

S SUMMARY

S.1 Introduction and Background

This section will introduce the California High-Speed Rail Project Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated Alternative (F-B LGA), and will summarize the background, development, and findings of this Fresno to Bakersfield Section Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (Supplemental EIR/EIS).

High-Speed Rail System

The system that includes the HSR guideways, structures, stations, traction-powered substations, and maintenance facilities.

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority), a state governing board formed in 1996, has responsibility for planning, designing, constructing, and operating the California High-Speed Rail (HSR). Its mandate is to develop a high-speed rail system coordinating with the state's existing transportation network, which includes intercity rail and bus lines, regional commuter rail lines, urban rail and bus transit lines, highways, and airports.

The California High-Speed Rail System (HSR System) will provide electrified intercity, high-speed service on nearly 800 miles of tracks throughout California, connecting the major population centers of Sacramento, the San Francisco Bay Area, the Central Valley, Los Angeles, the Inland Empire, Orange County, and San Diego. Figure S-1 shows this system. It will use state-of-the-art, electrically powered, high-speed, steel-wheel-on-steel-rail technology, including contemporary safety, signaling, and automated train-control systems, with trains capable of operating up to 220 miles per hour (mph). When completed, the HSR system would provide new passenger rail service to more than 90 percent of the state's population, providing more than 200 weekday trains to serve the statewide intercity travel market.

As described in *Connecting and Transforming California, 2016 Business Plan* (Authority 2016), the Authority intends to implement this system in two phases. Phase 1¹ will connect San Francisco Bay Area to Los Angeles Basin via the Central Valley with a mandated express travel time of 2 hours and 40 minutes or less. Phase 2 will extend the system from Merced to Sacramento in the north, and from Los Angeles to San Diego via the Inland Empire in the south.

The Fresno to Bakersfield HSR Section as shown on Figure S-2 is a critical Phase 1 link connecting to the Merced to Fresno and Bay Area HSR sections to the north and the Bakersfield to Palmdale and Los Angeles HSR sections to the south. Figure S-2 shows the Fresno to Bakersfield Section project alternatives that includes HSR stations in the cities of Fresno and Bakersfield and a third station east of Hanford (the Kings/Tulare Regional Station) that would serve the Hanford, Visalia, and Tulare areas. The Fresno and Bakersfield stations are the Fresno to Bakersfield HSR Section's beginning and ending points, or project termini. The Preferred Alternative as shown on Figure S-3 identified in the California High-Speed Rail Authority *Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement* (Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS) (Authority and FRA 2014) consists of the BNSF Alternative in combination with the Corcoran and Allensworth Bypasses, and the Bakersfield Hybrid Alternative and Bakersfield Hybrid Station (Truxtun Avenue Station).


On May 7, 2014, the Authority certified the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS (Authority and FRA 2014). While the analysis in the Final EIR/EIS was certified from the Fresno Station to the Bakersfield Station, the Authority's project approval was from the southern limit of the Fresno Station to the north side of 7th Standard Road, the city limit of the City of Bakersfield.

¹ Phase 1 would be built in stages dependent on funding availability.

This page intentionally left blank



Figure S-1 California HSR System Initial Study Corridors



Source: URS/HMM/Arup JV, 2013.

November 20, 2013




Figure S-2 Fresno to Bakersfield Section project alternatives




Figure S-3 Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS Preferred Build Alternative

This page intentionally left blank

Based on the analyses in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS and after consideration of public and agency comments received on the Final EIR/EIS, the Federal Railroad Administration issued a Record of Decision (ROD) on June 27, 2014 that approved the entire Preferred Alternative in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS, from the Fresno Station to the Bakersfield Station at Truxtun Avenue. The ROD includes findings in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, and Section 7 of the Federal Endangered Species Act. Pursuant to Executive Orders the FRA made findings on Wetlands, Floodplains, and Environmental Justice. Finally, it makes a General Conformity Determination for implementation of the State's Implementation Plan as required by the Clean Air Act. The Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS considered the impacts associated with three alternative alignments through Bakersfield, and ultimately the Authority and FRA selected the Bakersfield Hybrid as the best of the three Bakersfield alternatives.

On June 5, 2014, the City of Bakersfield filed a state lawsuit challenging the Authority's May 7, 2014, approvals under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The City claimed that the Preferred Alternative identified in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS would severely impact the City's ability to utilize existing city assets, including its corporation yard, senior housing, and parking facilities at the Rabobank Arena, Theatre and Convention Center; would render unusable one of the city's premier health facilities; and would affect the Bakersfield Commons project, a retail/ commercial/ residential development. In a Settlement Agreement signed December 19, 2014 between the City of Bakersfield and the Authority, the two agencies agreed to work together to develop and study the F-B LGA. The F-B LGA described and analyzed in this Fresno to Bakersfield Section Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS evolved from this mutual cooperation and subsequent public input. The Authority has also collaborated with the City of Shafter and Kern County in developing the F-B LGA.

When developing the geographic scope of the F-B LGA, the Authority and FRA identified a northern terminus (i.e., Poplar Avenue) allowing for a full evaluation of the impacts that could result from the F-B LGA. This enables the agencies to focus their review on an alignment and station alternative that was not evaluated in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS. While the northern terminus is within the section of the Fresno to Bakersfield Project Section approved by both the Authority and FRA, no final design or construction activities will occur in areas being analyzed in this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS prior to its approval. However, this does not preclude the Authority from advancing project activities north of Poplar Avenue including those described in Sections 2.1.1 through 2.1.6 of this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.

The Authority and FRA have prepared this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS to supplement the Final EIR/EIS for the Fresno to Bakersfield Section. The F-B LGA provides an alternative alignment for a 23.13-mile segment of the Fresno to Bakersfield Section between the City of Shafter and the City of Bakersfield. The F-B LGA station (F Street Station) would be located at the intersection of State Route (SR) 204 and F Street. A maintenance of infrastructure facility (MOIF) would be located along the F-B LGA in northern Shafter between Poplar Avenue and Fresno Avenue.

As previously discussed, the 2014 Fresno to Bakersfield Section Preferred Alternative consists of the BNSF Alternative in combination with the Corcoran and Allensworth Bypasses, and the Bakersfield Hybrid Alternative and Bakersfield Hybrid Station (Truxtun Avenue Station). The portion of the Preferred Alternative which is comparable to the F-B LGA is referred to as the "May 2014 Project" in this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS. The May 2014 Project is a 23.13-mile portion of the Preferred Alternative, encompassing the BNSF Alternative from Poplar Avenue to Hageman Road and the Bakersfield Hybrid from Hageman Road to Oswell Street (Figure S-4; see also Figure 2-30 [page 2-35] of the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS for a depiction of the BNSF Alternative and the Bakersfield Hybrid from Shafter to Bakersfield).

This page intentionally left blank




Figure S-4 May 2014 Project and F-B LGA Alignment Comparison

This page intentionally left blank

The May 2014 Project alignment runs primarily at-grade as it follows the BNSF corridor and SR 43 through Shafter and SR 58 into Bakersfield. It parallels the F-B LGA until approximately Beech Avenue, where it diverges from the F-B LGA, parallels the BNSF right-of-way in a southeasterly direction, and then curves back to the northeast to parallel the BNSF tracks toward Kern Junction. After crossing Truxtun Avenue, the alignment curves to the southeast to rejoin the F-B LGA and parallel the UPRR tracks and Edison Highway to its terminus at Oswell Street. The May 2014 Project includes a station at the corner of Truxtun and Union Avenues/SR 204 as well as a MOIF located along the alignment just north of the City of Bakersfield and 7th Standard Road. See Figure S-4 for a comparison of the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA alignments and stations. This Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS in its entirety has been posted on the Authority's [website](#) as well as FRA's [website](#). In addition, the Authority has published materials online (in English and Spanish) summarizing the purpose and contents of the document and how to participate in the public comment period.

