoric and historic archaeology within the city.
City of Tehachapi General Plan (2012), Town Form Element			
Objective 5: Shape and activate Tehachapi's public realm through town-scaled buildings.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not result in the construction of buildings within the city's public realm. Rather, all infrastructure and buildings would be constructed within a 100-foot fenced right-of-way from the project footprint and would be set back at least 50 feet from the city's public realm. Thus, the project section would not affect the city's policy of shaping and activating the public realm through town-scaled buildings.
Policy TF17: Maintain the location of historic resources on the zoning map to fully inform decision-making and to integrate such resources into new development or regeneration.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of maintaining historic resources on the zoning map to fully inform decision making and to integrate such resources into new development or regeneration.
Policy TF18: Enable historic buildings to be fiscally viable through an adaptive re-use ordinance.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of enabling the fiscal viability of historic buildings through an adaptive reuse ordinance.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Objective 8: Realize relevant and high-quality architecture.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be constructed within a fenced right-of-way 100 feet from the project footprint. All structures would be set back at least 50 feet from the city's public realm and would not affect the city's objective of realizing relevant and high-quality architecture.
Policy TF29: Require that architectural details bear a close relationship to the historic and geographic details of Tehachapi's regional architecture.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would be constructed within a fenced right-of-way 100 feet from the project footprint. All structures would be set back at least 50 feet from the city's public realm and would not affect the city's policy of ensuring that architectural elements of development projects are consistent with historic and geographic elements of Tehachapi's regional architecture.
Greater Tehachapi Area Specific Plan (2010), Conservation and Open Space Element			
Goal COS.7: Promote the protection of archeological and historic resources that are important to the culture and history of the Greater Tehachapi Area.	Golden Hills	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the county's policy of promoting historical resources that are important to the culture and history of the Greater Tehachapi Area.
Policy COS.30: Discretionary projects may be required to provide a Cultural Resources Records Search prepared by the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC), and a Phase I, Phase II, or Phase III Cultural Assessments as applicable. If paleontological resources are anticipated to occur, a Paleontological Resource Mitigation Plan must be prepared.	Golden Hills	All Build Alternatives	**Not Consistent.** Although Kern County is not an agency with jurisdiction over the project and would not have the authority to dictate archaeological requirements, a records search from the SSJVIC and a detailed assessment of cultural resources have been conducted for archaeological and built resources within this section. The records search and assessment are described in the HASR, the HPSR, and the confidential ASR. An evaluation of paleontological resources has been undertaken in Section 3.9, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources, of this EIR/EIS.
City of Tehachapi Municipal Code			
Title 13, Chapter 13.24.060: Defines the definition of historic structures.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the definition of "historic structures" in Title 13 of the municipal code.
Title 15, Chapter 15.12.230: The variance procedure for the reconstruction, rehabilitation or restoration of structures listed in the National Register of Historic Places or the State Inventory of Historic Places has fewer criteria then the variance procedure for reconstruction of other structures.	Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the variance procedure for the reconstruction or restoration of historic structures as provided in Title 15 of the municipal code.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Los Angeles County General Plan (2015), Conservation and Natural Resources Element			
Goal C/NR 14: Protect historic, cultural, and paleontological resources.	Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Not Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of cultural and historic resources. This is not consistent with the policy calling for the protection of cultural and historic resources. However, the Authority and the FRA are taking steps to identify and protect cultural and historic resources during construction and operation of the project section, in compliance with federal and state regulations, by conducting cultural resource inventories; implementing protective measures (including conducting archaeological training and monitoring during construction and preserving sites in place where feasible); conducting archaeological test excavations; and undertaking building stabilization or historic structure relocation, as outlined in General Mitigation Measures #1 through #5.
Policy C/NR 14.1: Mitigate all impacts from new development on or adjacent to historic, cultural, and paleontological resources to the greatest extent feasible.	Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority and FRA are taking steps to mitigate all impacts from the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section on cultural and historic resources during construction and operation of the project section, in compliance with federal and state regulations, by conducting cultural resource inventories; implementing protective measures (including conducting archaeological training and monitoring during construction and preserving sites in place where feasible); conducting archaeological test excavations; and undertaking building stabilization or historic structure relocation, as outlined in General Mitigation Measures #1 through #5**.**
Policy C/NR 14.2: Support an inter-jurisdictional collaborative system that protects and enhances historic, cultural, and paleontological resources.	Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the county's policy of supporting an interjurisdictional, collaborative system that protects and enhances historic and cultural resources. Furthermore, the Authority and the FRA have established mitigation measures (General Mitigation Measures #1 through #5) as part of the environmental review procedure, which includes archaeological training and monitoring during construction. An evaluation of paleontological resources has been undertaken in Section 3.9, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources, of this EIR/EIS.
Policy C/NR 14.3: Support the preservation and rehabilitation of historic buildings.	Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the county's policy of supporting the preservation and rehabilitation of historic buildings.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy C/NR 14.4: Ensure proper notification procedures to Native American tribes in accordance with Senate Bill 18 (2004).	Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority and the FRA are notifying Native American tribes in compliance with the policy of ensuring the proper notification procedures to Native American tribes, as well as all applicable federal and state regulations (see discussion on Native American Outreach and Coordination in Section 3.17.4.1).
Policy C/NR 14.5: Promote public awareness of historic, cultural, and paleontological resources.	Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the county's policy of promoting public awareness of historic and cultural resources.
Policy C/NR 14.6: Ensure proper notification and recovery processes are carried out for development on or near historic, cultural, and paleontological resources.	Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Authority and the FRA are following proper notification procedures in compliance with the policy of ensuring proper notification procedures are carried out, as well as all federal and state regulations applicable to the notification process (Section 3.17.2). In addition, all recovery efforts, as necessary, will follow proper procedure (General Mitigation Measures #4 and #5).
Los Angeles County General Plan (2015), Conservation and Natural Resources Element			