S.2 Public Involvement

Pursuant to the requirements of National Environmental Policy Act and CEQA, the Authority and FRA conducted an extensive public and agency involvement program as part of the Fresno to Bakersfield Section environmental review process, including during the preparation of the August 2011 Draft EIR/EIS, the July 2012 Revised Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS, and the April 2014 Final EIR/EIS. Beginning in 2007, the Authority held statewide agency meetings for the Fresno to Bakersfield project section. Public workshops, open houses, and other informational sessions were held; public comments were accepted; and draft documents were widely circulated and made available. For more detail on the public coordination that occurred through March 2014, see the Fresno to Bakersfield Final EIR/EIS, Chapter 8.0. These efforts are consistent with the Authority's emphasis on public and agency outreach throughout the development of the statewide high-speed rail system. This includes public involvement and outreach through meetings, presentations, and materials, agency consultations, and notification and circulation of the Statewide Program EIR/EIS.

During the development of this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS for the F-B LGA, the Authority and FRA consulted with federal, state, and local agencies including Native American tribes, and held meetings to provide project updates and obtain feedback from the public. The Authority and FRA held informal and formal public meetings during the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS preparation process for the F-B LGA, as summarized below. The Authority held four community open houses between August 25, 2015 and August 25, 2016, in the cities of Bakersfield and Shafter to provide information to the interested public and agencies about the F-B LGA. These community open houses provided the community an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments about the F-B LGA. Approximately 753 community members attended these events. Ninety comments were received. Of these, 33 were in favor of the F-B LGA or the project in general, 10 comments expressed opposition to the alignment or the HSR project, and 7 comments expressed a preference for the previously approved Bakersfield Hybrid Alternative (i.e., Truxtun Avenue station in downtown Bakersfield) or a different alignment. Other comments received were associated with impacts to homes, businesses, and public facilities; construction costs or job creation; station connectivity to other transportation modes; suggestions for alternative alignments or opposition to the project; water storage; electromagnetic field and noise impacts; airport conflicts; the potential Shafter Heavy Maintenance Facility (HMF)²; and security concerns during operation. The Authority has also conducted numerous outreach meetings with potentially

² An HMF is a maintenance facility that supports delivery, testing, and commissioning on the first completed segment of the HSR System. Trainset assembly, testing and commissioning, train storage, inspection, maintenance, retrofitting, and overhaul are typical HMF activities. A MOIF is a facility where HSR infrastructure would be maintained and would be located on 150-mile intervals along the HSR System. MOIFs provide equipment, materials and replacement parts for the HSR system subdivision it serves. MOIFs would be locations of regional maintenance machinery servicing storage, materials storage, personnel, and maintenance and administration staff.

affected property owners, businesses, and school and special districts since 2015. See Chapter 9.0 of this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS for more information on the Public and Agency Involvement for the F-B LGA.

Communities with high concentrations of minority or low-income populations along the alignment were identified and targeted for additional public outreach, in accordance with NEPA requirements. The communities included Shafter and the area identified as East Bakersfield (generally east of Union Avenue between the Union Pacific Railroad tracks and California Avenue). These efforts included holding meetings to provide information about possible alignments and the proposed station locations, canvassing in areas near the proposed alignment, conducting educational workshops to inform the public about the release of the environmental document, and directing outreach to vendors in proximity to the alignment. Special outreach conducted for minority and low-income populations in these communities included availability of Spanish-language versions of presentation materials and availability of Spanish-language interpreters at public meetings.

S.3 Purpose and Need for the High-Speed Rail System and the Fresno to Bakersfield Section, including the F-B LGA

The need for a HSR system exists statewide, and the Fresno to Bakersfield Section is an essential component. The purpose, need, and objectives documented in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS have not changed and are included below for context and readability. The purpose of the HSR system is as follows:

The purpose of the statewide HSR System is to provide a reliable high-speed electrified train system that links the major metropolitan areas of the state, and that delivers predictable and consistent travel times. A further objective is to provide an interface with commercial airports, mass transit, and the highway network and relieve capacity constraints of the existing transportation system as increases in intercity travel demand in California occur, in a manner sensitive to and protective of California's unique natural resources. (Authority and FRA 2005)

The purpose of this project is to implement the Fresno to Bakersfield Section of the California HSR System to provide the public with electric-powered HSR service that provides predictable and consistent travel times between major urban centers and connectivity to airports, mass transit, and the highway network in the south San Joaquin Valley, and that connects the northern and southern portions of the system. This region contributes significantly to the statewide need for a new intercity transportation service that would connect with the major population and economic centers and to other regions of the state.

The Fresno to Bakersfield Section is an essential part of the statewide HSR System. As part of the Central Valley section of the HSR System, the Fresno to Bakersfield Section would provide Shafter and Bakersfield access to a new transportation mode, and would contribute to increased mobility throughout California. This section will connect the south San Joaquin Valley region to the rest of the statewide HSR System via Fresno, Kings, Tulare, and Kern counties.

The approximately 23.13-mile-long F-B LGA provides an alternative alignment to the selected alternative for the southern terminus of the Fresno to Bakersfield Section (from Poplar Avenue in the City of Shafter to Oswell Street in the City of Bakersfield).

The Fresno to Bakersfield Section of the HSR System would help meet the need for improvements to intercity travel in California in response to future growth in demand for intercity travel, increased congestion and travel delays on highways, unreliability and decreased safety, reduced mobility, and poor and deteriorating air quality and pressure on natural resources and agricultural lands, resulting from expanded highways and urban development. For a more detailed description of the purpose, objectives, and need of the HSR System, including the F-B LGA, refer to the Program EIR/EIS documents and the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS.

S.4 Alternatives

S.4.1 Alternatives Evaluated in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section EIR/EIS

The Authority developed the alternatives evaluated in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS based on input provided by stakeholders during the preparation of the *Final Program Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the proposed California High-Speed Train System (2005 Statewide Program EIR/EIS)* (Authority and FRA 2005) and the 2008 Bay Area to Central Valley Program EIR/EIS (Authority and FRA 2008), public and agency input from the scoping process, extensive local and agency involvement during Technical Working Group³ meetings, other stakeholder meetings, and public and agency comments on the Draft EIR/EIS and Revised DEIR/Supplemental DEIS.

The Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS considered several alternatives between the cities of Fresno and Bakersfield: (1) No Project Alternative; (2) BNSF Alternative; (3) Hanford West Bypass 1 Alternative; (4) Hanford West Bypass 1 Modified Alternative; (5) Hanford West Bypass 2 Alternative; (6) Hanford West Bypass 2 Modified Alternative; (7) Corcoran Elevated Alternative; (8) Corcoran Bypass Alternative; (9) Allensworth Bypass Alternative; (10) Wasco-Shafter Bypass Alternative; (11) Bakersfield South Alternative; and (12) Bakersfield Hybrid Alternative. Ultimately, as described above, the Authority and FRA identified a Preferred Alternative that consisted of the BNSF Alternative in combination with the Corcoran and Allensworth Bypasses, and the Bakersfield Hybrid Alternative and Bakersfield Hybrid Station (Truxtun Avenue Station). While the analysis in the Final EIR/EIS was certified from the Fresno Station to the Bakersfield Station, the Authority's project approval was from the southern limit of the Fresno Station to the north side of 7th Standard Road, the city limit of the City of Bakersfield.

For a complete discussion of the alternatives considered during development of the Fresno to Bakersfield Section, please refer to Chapter 2, Alternatives, Sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS (pages 2-54 through 2-72) (Authority and FRA 2014). Additionally, Section 2.2 of the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS (page 2-3) provides information on HSR system performance criteria, infrastructure, and systems, which would apply to the HSR, including the F-B LGA.

S.4.2 May 2014 Project

The May 2014 Project⁴ consists of a portion of the Preferred Alternative identified for the Fresno to Bakersfield Section in the Final EIR/EIS. The May 2014 Project alignment runs primarily at-grade as it follows the BNSF corridor and SR 43 through Shafter and SR 58 into Bakersfield. It parallels the F-B LGA until approximately Beech Avenue, where it diverges from the F-B LGA, parallels the BNSF right-of-way in a southeasterly direction, and then curves back to the northeast to parallel the BNSF tracks toward Kern Junction. After crossing Truxtun Avenue, the alignment curves to the southeast to rejoin the F-B LGA and parallel the UPRR tracks and Edison Highway to its terminus at Oswell Street. The May 2014 Project begins at-grade but elevates through Shafter for a distance of about 4 miles between North Shafter Avenue and Cherry Avenue and in Bakersfield at Country Breeze Place and continues as an elevated structure all the way to the project terminus at Oswell Street. The May 2014 Project Station would be built at the corner of Truxtun and Union Avenues/SR 204. A MOIF would be located along the May 2014 Project just north of the City of Bakersfield and 7th Standard Road.