Goal P/R 5: Protection of historical and natural resources on County park properties.	Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not result in the loss of historical resources on county park properties. However, unknown or unrecorded archaeological resources that are not observable when conducting standard surface archaeological inspection, including subsurface buried archaeological deposits, may exist within urbanized or rural areas. This is not consistent with the policy calling for the protection of historical and natural resources on county park properties. The Authority and FRA are taking steps to identify and protect cultural and historic resources during construction and operation of the project section, in compliance with federal and state regulations, by conducting cultural resource inventories; implementing protective measures (including conducting archaeological training and monitoring during construction and preserving sites in place where feasible); conducting archaeological test excavations; and undertaking building stabilization or historic structure relocation, as outlined in General Mitigation Measures #1 through #5.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy P/R 5.1: Preserve historic resources on County park properties, including buildings, collections, landscapes, bridges, and other physical features.	Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not result in the loss of historical resources on county park properties. Unknown or unrecorded archaeological resources that are not observable when conducting standard surface archaeological inspection, including subsurface buried archaeological deposits, may exist within urbanized or rural areas. This is not consistent with the policy calling for the preservation of historic resources on county park properties. However, the Authority and FRA are taking steps to identify and protect cultural and historic resources during construction and operation of the project section, in compliance with federal and state regulations, by conducting cultural resource inventories; implementing protective measures (including conducting archaeological training and monitoring during construction and preserving sites in place where feasible); conducting archaeological test excavations; and undertaking building stabilization or historic structure relocation, as outlined in General Mitigation Measures #1 through #5.
Policy P/R 5.2: Expand the collection of historical resources under the jurisdiction of the County, where appropriate.	Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the county's policy of expanding the historical resources under the county's jurisdiction.
Policy P/R 5.4: Ensure maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction of historical resources in County parks and recreational facilities are carried out in a manner consistent with the most current Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings.	Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Not Applicable.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect historical resources in county parks and recreational facilities.
Los Angeles County General Plan (2015), Land Use Element			
Zoning Overlays: Special Management Areas require additional development regulations due to the presence of natural resources, scenic resources, or identified hazards. Historic, Cultural and Paleontological Resources is one Special Management Area.	Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives **[need local GIS data on zoning overlays to verify]**	**Consistent.** The county is not an agency with jurisdiction to require additional development regulations of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section. However, the project will comply with state and federal laws governing cultural resources, and the county would be consulted during the public review process.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Los Angeles County Municipal Code			
Title 22 Chapter 22.44.1570: provides relevant definitions and requirements, including a cultural resource review prior to the issuance of any necessary permits, a Phase II evaluation (if applicable), Phase III Mitigation Programs (if applicable), procedures for cataloging and filing information and required steps when any archaeological discoveries are made during the course of construction for a project.	Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** While the county is not an agency with jurisdiction over the project, it would be consulted during the public review process. In addition, the Authority and FRA are taking steps to identify and protect cultural and historic resources during construction and operation of the project section, in compliance with federal and state regulations, by conducting cultural resource inventories; cataloging and filing information, identifying mitigation measures, and complying with state and federal regulations if any archaeological discoveries are made during construction (General Mitigation Measures #1 through #5).
Title 22 Chapter 22.44.3000: Establishes historical districts and sets development standards for historic districts.	Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Not Applicable.** The county is not an agency with jurisdiction over the project and would not have the authority to dictate requirements to ensure compatibility with historic districts. However, the city would be consulted during the public review process.
Title 22 Chapter 22.52: Provides an incentive for owner of qualified historic properties within the unincorporated areas of the County to preserve, restore and rehabilitate the historic character of such properties.	Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the county's policy of providing incentives for owners of historic properties.
City of Lancaster General Plan (2009), Plan for the Natural Environment			
Specific Action 3.4.1(e): Work with Los Angeles County and other public agencies to accept dedication of open space lands of regional significance, including watersheds, wildlife habitats, wetlands, historic sites, and scenic lands. The City shall also encourage private entities to preserve open space lands.	Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of dedicating open space and historic sites in collaboration with Los Angeles County and other public agencies.
City of Lancaster General Plan (2009), Plan for Active Living			
Goal 12: To promote community appreciation for the unique history of the Antelope Valley and the City of Lancaster and to promote community involvement in the protection, preservation, and restoration of the area's significant cultural, historical, or architectural features.	Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect Kern County's policy of promoting community appreciation for cultural, historical, and architectural features.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Objective 12.1: Identify and preserve and/or restore those features of cultural, historical, or architectural significance.	Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Not Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of features of cultural, historic, or architectural interest. This is not consistent with the policy calling for the preservation of features of cultural, historic, or architectural significance. However, the Authority and FRA are taking steps to identify and protect cultural and historic resources during construction and operation of the project section, in compliance with federal and state regulations, by conducting cultural resource inventories; implementing protective measures (including conducting archaeological training and monitoring during construction and preserving sites in place where feasible); conducting archaeological test excavations; and undertaking building stabilization or historic structure relocation, as outlined in General Mitigation Measures #1 through #5.
Policy 12.1.1: Preserve features and sites of significant historical and cultural value consistent with their intrinsic and scientific values.	Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Not Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of features of cultural, historic, or architectural interest. This is not consistent with the policy calling for the preservation of features and sites of significant historical and cultural value. However, the Authority and FRA are taking steps to identify and protect cultural and historic resources during construction and operation of the project section, in compliance with federal and state regulations, by conducting cultural resource inventories; implementing protective measures (including conducting archaeological training and monitoring during construction and preserving sites in place where feasible); conducting archaeological test excavations; and undertaking building stabilization or historic structure relocation, as outlined in General Mitigation Measures #1 through #5.