³ Technical Working Groups were composed of senior staff from county and city public works, planning, economic development, and administrative departments.

⁴ The May 2014 Project is the complementary portion of the Preferred Alternative that was identified in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS. That portion consists of the portion of the BNSF Railway Alternative from Poplar Avenue to Hageman Road and the Bakersfield Hybrid from Hageman Road to Oswell Street.

S.4.3 Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated Alternative (F-B LGA)

As described above, in a Settlement Agreement between the City of Bakersfield and the Authority, the two agencies agreed to work together to develop and study an alternative that would respond to concerns raised by the City and meet the Authority's design requirements. The F-B LGA evolved from this mutual cooperation and subsequent public input. It provides an alternative alignment between Poplar Avenue in Shafter and Oswell Street in Bakersfield to the east of the Preferred Alternative described in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS.

The F-B LGA alignment would begin north of Shafter, continuing southeasterly until just north of Burbank Street where it would turn east until reaching the UPRR corridor. At this point, the alignment would turn and continue southeasterly, adjacent to, and west of, the UPRR corridor. The alignment would continue southeasterly into Bakersfield and would deviate from the UPRR corridor at Airport Drive. Southwest of the community of Oildale, the alignment would cross SR 99 and continue southeast. South of Airport Drive, the alignment would cross and run parallel to the west side of SR 204. This route would continue until the SR 178 crossing, where the alignment would turn east and parallel to the UPRR corridor. The F-B LGA would continue generally east within the Sumner Street and Edison Highway corridors and would terminate at Oswell Street. The F-B LGA station would be located at the intersection of SR 204 and F Street. A MOIF would be located along the F-B LGA in the City of Shafter between Fresno Avenue and Poplar Avenue.

S.5 Measures to Avoid and Minimize Impacts

The HSR project includes alternatives and design features that were developed to avoid and minimize environmental impacts. Project design incorporates the following measures:

- Follows existing transportation corridors to the extent feasible
- Uses shared right-of-way when feasible
- Uses a narrowed footprint with elevated or retained cut profile
- Spans water crossings where practical
- Includes passages for wildlife movement
- Avoids sensitive environmental resources to the extent practical

Avoidance and minimization measures for the F-B LGA that are specific to each resource area are discussed in Chapter 3 of this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.

S.6 F-B LGA Comparison with May 2014 Project

The following section provides an overview of the effects, including benefits of the F-B LGA and May 2014 Project and proposed mitigation, and compares differences between the impacts and costs of these two alternative alignments. Section S.11 provides a high-level comparison of key features associated with each of the alternative alignments under consideration. A more detailed analysis of the environmental effects associated with the May 2014 Project, and a subsequent summary comparison of impacts between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA, is provided in Appendix 8-A, Analysis of the Comparable Section (May 2014 Project), of this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.

S.6.1 Transportation

The F-B LGA would grade-separate many existing at-grade crossings in Shafter, benefiting traffic safety and circulation. Additionally, the F-B LGA would eliminate seven existing at-grade intersections with the BNSF railway in the City of Shafter.⁵ Removal of the at-grade intersections would improve traffic safety and circulation. Project operation would increase traffic congestion at numerous intersections around the Bakersfield station and result in permanent road closures in urban and rural areas. Potential construction-related cumulative impacts on transportation would be similar for the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA. Both alternatives would require similar construction techniques, including temporary road closures and delays, but at different locations; avoidance and minimization measures to reduce these delays would be applicable to both alternatives.

Section S.11 includes a comparison of the transportation and traffic impacts associated with the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA.

S.6.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change

Implementation of the HSR project is predicted to have a beneficial effect on (i.e., reduce) statewide emissions of CO₂, NO_x, ROG, SO_x, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. The entire Fresno to Bakersfield Section with the inclusion of the F-B LGA, when compared to the entire Fresno to Bakersfield Section with the inclusion of the May 2014 Project, would be expected to have similar changes in vehicles miles traveled and intrastate air travel, as well as similar increases in electrical demand (required to power the HSR). Therefore, as with the May 2014 Project, implementation of the F-B LGA would have a beneficial effect on (i.e., reduce) statewide emissions of all applicable pollutants, as compared to the existing conditions.

Construction of the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA would result in criteria pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions. Similar to the entire Fresno to Bakersfield Section with the inclusion of the May 2014 Project, the entire Fresno to Bakersfield Section with the inclusion of the F-B LGA, would be able to offset the greenhouse gas emissions within 12 months of the beginning of operation.

S.6.3 Noise and Vibration

Both the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA would create noise impacts during construction. These impacts would be temporary and mitigated through the implementation of project design features and mitigation measures identified in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS. Mitigation for these impacts includes noise monitoring during construction and requiring the contractor to implement one or more noise control measures to meet the noise limits. The F-B LGA could also result in building damage from construction vibration when fragile/historic buildings and residential structures are located approximately 77 feet and 55 feet, respectively, from pile driving activities. Mitigation for vibration impacts includes preconstruction surveys to document the existing condition of buildings located within 50 feet of pile installation and using methods other than a hammer to install piles close to buildings that could be damaged by vibration.

⁵ Analysis the Authority conducted shows that five grade separations of rail lines from cross vehicle traffic would adequately maintain present and future-condition traffic circulation in Shafter (Poplar, Fresno, Central, East Lerdo Highway, and Riverside). A sixth, at Shafter Avenue, is not necessary to maintain adequate traffic circulation. It is evaluated in this environmental document for informational purposes only, at the request of Shafter and in attempt to settle litigation (not concluded) Shafter filed in 2014; its inclusion in this document does not commit the Authority to include it in any project the Authority approves at the conclusion of the environmental process. Similarly, Zachary Avenue, Driver Road and Zerker Road are existing north-south roadways the LGA would cross as it traverses between the BNSF and SR-99. The LGA design includes openings under the HSR tracks to allow for the current roadway and Shafter's desired future improvements, however it is likely that one or more of these three roadways are not required to remain open to maintain adequate circulation. These three openings are included in this environmental document at the request of Shafter and in attempt to settle litigation (not concluded) Shafter filed in 2014; their inclusion in this document does not commit the Authority to their inclusion in any project the Authority approves at the conclusion of the environmental process.

The existing noise environment near the BNSF rail line in the city of Shafter includes noise generated from BNSF rail operations and train horns. The BNSF rail line in the city of Shafter would be elevated as part of the proposed F-B LGA HSR Project. Noise levels generated from the BNSF rail operations would continue, but would generally be lower due to shielding of the retained fill and elimination of the train horns. Since the background noise level would either be the same or lower, noise impacts from both the elevated BNSF railway and proposed F-B LGA would remain the same.

Both alternatives would create operational noise impacts. After mitigation, noise associated with operation of the F-B LGA would severely impact a total of 152 sensitive receptors, including 149 residences, compared to 305 sensitive receptors, including 299 residences, that would be impacted under the May 2014 Project.

S.6.4 EMF/EMI

During construction, only a slight measurable increase of electromagnetic field (EMF)/electromagnetic interference (EMI) levels would occur and within a very limited geographical area.

Under both alternatives, EMF impacts on the general public and people in nearby schools, hospitals, businesses, colleges, and residences would be below the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Standard limit of 9,040 milli-Gauss. Even within the mainline right-of-way, this limit would not be reached. A review of land uses along the May 2014 Project identified two potentially sensitive receptors (i.e., medical imaging facilities) within the 200-foot study area that would be impacted by HSR-produced EMI. No sensitive receptors were identified within 1,000 feet of the F-B LGA. Although the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS identified a mitigation measure to provide adequate shielding to medical imaging facilities, the F-B LGA would be located at a distance greater than the potential area of impact to such facilities.

S.6.5 Public Utilities and Energy

Construction of the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA could result in planned temporary interruption of utility service, accidental disruption of services, increased water use, and an increase in waste generation.

Utility demand occurring under the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA would not require expansion of existing facilities or the construction of new facilities or entitlements, including those related to water and wastewater treatment, or stormwater drainage. The F-B LGA would require 1,201.2 total acre-feet of water during construction whereas the May 2014 Project would require 1,333.1 total acre-feet of water. There are 1,892.3 acre-feet per year of existing water uses along the F-B LGA whereas there are 4,999.27 acre-feet per year of existing water uses along the May 2014 Project. The F-B LGA would generate 468,000 cubic yards of waste whereas the May 2014 Project is anticipated to generate 484,068 cubic yards. Finally, with inclusion of the MOIF the F-B LGA would require 1,018.75 billion British thermal units (Btu) of energy during construction whereas the May 2014 Project would require 1,037.7 billion Btu of energy during construction.

S.6.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands

Implementation of the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA would result in direct and indirect impacts on biological resources as a result of both construction period impacts and operation impacts. The following summarizes how temporary and permanent impacts were evaluated for construction and operation of the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA:

- Construction and operation impacts were considered temporary if they can be fully restored to pre-disturbance conditions following construction. Temporary impacts would include construction staging areas, construction laydown, relocation of underground utilities, and other workspace that would not be occupied by HSR facilities during project operation.
- Impacts were considered permanent when they have lasting effects beyond the project construction period, or cannot be fully restored following construction. Permanent impacts included right-of-way for at-grade track segments, elevated structure track segments

(everything under the aerial extent of the structure), road crossings, electrical substations, facilities for maintenance-of-way and stations.

Construction activities would result in both permanent and temporary direct or indirect impacts through the disturbance or removal of lands that have been determined to support or could potentially support special-status species, affect habitats of concern, or interfere with wildlife movement corridors. Project operation would result in both permanent and temporary direct and indirect impacts on special-status species and habitats of concern, and would obstruct wildlife movement corridors.

Section S.11 compares the impacts to biological resources and wetlands associated with the two alternatives. Overall, the F-B LGA would result in less impact to special-status plant species, less impact to terrestrial habitats that support special-status wildlife species, greater impacts to black willow thickets, less impact to riparian areas, and fewer direct impacts to jurisdictional waters than the May 2014 Project. A more detailed analysis of the environmental effects associated with the May 2014 Project, and a subsequent summary comparison of impacts between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA, is provided in Appendix 8-A, Analysis of the Comparable Section (May 2014 Project), of this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.

S.6.7 Hydrology and Water Resources

Construction and operational activities associated with the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA could potentially result in hydrology and water quality impacts to existing drainage, irrigation distribution systems, and water quality; however, avoidance and minimization measures have been incorporated into the design to reduce impacts on hydrology and water resources. These measures include, but are not limited to, project design features for storm water management and flood protection, and erosion and sedimentation controls, tracking controls, and waste management and materials pollution controls.

The F-B LGA would result in impacts associated with hydrology and water quality in similar ways to the May 2014 Project. There may be site-specific differences in the location of potential impacts due to routing variations included under the F-B LGA (e.g., major water body crossings, water districts); however, the nature and intensity of potential impacts would be largely comparable. The F-B LGA would require two more water body crossings and would affect one additional water district with infrastructure in the study area compared to the May 2014 Project. Impacts associated with groundwater and floodplains would be the same for the F-B LGA and the May 2014 Project and are further discussed in Chapter 3.8 of this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.

S.6.8 Geology, Soils Seismicity, and Paleontology

Both the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA could result in impacts associated with geologic, soils, and seismic hazards, including unstable slopes, soil settlement, accelerated erosion, expansive and corrosive soil properties, and earthquake-induced ground liquefaction and slope destabilization. Potential impacts would be addressed through implementation of conventional foundation design methods for elevated structure, retained-fill, at-grade, and retained-cut facilities. Impacts associated with the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA are comparable for this issue area.

The F-B LGA would impact fewer active, idle, new, and plugged wells (11) when compared to the May 2014 Project (28). There are 5 active wells within 150 feet of the May 2014 Project centerline and none within 150 feet of the F-B LGA centerline.

For both the F-B LGA and the May 2014 Project, no specific paleontological resources have been recorded within the study areas, although five geologic formations that intersect the study area are considered highly sensitive for potentially significant, yet unidentified, paleontological resources. Under both alternatives, the potential for project activities to affect paleontological resources would depend upon the required depth of ground disturbances during construction, and a Paleontological Resource Monitoring and Mitigation Plan would be implemented to address potential impacts.

S.6.9 Hazardous Materials and Wastes

Construction and operation of the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA could cause ground disturbance (including disturbance of groundwater or surface water) near known contaminated site or sites, or where contamination could exist in the study area. Construction and operation of both alternatives could also involve the use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes in the study area. Impacts associated with the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA are generally comparable for hazardous materials and wastes, except that substantially more Potential Environmental Concern (PEC) sites are within 150 feet of the F-B LGA footprint (149 PEC sites for F-B LGA compared to 2 PEC sites for May 2014 Project), resulting in the need for additional investigation during the final engineering and design phase. Increased activities associated with the investigation and remediation of PEC sites would be required under the F-B LGA when compared to the May 2014 Project, due to the increased concentration of PEC sites along the alignment. However, potential impacts would be similar between the May 2014 Project or F-B LGA, and the same types of mitigation actions would be required.

S.6.10 Safety and Security

Both alternatives could increase demand for local emergency responders around the stations due to station activity and associated redevelopment and increased commercial development/increased employees in the area, which could increase response times and require new or physically altered government facilities that might impact the environment.

The fire and law enforcement departments and hospitals that would provide services to the F-B LGA are the same as those for the May 2014 Project. Three heliports are located within 2 miles of both the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA, and one public-service airport is located within 2 miles of the F-B LGA, whereas no public-service airports are located within 2 miles of the May 2014 Project. There are a total of 25 at-grade railroad crossings within the F-B LGA footprint: 8 at-grade crossings in the City of Shafter and 17 in the City of Bakersfield. FRA records indicate that historically, for the 8 at-grade crossings in Shafter, there have been 29 at-grade roadway crossing accidents, resulting in 10 injuries and 10 fatalities (FRA 2016). According to FRA accident/incident reports, 108 train accidents/incidents occurred in the Kern County portion of the study area between January 2004 and December 2009, resulting in 5 fatalities and 22 injuries. According to records, 89 train accidents/incidents at highway/rail grade crossings occurred in the study area between January 2004 and December 2009, resulting in 12 fatalities and 11 injuries (FRA 2010b). The crossings within the May 2014 Project footprint have more accidents/incidents and have resulted in more fatalities, but fewer injuries. Design and implementation of the F-B LGA would eliminate at-grade crossings resulting in the elimination of pedestrian and vehicle conflicts with BNSF currently experienced throughout the City of Shafter. Sixteen schools are located within 0.25 mile of the F-B LGA construction footprint. Notably, a portion of the F-B LGA construction footprint would be located on two parcels occupied by Valley Oaks Charter School and Free Will Christian Academy. Temporary construction easements would more than likely be required for these parcels occupied by these two schools and a permanent easement would be required to accommodate the 34th Street access for Valley Oaks Charter School, which would directly impact one of the school's buildings.

Project design features, plans, and protocols developed as part of the May 2014 Project would avoid or minimize most safety and security impacts and would also be applicable to the F-B LGA.

S.6.11 Socioeconomics and Communities

Potential impacts that would result from the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA include the disruption and division of communities and economic effects. Many of these impacts are related to the displacement and relocation of residences, businesses, agricultural operations, and community facilities as a result of property acquisitions for the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA. As the F-B LGA would follow existing and long-established highway and railroad corridors through the urban areas, and would not bisect established neighborhoods, it would cause less disruption than the May 2014 Project, which traverses residential areas in the northwest district of Bakersfield. Additionally, the F-B LGA would not pass through the community of Crome, where approximately

one-third of the homes and the only church in this community would be displaced under the May 2014 Project. However, sufficient comparable residential units are available to accommodate displaced residents under either of the alternatives, and therefore no additional housing would need to be constructed as a result of the HSR project.