Specific Action 12.1.1(a): As part of the CEQA review process, require site-specific historical, archaeological, and/or paleontological studies when there exists a possibility that significant environmental impacts might result or when there is a lack of sufficient documentation on which to determine potential impacts.	Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section includes site-specific historical and archaeological studies conducted in accordance with CEQA regulations. Furthermore, an evaluation of paleontological resources has been undertaken in Section 3.9, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources, of this EIR/EIS.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Specific Action 12.1.1(b): Include a condition of approval on all development projects that address State and Federal regulations with respect to the disposition of cultural resources.	Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of including a condition of approval on all development projects that addresses state and federal regulations with respect to the disposition of cultural resources.
Specific Action 12.1.1(c): Process requests for inclusion in state and federal historic registers those historic and prehistoric sites and features which meet state or federal criteria.	Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of processing requests for inclusion in state and federal historic registers.
Specific Action 12.1.1(d): Prior to permitting demolition of any historic structure, require that an evaluation of the condition of the structure, potential adaptive reuse of the structure, and the cost of rehabilitation be undertaken.	Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** While the city is not an agency with jurisdiction over the project, it would be consulted during the public review process. In addition, the Authority and FRA would undertake an evaluation of the condition of the structure and feasible methods to minimize or mitigate effects from the project section in compliance with Section 106, CEQA, and NEPA.
Specific Action 12.1.1(e): Work with area school districts and historical/ archaeological/paleontological preservation support groups to establish educational programs related to all phases of Lancaster's cultural and historical heritage.	Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of establishing historical resource educational programs.
Policy 19.3.4: Preserve and protect important areas of historic and cultural interest that serve as visible reminders of the City's social and architectural history.	Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Not Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would result in the loss of areas of historic and cultural interest. This is not consistent with the policy calling for the preservation of areas that serve as visible reminders of the city's social and architectural history. However, the Authority and FRA are taking steps to identify and protect cultural and historic resources during construction and operation of the project section, in compliance with federal and state regulations, by conducting cultural resource inventories; implementing protective measures (including conducting archaeological training and monitoring during construction and preserving sites in place where feasible); conducting archaeological test excavations; and undertaking building stabilization or historic structure relocation, as outlined in General Mitigation Measures #1 through #3.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Specific Action 19.3.4: Through the development review process, apply Community Design guidelines that incorporate site-sensitive building design techniques into developments that shall integrate harmoniously into the community to preserve areas of historic and cultural interest.	Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Not Consistent.** Although the city is not an agency with jurisdiction over the project and would not have the authority to dictate requirements to ensure compatibility with specific community design guidelines, the city will be consulted as part of the public review process.
City of Lancaster Code of Ordinances			
Title 17 Chapter 17.40: Defines a historic structure and outlines the requirements and procedures for obtaining a variance for the repair or rehabilitation of historic structures.	Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not result in a change to the definition of a historic structure as provided in Title 17 of the municipal code. In addition, while the city is not an agency with jurisdiction over the project, it would be consulted during the public review process.
City of Palmdale General Plan (1993), Environmental Resources Element			
Goal ER7: Protect historical and culturally significant resources which contribute to the community's sense of history.	Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not result in the loss of known historical and culturally significant resources. This is consistent with the policy calling for the protection of these resources that contribute to the community's sense of history. Additionally, the Authority and FRA are taking steps to identify and protect cultural and historic resources during construction and operation of the project section, in compliance with federal and state regulations, by conducting cultural resource inventories; implementing protective measures (including conducting archaeological training and monitoring during construction and preserving sites in place where feasible); conducting archaeological test excavations; and undertaking building stabilization or historic structure relocation, as outlined in General Mitigation Measures #1 through #5.
Objective ER7.1: Promote the identification and preservation of historic structures, historic sites, archaeological sites, and paleontological resources in the City.	Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of promoting the identification and preservation of historic structures, historic sites, archaeological sites, and paleontological resources in the city.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Policy ER7.1.3: Require that new development protect significant historic, paleontological, or archaeological resources, or provide for other appropriate mitigation.	Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** While the city is not an agency with jurisdiction over the project, it would be consulted during the public review process. In addition, the Authority and FRA are taking steps to identify and protect cultural and historic resources during construction and operation of the project section, in compliance with federal and state regulations, by conducting cultural resource inventories; implementing protective measures (including conducting archaeological training and monitoring during construction and preserving sites in place where feasible); conducting archaeological test excavations; and undertaking building stabilization or historic structure relocation, as outlined in General Mitigation Measures #1 through #5.
Policy ER7.1.4: Develop and maintain a cultural sensitivity map. Require special studies/surveys to be prepared for any development proposals in areas reasonably suspected of containing cultural resources, or as indicated on the sensitivity map.	Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Because the county is not an agency with jurisdiction over the project, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section is not consistent with the policy of maintaining a cultural sensitivity map. However, the city would be consulted during the public review process. In addition, the Authority and FRA have prepared in-depth analyses within this section, the HASR, the HPSR, and the confidential ASR.
Policy ER7.1.5: When human remains, suspected to be of Native American origin are discovered, cooperate with the Native American Heritage Commission and any local Native American groups to determine the most appropriate disposition of the human remains and any associated grave goods.	Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Consistent with Stipulation XIII of the Section 106 PA, if human remains of Native American origin are discovered on state-owned or private lands, the Authority shall contact the NAHC to identify the appropriate descendant communities to determine the most appropriate disposition option, as described in General Mitigation Measures #4 and #5.
Policy ER7.1.8: Discourage historic landmark properties from being altered in such a manner as to significantly reduce their cultural value to the community. (General Plan Amendment 04-01, adopted by City Council April 14, 2004.)	Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of discouraging historic landmark properties from being altered in such a manner as to significantly reduce their cultural value.
City of Palmdale General Plan (1993), Public Services Element			
Goal PS7: Provide for open space elements throughout the planning area which preserve significant natural, historic, scenic and topographic features while minimizing fiscal impacts to the City and its residents.	Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** Although the city is not an agency with jurisdiction over the project and would not have the authority to dictate open space, it will be consulted as part of the public review process for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section.