The F-B LGA would result in the displacement of 15 fewer businesses equating to 277 more employees when compared to the May 2014 Project. Many of the business relocations that would occur under the F-B LGA are located in the community of Oildale, where the alignment would run through a heavily industrial area that would be avoided by the May 2014 Project. However, sufficient replacement space for these businesses is available under either of the alternatives. The overall impact of these relocations on business operations, however, would be significant under either alternative.

The F-B LGA would result in an additional 12 agricultural parcels being split into two or more pieces by the HSR project footprint, relative to the May 2014 Project. Implementation of both the F-B LGA and May 2014 Project would result in one displaced agricultural facility. Both alternatives would have approximately the same impact to the number of jobs lost in the agricultural industry.

Both the F-B LGA and May 2014 Project would result in loss of sales tax revenue associated with displacement of businesses. However, construction-related sales tax gains would help to offset these losses and sales tax losses associated with displacements would begin to decrease as displaced businesses become re-established at new locations and new businesses move in to replace those that did not reopen. The local construction expenditures on materials and supplies under the F-B LGA are estimated to be \$318.7 million, while the associated local sales tax revenues generated are estimated to be around \$3.53 million, amounting to an average of \$707,000 annually over the six-year construction period. The sales tax revenues lost from displaced businesses under this alternative are estimated to be approximately \$653,000 per year, \$130,000 per year higher for the F-B LGA than for the May 2014 Project. The construction-related sales tax gains would help to offset these losses, reducing them to approximately \$54,000 per year over the construction period for the F-B LGA. The May 2014 Project has been estimated to generate \$758,000 in annual sales tax revenues for the region during the construction period; increases in tax revenues for Kern County is estimated to be \$3.79 million under the May 2014 Project.

Project operation is expected to have an overall positive impact on sales taxes collected by local governments under both the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA.

S.6.12 Station Planning, Land Use, and Development

Construction of the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA would result in temporary impacts, including an increase in noise and pollutants and disruption of access during the construction period. These impacts also include temporary use of land for construction staging that would cease when construction is complete. The lands would be restored to their pre-construction condition at the end of construction and returned to the landowner, with restored access, utility connections, and other infrastructure already existing.

Project operation impacts are permanent impacts and include acquisition of property, even though that acquisition would occur before construction. Both the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA would result in permanent conversion of land currently in other uses (agricultural, residential, industrial, and commercial uses) to transportation-related uses, but would not change existing adjacent land uses. Overall, the May 2014 Project would result in greater impacts associated with land conversion than the F-B LGA (976 acres compared to 819 acres under the F-B LGA).

S.6.13 Agricultural Land

Construction of both alternatives would result in the temporary use of agricultural land, including Important Farmland, for construction sites outside of the permanent right-of-way, such as for staging and material laydown areas. This land would be restored and returned to agricultural use after project construction is completed. The F-B LGA would result in similar impacts to the May

2014 Project for the following issues: effects on confined animal agriculture, effects on irrigation distribution canals, noise effects on grazing animals, wind-induced effects, and effects on aerial spraying.

Both the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA would convert Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses, bisect agricultural parcels, and require full or partial acquisition of parcels under Williamson Act and Farmland Security Zones (FSZ) contract. In addition to full or partial acquisitions, the F-B LGA would also implement a Farmland Consolidation Program to reduce impacts caused by parcel severance; while parcel ownership may change due to severance, the larger remnant parcels would remain in agricultural use. The F-B LGA would result in lesser permanent agricultural land impacts as it would permanently convert fewer acres of Important Farmland to nonagricultural use, and receives an overall lower Land Evaluation and Site Assessment System farmland conversion rating (the F-B LGA would result in the loss of 372 acres of Important Farmland whereas the May 2014 Project would result in the loss of 485 Important Farmland). In addition, a remnant parcel analysis was conducted to determine which Important Farmland parcels severed by the project footprint would continue to remain economically viable for agriculture or would be necessary to convert from agricultural use to nonagricultural use. Severed parcels determined necessary to convert to nonagricultural use are referred to as “noneconomic parcels.” The F-B LGA would result in fewer total non-economic remnant parcels (12 remnant parcels) than the May 2014 Project (18 remnant parcels) and would affect more acres (114) of protected farmland (i.e., Williamson Act) than the May 2014 Project (47 acres).

S.6.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

There are two fewer parks located within 300 feet of the centerline (three versus five) of the F-B LGA than the May 2014 Project. In addition, while more parks would be located within 0.5 mile of the F-B LGA passenger station than the May 2014 Project passenger station (six versus three), more schools (whose spaces can serve as recreational spaces) would be located within 0.5 mile of the May 2014 Project passenger station than the F-B LGA passenger station (three versus one). Moreover, six more schools would be located within 1,000 feet of the May 2014 Project centerline than the F-B LGA centerline (eight versus two). This indicates that quantitatively, a smaller number of parks and open space resources (including school recreational resources) would be located within close proximity to the F-B LGA than the May 2014 Project. The following information provides a qualitative comparison of resources affected under each alternative:

- Of all park and open space resources identified within the study area (1,000 feet from the proposed centerlines), the Kern River Parkway would be affected by both the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA, while Weill Park would only be affected by the F-B LGA, and Mill Creek Linear Park would only be affected by the May 2014 Project.
- At the Kern River Parkway, the F-B LGA and the May 2014 Project would both result in temporary construction closures, permanent acquisition of portions of the Kern River Parkway, and introduce a new visual feature to users of the park; the F-B LGA crossing would primarily affect the existing bike path, while the May 2014 Project would affect the bike path as well as a grassy area with trees that provides the entryway to the Subpark D parking lot. The nature and extent of potential impacts at the Kern River Parkway would be more intense under the May 2014 Project, due to the visual effects associated with both the bike path and the entryway to the Subpark D parking lot.
- At Weill Park, the F-B LGA would introduce noise, vibration, and visual impacts that would not occur under the May 2014 Project. Weill Park is less than two acres in size, consisting of grassy fields, and is not adjacent to residences. The F-B LGA would result in the permanent acquisition of the northern portion of Weill Park; however, the proposed F Street Station would include new park space, which would at least partially offset the parkland that would be acquired for construction of the F-B LGA and would provide new parkland in generally the same area as the parkland being acquired. Weill Park would not be affected by the May 2014 Project. Therefore, although impacts to Weill Park would be more intense under the F-B LGA, the portion displaced would be replaced by the new park space included at the proposed F Street Station.

- At Mill Creek Linear Park, the May 2014 Project would introduce a new 90-foot-wide maintenance easement to accommodate the placement of permanent footings for columns that would support the guideway through the portion of the park that straddles Kern Island Canal south of the existing BNSF right-of-way. Mill Creek Linear Park is a discontinuous resource of approximately eight acres in total size. Mill Creek Linear Park would not be affected by the F-B LGA. Therefore, the nature and extent of impacts at Mill Creek Linear Park would be more intense under the May 2014 Project.

S.6.15 Aesthetics and Visual Resources

Overall aesthetic impacts during construction would be the same for both the F-B LGA and the May 2014 Project. Under both alternatives, HSR construction in the vicinity of the Kern River Parkway Bike Trail would temporarily obstruct scenic views of natural vegetation and landforms, and could increase light and glare, reducing visual quality from moderately high to moderate. Similarly, construction of both the F-B LGA and the May 2014 Project would have an adverse effect on visual quality in the rural San Joaquin Valley and urban Bakersfield portions of the alignment, as well as through the City of Shafter, and result in a significant impact from obstruction, light, and glare.

Because the F-B LGA would shift the HSR elevated viaduct in rural Shafter eastward toward SR 99, it would not pass near rural residents at the intersection of 7th Standard Road and Santa Fe Way. Therefore, the F-B LGA would avoid the May 2014 Project's adverse operation-period effect to these residents.