Policy/Goal/Objective	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Objective PS7.1: Ensure that any land proposed for acquisition, dedication or that is maintained by the City will contribute benefits to the general public, and that short- and long-term impacts of accepting responsibility for such land are adequately evaluated by the City.	Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's objective of ensuring that land acquired, dedicated, or maintained by the city will contribute benefits to the general public, and that the impacts of acquisition are weighed by the city.
Policy PS7.1.1: Evaluate proposed dedications of land or easements to the City for various purposes based on criteria including whether the proposed area contains biotic, historic, or cultural resources of local or regional significance or whether the site represents a natural and scenic resource to the City.	Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of basing land acquisitions on criteria that include whether the area contains biotic, historic, or cultural resources.
City of Palmdale Municipal Code			
Title 15 Chapter 15.28: Repairs of structures listed on the National Register of Historic Places or a State Inventory of Historic Places are exempted from being designated as "Substantial improvement."	Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of exempting work done on structures listed on the National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historical Resources from being designated as "Substantial Improvement."
Title 14 Chapter 14.05.030: Registered local, State or Federal historical sites are exempted from the requirements of Chapter 14.05, Water Efficient Landscape.	Palmdale	All Build Alternatives	**Consistent.** The Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section would not affect the city's policy of exempting historical sites from the requirements of Chapter 14.05.