The F-B LGA would also avoid the May 2014 Project's operation impacts to single-family residential neighborhoods in the Rosedale/Greenacres landscape unit. Instead, it would cross the North Bakersfield landscape unit along SR 99, passing within approximately 300 feet of single- and multi-family residences along Norris Road. Although the F-B LGA would introduce aesthetic impacts in North Bakersfield, the number of receptors affected in this area would be substantially less than the number of receptors affected in the Rosedale/Greenacres area under the May 2014 Project.

In the Central Bakersfield landscape unit, the F-B LGA would avoid visual impacts in downtown Bakersfield by realigning the HSR elevated viaduct eastward between SR 99 and the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. In the East Bakersfield landscape unit, the F-B LGA would avoid impacts to residences while introducing impacts to a commercial district.

Overall, the F-B LGA would substantially reduce the number of adversely affected residential receptors. Aesthetic impacts during construction and on schools would be similar. Overall, aesthetic impacts associated with the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA would be comparable with regards to the impact determinations on the individual landscape units; however, the F-B LGA would not be as impactful based on the reduced impacts to residential receptors.

S.6.16 Cultural Resources

Activities that cause impacts on cultural resources are typically associated with construction of a project: disturbance of the ground, material, or physical alteration of the built environment, or alteration of the visual setting. Construction of the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA would occur in both urban and rural/undeveloped areas. Both alternatives would have the greatest potential to affect historic architectural and historic-era archaeological resources in the urban areas and the greatest potential to affect undisturbed prehistoric archaeological sites in rural/undeveloped areas. The F-B LGA would result in indirect adverse visual effects to four historic architectural resources that are listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and qualify as historical resources under CEQA. One CEQA-only historical resource was identified within the F-B LGA project area. The May 2014 Project may result in a direct effect on one archaeological resource that is assumed eligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR, and would result in an indirect adverse visual effect on one historic architectural resource that is listed or eligible for listing on the NRHP, and substantial adverse changes to four CEQA historical resources.

Both alternatives have the potential to cause impacts to unknown archaeological resources. Impacts to cultural resources associated with the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA would be comparable with regards to the impact determinations on unidentified archaeological resources. Mitigation for the identified and potential impacts includes implementing the resource treatment plans for prehistoric and historic resources developed in coordination with the State Historic Preservation Officer, as well as complying with the mitigation framework outlined in the Programmatic Agreement and Memorandum of Agreement for cultural resources protection that have been developed for this project.

S.6.17 Regional Growth

Both the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA could result in impacts associated with short- and long-term growth in the region. Construction of the May 2014 Project would result in new, near-term construction-related employment that may draw additional workers to the region, thereby increasing the population. Operation of the project also has the potential to induce growth in the region as a result of new direct jobs to operate and maintain the HSR project, indirect and induced jobs created to support new operations workers, and additional jobs created as a result of the improved connectivity of the region to the rest of the state, which is anticipated to increase the competitiveness of the region's industries and overall growth in the regional economy. The May 2014 Project and F-B LGA would have similar impacts to regional growth. Over the six-year construction period, the May 2014 Project would result in the creation of approximately 846 more one-year full-time job equivalents in Kern County than the F-B LGA; however, both would create over 11,000 jobs in the County. It is anticipated that these jobs would generally be filled by local residents and would not result in a substantial increase in the population. Even accounting for the requirements of residents displaced by construction of the F-B LGA, there is a surplus of housing in the Project area, with additional development in Kern County ongoing, so it is unlikely that new housing would be required for any incoming workers.

The May 2014 Project and F-B LGA would both result in approximately the same length of railroad tracks that would require maintenance, and one train station and one maintenance of infrastructure facility that would require operation and maintenance. Therefore, the number of direct, indirect, and induced jobs generated by operation of the system would be the same for both of the alternatives. The population growth and associated land use consumption that would occur as a result of the HSR System would also be the same for both of the alternatives. Although both the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA would result in the creation of additional short-term annual jobs in the region during the construction period, these jobs would generally be filled by local residents and would not result in a substantial increase in the population.

S.6.18 Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

When combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, cumulative impacts under the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA would be comparable. Further, the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA would result in a similar contribution to cumulative effects. In summary, the differences between the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA relevant to cumulative impacts are not substantial, and there are no significant differentiating features for this issue area.

S.6.19 Section 4(f)-6(f) Evaluation

Implementation of the May 2014 Project would result in a permanent 4(f) use impact to the Kern River Parkway and Mill Creek Linear Park. Mitigation would include deliberate placement of abutments and supports, as well as temporary easements for construction, to avoid the primary or secondary floodways and park amenities, to the extent possible and depending on the limits of each resource verified through coordination with the owner agency. Any trails impacted would be re-routed and maintained for use during construction, and temporarily relocated if needed. The F-B LGA would result in a de minimis Section 4(f) impact to the Kern River Parkway and Weill Park. Weill Park is not affected under the May 2014 Project; however, the May 2014 Project has a permanent Section 4(f) use impact to Mill Creek. None of the historic resources identified within the project area was determined to have a Section 4(f) use. No Section 6(f) resources were identified within the May 2014 Project or F-B LGA study area. Impacts to Section 4(f) resources

under the May 2014 Project are greater than those under the F-B LGA. There are no Section 6(f) resources under either alternative.

S.6.20 Environmental Justice

Similar to the May 2014 Project, the F-B LGA would result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations. A comparison of the intensity of these high and adverse effects under each alternative as they relate to each of the resource areas discussed in this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS shows that: four resource areas have lesser affects under the F-B LGA and one has comparable effects (see Table 5-3 in Chapter 5 of this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS). Cumulative impacts are also comparable between the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA. The F-B LGA includes mitigation measures that would minimize or avoid most of the impacts associated with project construction and operation. Where mitigation measures would not completely reduce the impacts in areas with minority and low-income populations, disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations would occur. With implementation of the F-B LGA, displacement and community disruption, noise and vibration, visual, and cumulative impacts would have disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations.

S.6.21 Capital Cost Comparison between F-B LGA and May 2014 Project

Table S-1 compares the construction and operation costs for the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA.

Table S-1 Cost and Operation Impact Comparison between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA

| | May 2014 Project | F-B LGA |
|---------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Capital Cost for Alignment | \$2,893.7 million | \$2,687.5 million |
| Operations and Maintenance Cost | Costs for the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA are considered to be the same, and range from \$57.7 million, with higher fares, to \$80.7 million, with lower fares (2010 dollars) | |

As shown in Table S-1, the May 2014 Project’s estimated construction costs are \$206.2 million higher than those estimated for the F-B LGA. The May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA have approximately the same number of trainset miles, stations, and route miles. Therefore, Operations and Maintenance costs for each of these alignments are considered to be the same. The costs associated with “Operation & Maintenance Equipment” for the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA are apportioned on the basis of trainset miles operated within the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA. The costs associated with “Maintenance of Infrastructure” of the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA are apportioned as a ratio of 23.13 route miles to the 800 total route miles. The costs associated with “Stations” for the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA are apportioned as a ratio based on 1 of the 24 stations being located in the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA. The costs of “Administration” and “Contingency” are each calculated to be ten percent of the overall system costs. Operation and maintenance costs for the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA are considered to be the same.

S.7 Areas of Controversy

Based on the public outreach efforts throughout the environmental review process, the following are known areas of controversy:

- Selection of the preferred HSR alternative.
- Impacts on special-status plants and wildlife and wildlife habitat preserves.
- Impacts on corridor communities (including noise, visual quality impacts, loss of community character and cohesion, and right-of-way acquisition).

- Impacts on farmlands (including severance of farmlands, loss of productive farmland, and loss of agricultural enterprises).
- Trade-offs between corridor communities and agricultural lands.

S.8 Public and Agency Comment Summary

Statewide agency meetings were held starting in 2007 for the Fresno to Bakersfield project section. Public workshops, open houses, and other informational sessions were held, public comments were accepted, and draft documents were widely circulated. Refer to Chapter 8 of the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS (page 8-1) for more detail on the public coordination that occurred through March 2014.

Throughout the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS development process, some of the most frequently asked questions were related to noise generation (discussed further in Section 3.4, Noise and Vibration of this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS), property values (property values of parcels that would be acquired due to project implementation) (discussed further in Section 3.12, Socioeconomics and Communities of this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS), right-of-way acquisition (discussed further in Appendix 3.12-A of the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS), and construction employment opportunities. At the project open houses, project staff addressed these and other questions, often referring to the environmental analysis underway for this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS and informing people of upcoming opportunities to provide comments. Those comments raised by the public have informed this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS. When developing the F-B LGA, project staff also considered alternative alignments or design modifications that individuals and organizations had suggested (refer to the Draft Feasibility Summary Memorandum of this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS). When questions could not be answered at a public meeting, outreach staff followed up with inquiring party(ies) or included the discussion as items to be addressed at future public meetings. With information gathered during public meetings the Authority, in cooperation with the City of Bakersfield, and also the City of Shafter and Kern County, conducted a high-level analysis to assess the feasibility and practicability of potential alternatives to carry forward into the preliminary design and environmental review in this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS. Further discussion of this analysis is provided in Chapter 2 Section 2.1.1 of this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.

During the development of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS for the F-B LGA, the Authority and FRA consulted with federal, state, and local agencies, and held meetings to provide project updates and obtain feedback from the public. A summary of these activities is provided in Chapter 9 of this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.

S.9 Identification of Preferred Alternative

At the November 2015 Board meeting, the Board discussed the opportunity of identifying a Preliminary Preferred Alternative in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS. The advantage of identifying the Preliminary Preferred Alternative in the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS is that the public would be able to comment sooner on the Preliminary Preferred Alternative allowing the FRA and Authority to take such comments into consideration and revise aspects of the project as applicable.

At the May 2016 Board meeting, Authority staff recommended that the Board identify the F-B LGA as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative in the Fresno to Bakersfield Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS. The Board concurred with staff's recommendation that the F-B LGA be designated as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative in this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.

The Authority and FRA have determined that sufficient information will be available to identify the F-B LGA as the Preferred Alternative as described in this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS. The Preferred Alternative extends from Poplar Avenue, north of Shafter, to Oswell Street in Bakersfield. The station associated with the Proposed Preferred Alternative would be located at the intersection of SR 204 and F Street in Bakersfield. The Preferred Alternative is estimated to cost approximately \$2,687.5 million (in 2010 dollars). The Preferred Alternative would have lower capital costs than the May 2014 Project, which is estimated at \$2,893.7 million.

The F-B LGA reflects the ability and willingness of the Authority to work with local stakeholders to refine the HSR project to achieve positive outcomes for affected communities and the natural environment, while still meeting the overall project objectives consistent with the voter-approved Proposition 1A. The F-B LGA is the Preferred Alternative because it is supported by the local community (e.g., City of Bakersfield); would result in lesser impacts associated with agricultural lands, residential displacements, special-status plant species, riparian areas, and permanent impacts to jurisdictional waters; would cost less to construct; would improve traffic, pedestrian, and bicycle safety and circulation in the City of Shafter; and would reduce overall system-wide travel time.

S.10 Next Steps in the Environmental Process

The Authority and FRA are circulating the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS to affected local jurisdictions, elected officials, state and federal agencies, tribes, community organizations, other interest groups, interested individuals, and the public. The document also is available at the Authority offices, public libraries in the study area, and on the Authority’s website. The following discussion explains the decision-making processes of the agencies relying on the information included in this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.

The Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS will be circulated for a 45-day comment period, which will include open houses and a public hearing. Information about the schedule for these meetings is available on the [Authority’s website](#).

S.10.1 FRA Decision-Making

The FRA issued a ROD in June 2014 based on the environmental analysis in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS. That decision extends from the Fresno HSR Station through the Bakersfield Truxtun Avenue HSR Station to Oswell Street. FRA would consider the information and analysis regarding the potential impacts of the F-B LGA contained in this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, along with public and agency comments, to determine whether to modify its decision for the Fresno to Bakersfield Section. Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 304a(b), FRA is required to expeditiously develop a single document consisting of the Final EIS and ROD to the maximum extent practicable, unless the Final EIS makes substantial changes to the proposed action that are relevant to environmental safety or concerns, unless there is significant new information relevant to environmental concerns bearing on the proposed action or its impacts.

S.10.2 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Decision-Making

The Fresno to Bakersfield Section of the HSR System will require permits from the United States Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act (33 U.S.C. 408). The United States Army Corps of Engineers is using the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS to integrate the procedural and substantive requirements of NEPA and its permitting responsibilities (including consideration of EPA’s 404(b)(1) Guidelines in determining the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative). The EIR/EIS enables informed decision-making by the United States Army Corps of Engineers to support adoption of the EIS, issuance of ROD(s), Statement of Findings, and Section 404 permit and Section 408 permit decisions (as applicable).

S.10.3 Surface Transportation Board

If the Authority approves the F-B LGA as its new preferred alternative for the Fresno to Bakersfield project, and the FRA approved the F-B LGA in a modified Record of Decision, the Authority would submit a petition to the Surface Transportation Board for authorization to construct the F-B LGA. The Surface Transportation Board would consider the Transportation merits of the project, review the environmental record, and decide whether to deny, approved, or approve with conditions (including environmental conditions) the Authority’s construction request.

S.10.4 U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

The Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) may issue rights of entry permits for pedestrian surveys and ground disturbing investigations, such as geotechnical investigations, or other

information gathering activities. It may grant temporary construction permits for the relocation of facilities and equipment such as pipes, canals, and pumps. If the facilities are relocated outside of Reclamation's ownership, the Authority will acquire any needed land rights necessary for future operations and maintenance needs and/or relocated Reclamation features. After construction, the Authority will transfer to Reclamation necessary land rights. Reclamation will grant or transfer land rights as appropriate to the Authority. The HSR alignment crosses Reclamation lands and facilities, one of which is the Friant-Kern Canal. Impacts to Reclamation facilities within the F-B LGA project footprint are analyzed in this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.

S.10.5 California High-Speed Rail Authority Decision-Making

Although the Authority Board certified the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS, which evaluated the alignment from the Fresno HSR Station to the Bakersfield Truxtun Avenue HSR Station, the Board only approved the project from the Fresno HSR Station to 7th Standard Road, which is the northern limit of the City of Bakersfield. The Board determined that the F-B LGA is the Preliminary Preferred Alternative in May 2016. The Board will determine if based on the analysis in this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, agency comments, public comments and testimony, and a Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Consideration, it will approve the F-B LGA, the comparable segment of the May 2014 Project, or no project at all.

S.11 Project Implementation

After the issuance of the FRA ROD and the Authority's Notice of Determination, the Authority would complete final design, obtain construction permits, and acquire property before starting construction. The Authority has commenced the right-of-way acquisition process in Bakersfield on long-lead locations, and right-of-way acquisition of the alignment is anticipated to commence in summer 2018.

Table S-2 provides a high-level comparison of key features associated with each of the alternative alignments presented in this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS. Table S-2 provides a comparison of impacts with discernable difference between the May 2014 Project and the F-B LGA. Where impacts between the two alternatives are similar, a summary statement identifying the similar nature of impacts has been included. A more detailed analysis of the environmental effects associated with the May 2014 Project, and a subsequent summary comparison of impacts between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA, is provided in Appendix 8-A, Analysis of the Comparable Section (May 2014 Project), of this Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.