ASR = Archaeological Survey Report
Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority
CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act
EIR/EIS = Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement
FRA = Federal Railroad Administration
HASR = Historic Architectural Survey Report
NAHC = Native American Heritage Commission
NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act
PA = Programmatic Agreement
SSJVIC = Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center

Table 2-H-23 Consistency with Regional and Local Policies—Regional Growth

Plan	Segments	Alternatives	Consistency
Kern Council of Governments 2014 Regional Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Community Strategy (2014)	City of Bakersfield, City of Tehachapi, Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	Consistent
Southern California Association of Government's 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016)	City of Lancaster, City of Palmdale, Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives and the Palmdale Station	Consistent
Kern County General Plan (2009): Circulation Element and Land Use, Conservation, and Open Space Element	Unincorporated Kern County	All Build Alternatives	Consistent
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (2016): Land Use Element, Circulation Element, Conservation Element, and Open Space Element	City of Bakersfield	All Build Alternatives and the Bakersfield Station	Consistent
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (Unincorporated Planning Area) (2007): Land Use Element, Circulation Element, Conservation Element, and Open Space Element	Unincorporated Kern County/ Community of Edison	All Build Alternatives	Consistent
City of Tehachapi General Plan (2012): Town Form Element, Mobility Element, Public Realm Element, and Natural Resources Element	City of Tehachapi	All Build Alternatives	Consistent
Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (2015): Land Use Element, Mobility Element, Conservation and Natural Resources Element, and Parks and Recreation Element	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	Consistent
Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan (2015): Land Use Element, Mobility Element, and Conservation and Open Space Element	Unincorporated Los Angeles County	All Build Alternatives	Consistent
City of Lancaster General Plan 2030 (2009): Plan for the Natural Environment, Plan for Physical Mobility, and Plan for Physical Development	City of Lancaster	All Build Alternatives	Consistent
City of Palmdale General Plan (2013): Circulation Element, Land Use Element, Environmental Resources Element, Community Design Element, and Parks, Recreation, and Trails Element	City of Palmdale	All Build Alternatives and the Palmdale Station	Consistent

Table 2-H-24 Local General and Specific Plans—Regional Growth

Kern County	
Kern County General Plan (Kern County 2009)	The Kern County General Plan was adopted in 2004 and amended in 2009. The plan's Land Use, Conservation, and Open Space Element considers a 20-year planning horizon and provides for a variety of land uses for future economic growth, while also ensuring the conservation of Kern County's agricultural, natural, and resource attributes. Objectives of the General Plan encourage economic development that creates jobs and capital investments in urban and rural areas, and prompt new development to use existing infrastructure and services wherever feasible in the county's urban areas. In addition, the General Plan includes policies intended to protect environmental resources and the development of adequate infrastructure, with specific emphasis on conserving agricultural areas, discouraging unplanned urban growth, ensuring water supplies and acceptable quality for future growth, and addressing air quality issues.
City of Bakersfield	
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (City of Bakersfield and County of Kern 2016)	The planning area for the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan includes the city of Bakersfield and additional unincorporated areas of Kern County. The plan was adopted in 2002 with a 2020 planning horizon, and most recently amended in 2016. The City of Bakersfield does not have its own general plan. The area covered by the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan is the same as the Bakersfield Metropolitan Priority Area of the Kern County General Plan. The Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan includes policies to provide for a mix of land uses that meet the diverse needs of residents; offer a variety of employment opportunities; capitalize, enhance, and expand upon existing physical and economic assets; and allow for the capture of regional growth. The General Plan defines the sphere of influence boundaries for planned urban growth and includes policies for land development to encourage people to live and work in the same area, serving to minimize sprawl and reduce traffic, travel time, infrastructure costs, and air pollution.
City of Tehachapi	
Tehachapi General Plan 2035 (City of Tehachapi 2012)	The Tehachapi General Plan was adopted in May 2013 with an initial planning horizon of 2035. The plan applies to 16,871 acres in and outside of Tehachapi's incorporated boundaries, referred to as the sphere of influence. The main goal of the plan is to maintain the quality of life and unique character of Tehachapi as a small, vibrant, and sustainable mountain town. The plan guides development to 2035 with polices in a variety of categories: town form, mobility, the public realm, economic vitality, natural resources, sustainable infrastructure, civic health and culture, and community safety. The Greater Tehachapi Area Specific Plan informs this General Plan with the updated community vision and direction for the 9,906-acre-unincorporated area surrounding Tehachapi and in the Tehachapi sphere of Influence.
Kern County—Unincorporated Areas	
Keene Ranch Specific Plan (County of Kern 1997)	The Keene Ranch Specific Plan was adopted in 1991 and amended in 1997. This specific plan identifies issues that pertain to physical constraints on land use, the provision of public services, and the various land uses such as residential, commercial, and wildlife resources in the planning area. The plan places specific emphasis on maintaining the rural character of the area and ensuring the safety of residents.

Greater Tehachapi Area Specific and Community Plan (County of Kern 2010a)	The Greater Tehachapi Area Specific and Community Plan was adopted in 2010 to provide guidance through 2030. This specific plan designates the proposed distribution, pattern, character, and extent of land uses, including anticipated population density and building intensity, in the Greater Tehachapi Area, a 275 square mile planning area that consists of unincorporated areas surrounding the city of Tehachapi. The specific plan identifies goals and policies, and implementation measures designed to achieve the plan's stated objectives. The emphasis is on preventing sprawl, ensuring the most efficient utilization and provision of public services, and fostering a variety of housing types and densities while preserving the character of individual communities in the Greater Tehachapi Area.
Cameron Canyon 1986 Specific Plan (County of Kern 1986)	The Cameron Canyon Specific Plan was adopted in 1986 in compliance with the 2000 Kern County General Plan with a planning horizon of 2000. The specific plan designates the general location and distribution of housing, open space, resource land, and other private and public land uses, and acts as a guide for future development. No commercial or industrial development is designated for this planning area. However, limited development of commercial and light industrial activities may be allowed in the future.
Rosamond Specific Plan (County of Kern 2010b)	The Rosamond Specific Plan was adopted in 1989, amended in 2008 and again in 2010. The plan's general horizon was through 2010. The specific plan provides general goals for the area promoting a balanced, efficient, and functional mix of land uses to protect the economic base of the community. Specific goals, policies, and implementation measures are also provided for different types of land uses, such as residential, commercial, industrial, resource, and public facilities.
Los Angeles County	
Los Angeles County General Plan 2035 (Los Angeles County 2015b)	The Los Angeles County 2035 General Plan was adopted in October 2015 with a planning horizon to 2035. The plan is the foundational document for all community-based plans that serve the approximately 2,650 square miles of unincorporated areas, and includes specific area plans that cater to local communities' unique and diverse character. There are five guiding principles: employ smart growth, ensure sufficient accommodation of growth, provide the foundation for a strong and diverse economy, promote excellence in environmental resource management, and provide healthy, livable, and equitable communities. Land use policies encourage a development pattern that discourages sprawl, is consistent with local land use, utilizes sustainable design techniques, facilitates the use of transit, reduces excessive noise, increases safety, fosters economic growth and development, improves air quality, and promotes access to and protection of areas with natural resources.
City of Lancaster	
City of Lancaster General Plan 2030 (City of Lancaster 2009)	The General Plan for the City of Lancaster was adopted in July 2000 with a planning horizon to 2030. The plan applies to the 37 square miles that comprise the city limits and the 268 square miles of unincorporated area, of which 30 percent is developed. The plan lays out eight priorities and provides policies that seek to meet these goals: balancing growth, ensuring economic well-being, strengthening community identity, improving public safety, promoting active living, focusing on education and youth, supporting environmental conservation, and ensuring a balanced and efficient transportation system. Main attractors of the area include affordable housing and its rural/urban interface that the plan strives to preserve.

Fox Field Industrial Corridor Specific Plan (City of Lancaster 1996)	This specific plan was adopted in 1996 and provides planning and development regulations as well as goals and objectives that guide the development of the planning area surrounding the Fox Field Airport. The planning concept is to create a landscaped, high quality, campus environment that would accommodate a variety of clean businesses, including manufacturing, light industrial, professional, administrative, high technology, and research uses. A large portion of the site is proposed to be used for surface parking, although site intensification of underutilized parking lots is encouraged through specific plan amendments in the future.
Lancaster Business Park Phase III Specific Plan (City of Lancaster 1991)	The Lancaster Business Park Phase III specific plan was adopted in 1991. It provides a comprehensive set of plans, regulations, conditions, and programs for guiding the orderly development of the Lancaster Business Park Phase III. This development will include a variety of manufacturing, research and development, professional, and limited commercial uses that will be integrated in a unified framework of planned vehicular circulation, landscaping, pedestrian walkways, and common open space. The plan implements the applicable provisions and elements of the City's General Plan.
City of Palmdale	
Palmdale General Plan (City of Palmdale 1993)	The General Plan for the City of Palmdale was adopted in 1993 and guides development through 2010 within the city's 174-square-mile sphere of influence. The housing element was updated and adopted in 2013, and has a planning horizon of 2021. The General Plan provides guidelines and polices to provide balanced growth with economic development that strives to diversify the employment opportunities and services in the area. With this development, the plan strives to protect its natural resources, reduce the impacts on noise and air quality, promote increased access to transportation, and increase the safety and quality of life of its residents.
Los Angeles County—Unincorporated Areas	
Antelope Valley Area Wide Plan (Los Angeles County 2015a)	The Antelope Valley Area Wide Plan was adopted in June 2015 with a planning horizon to 2035. The purpose of the Antelope Valley Area Plan (Area Plan) is to achieve the communities' shared vision of the future through the development of specific goals, policies, land use and zoning maps, and other planning instruments.

Table 2-H-25 Consistency with Regional Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies—Environmental Justice

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Kern Council of Governments Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2014)	
Policy 33: Take a proactive in implementing Federal Title VI Environmental Justice requirements to ensure non-discrimination.	**Consistent.** During the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority coordinated with various stakeholder groups, including residents, businesses, and community groups, in the local jurisdictions which the HSR project would traverse to ensure the fair treatment of minority and low-income populations. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Source: California High Speed Rail (2016)

[1] Citations to the HSR project in this table should be interpreted to mean all of the Build Alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5).

Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority

HSR = high-speed rail

Table 2-H-26 Consistency with Local Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies—Environmental Justice

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
Kern County General Plan (2007)	
Circulation Element (2007)	
Goal 2.1-3: To plan for transportation modes available to all segments of the population, including people with restricted mobility.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Kern County by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. The HSR project would support this goal by creating a more diverse, fully accessible transportation system that is more readily able to accommodate a diverse population's transportation needs, including those of people with restricted mobility. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Kern County Economic Development Strategy Update (July 2010)	
Goal 1.2-2: Foster Inclusion and Increased Equity	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in Bakersfield and the surrounding areas in unincorporated Kern County. The HSR project would support inclusion and equity by increasing transportation options to serve a diverse population's transportation needs. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (December 2007)	
Housing Element (December 2008)	
Objective 4-2: Reduce the incidence of displacement.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to refine the alignments to reduce the number of property acquisitions and displacements. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this objective.
Policy 4-2-1: In development of public projects, require an analysis of potential displacement of existing residences with an emphasis on minimizing both temporary displacement and relocation.	**Consistent.** As part of the planning and conceptual design for the HSR project, the Authority is working with local officials to refine the alignments to reduce the number of property acquisitions and displacements of residents and residential uses. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.
Los Angeles County General Plan (October 2015)	
Mobility Element (2015)	
Policy M4.9: Ensure the participation of all potentially affected communities in the transportation planning and decision-making process.	**Consistent.** The planning and environmental processes for the HSR project have provided, and will continue to provide, extensive opportunities for members and representatives of affected communities to participate in the planning, evaluation, and decision-making processes for this project. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this policy.

Goals and Policies	Consistency Analysis[1]
City of Lancaster General Plan 2030 (July 2009)	
Housing Element (2014–2021) (October 2013)	
Goal 6: To promote sufficient housing to meet the diverse housing needs of all economic segments of the present and future City of Lancaster.	**Consistent.** The HSR project would result in a substantial number of residential displacements in Lancaster; however, sufficient replacement housing sites are available in the surrounding area to accommodate the relocation of the residents displaced by the project. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.
City of Lancaster Master Plan of Trails and Bikeways (October 2011)	
Goal 1: Provide a safe, connected, and convenient street environment where people of all ages and physical abilities can travel throughout Lancaster without a vehicle.	**Consistent.** Where existing roads cross the proposed HSR alignment, the HSR project would replace all transportation improvements, including bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, and transportation facilities, to match the existing conditions. Those roads would be grade-separated from the HSR facility, and the designs of those facilities would be consistent with the applicable local jurisdictions' design standards and requirements. Additionally, the HSR project would improve regional transportation access in this part of Lancaster by providing a high-speed transportation connection to other urban centers in California. Therefore, the four Build Alternatives would be consistent with this goal.

Source: California High Speed Rail (2016)

[1] Citations to the HSR project in this table should be interpreted to mean all of the Build Alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5).

Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority

HSR = high-speed rail

This page intentionally left blank