Table S-2 Impact Comparison between May 2014 Project and F-B LGA

| Impact | May 2014 Project | F-B LGA |
|--|---|--|
| Project Costs | | |
| Project Costs Base Year 2010 Dollars (millions) | \$2,893.7 | \$2,687.5 |
| Transportation Impacts | | |
| Construction Impacts: There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for transportation and traffic. Approximately 170 peak-hour trips would be added to roadways during construction for the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA. | | |
| Project Impacts: | | |
| TR#11: Changes in Vehicle Movements and Flows on Highways and Roadways | 14 permanent road closures | 10 permanent road closures |
| TR#13: Impacts on the Local Roadway Network due to Station Activity | No roadway segments would experience a significant impact under Existing Plus Project Conditions. | One roadway segments would experience a significant impact under Existing Plus Project Conditions. |

| Impact | May 2014 Project | F-B LGA |
|--------|--|---|
| | No roadway segments would experience a significant impact under Future (Year 2035) with Project Conditions (operational) | Two roadway segments would experience a significant impact under Future (Year 2035) with Project Conditions (operational) |
| | 11 study intersections would experience a significant impact under Future with Project Conditions. | 9 study intersections would experience a significant impact under Future with Project Conditions. |

Air Quality and Global Climate Change Impacts

Construction Impacts: There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for air quality and global climate change.

Project Impacts: There is no significant differentiating project impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for air quality and global climate change.

Noise and Vibration Impacts

Construction Impacts: There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for noise and vibration.

Project Impacts:

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| N&V#3: Moderate and Severe Noise Impacts from Project Operation to Sensitive Receivers | 305 severe noise impacts post mitigation from operations | 152 severe noise impacts post mitigation from operations |
| N&V#5: Impacts from Project Vibration | 0 properties affected by vibration. | 18 properties affected by vibration. |

Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference Impacts

Construction Impacts: There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for EMF/EMI.

Project Impacts: Two sensitive receptors (hospitals) are located within 200 feet of the May 2014 Project and there are none located within 200 feet of the F-B LGA. Impacts would be less with F-B LGA implementation compared to implementation of the May 2014 Project.

Public Utilities and Energy

Construction Impacts:

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| PU&E#3: Water demand during construction | 265.3 AFY (1,333.1 total acre-feet) | 244.05 AFY (1,201.25 total acre-feet) |
| PU&E#4: Waste Generation during construction | 484,068 cubic yards | 468,000 cubic yards |
| PU&E#5: Energy Consumption during construction | 998.48 billion BTU (no MOIF) 1,037.7 billion BTU (with MOIF) | 980.53 billion BTU (no MOIF) 1,018.75 billion BTU (with MOIF) |

Project Impacts: There is no significant differentiating project impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for public utilities and energy.

| Impact | May 2014 Project | F-B LGA |
|---|---|--|
| Biological Resources and Wetlands | | |
| Construction and Project Impacts: | | |
| BIO#1: Impacts to Special-Status Plant Species (Number of acres directly impacted that have the potential to support special-status plant species) | Direct Impacts – 112.26 acres | Direct Impacts – 62.13 acres |
| BIO#2: Impacts to Special-Status Wildlife Species (Number of acres permanently impacted and temporarily impacted that have the potential to support special-status wildlife species) | Permanent Impacts – 977.42 acres Temporary Impacts – 678.99 acres | Permanent Impacts – 819.31 acres Temporary Impacts – 170.42 acres |
| bvBIO#3: Impacts to Special-Status Plant Communities | Permanent Impacts – 0.70 acre Temporary Impacts – 0.30 acre | Permanent Impacts – 1.13 acres Temporary Impacts – 0.41 acre |
| BIO#4: Impacts to Jurisdictional Waters | Permanent Impacts – 17.03 acres Temporary Impacts – 3.11 acres | Permanent Impacts – 15.96 acres Temporary Impacts – 1.18 acres |
| BIO#5: Impacts to Conservation Areas | Project not located in a Conservation Area; therefore, not quantified | Project not located in a Conservation Area; therefore, not quantified |
| BIO#6: Impacts to Protected Trees | Number not generated for comparative analysis in documentation. | 412 |
| Hydrology and Water Resources | | |
| Construction Impacts: There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for hydrology and water resources. | | |
| Project Impacts: There is no significant differentiating project impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for hydrology and water resources. | | |
| Geology, Soils, Seismicity and Paleontology | | |
| Construction Impacts: There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for geology, soils, seismicity, and paleontology. | | |
| Project Impacts: There is no significant differentiating project impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for geology, soils, seismicity, and paleontology. | | |
| Hazardous Materials and Wastes | | |
| Construction Impacts: | | |
| HW#3: Construction on or in Proximity to PEC Sites | 2 PEC sites within 150 feet of the footprint. | 149 PEC sites within 150 feet of the footprint. |
| HW#4: Temporary Hazardous Material and Waste Activities in the Proximity of Schools. | There are 22 schools with 0.25 mile of the construction footprint. | There are 16 schools within 0.25 mile of the construction footprint. |
| HW#5: Construction in Proximity to Landfills and Oil Well Sites | There are no active or closed landfills within 0.25 mile of the May 2014 Project footprint. | There are 13 (1 active) landfills within 0.25 mile of the F-B LGA footprint. |

| Impact | May 2014 Project | F-B LGA |
|--------|---|---|
| | 2 active oil wells within 150 feet of centerline. | 0 active oil wells within 150 feet of centerline. |

Project Impacts: There is no significant differentiating project impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for hazardous materials and wastes.

Safety and Security

Construction Impacts: There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for safety and security.

Project Impacts: There is no significant differentiating project impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for safety and security.

Socioeconomics and Communities

Construction Impacts:

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| SO#4: Construction-Related Sales Tax Revenue Gains | \$758,000 annually or \$235,000 when offset with sales tax losses from businesses displaced during construction | \$707,000 annually or \$54,000 when offset with sales tax losses from businesses displaced during construction |
|--|---|--|

Project Impacts:

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| SO#6: Disruption to Community Cohesion or Division of Existing Communities from Project Operation | 20 key community facilities affected ¹ 2 religious facilities displaced | 15 key community facilities affected ¹ 0 religious facilities displaced. |
| SO#9: Residential Displacements | 384 housing units displaced (estimated) | 86 housing units displaced (estimated). |
| SO#10: Commercial and Industrial Business Displacements | 392 commercial and industrial businesses displaced (estimated). | 377 commercial and industrial businesses displaced (estimated). |
| SO#11: Project Effects on Agricultural Businesses | Splits 10 agricultural parcels | Splits 22 agricultural parcels |
| SO#12: Operation-Related Property and Sales Tax Revenue Effects | Loses \$4.2 million in property tax revenue | Loses \$3.6 million in property tax revenue |
| | Loses approximately \$523,000 in annual sales tax revenues | Loses approximately \$653,000 in annual sales tax revenues |
| SO#14: Changes in School District Funding and School Access Effects | 384 residential units, displacing 101 students. | 86 residential units; displacing 22 students. |

Station Planning, Land Use and Development

Construction Impacts: There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for station planning, land use and development.

| Impact | May 2014 Project | F-B LGA |
|--|---|--|
| Project Impacts: | | |
| LU#2: Permanent Conversion of Existing Land Uses to Transportation Use. | The May 2014 Project would result in the permanent conversion of more acres of residential, agricultural, commercial, multi-family and single-family residential, and other uses when compared to the F-B LGA. Single-Family 53 acres Multi-family 4 acres Commercial 25 acres Industrial 54 acres Community Facilities ² 17 acres Agriculture ³ 429 acres Other ⁴ 394 acres | The F-B LGA would result in the permanent conversion of more acres of industrial, and community facility uses, when compared to the May 2014 Project. Single-Family 1 acres Multi-family 2 acres Commercial 20 acres Industrial 115 acres Community Facilities ² 76 acres Agriculture ³ 323 acres Other ⁴ 281 acres |
| Agricultural Land | | |
| Construction Impacts: There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for agricultural land. | | |
| Project Impacts: | | |
| AG#4: Permanent Conversion of Agricultural Land to Nonagricultural Use | 485 acres of Important Farmland. Farmland conversion impact rating is 144. | 372 acres of Important Farmland. Farmland conversion impact rating is 140. |
| AG#5: Effects on Agricultural Land from Parcel Severance | 18 non-economic remnant parcels totaling 10 acres. | 12 non-economic remnant parcels totaling 20 acres. |
| AG#6: Effects on Land Under Williamson Act or FSZ Contracts, Local Zoning | 47 acres of Williamson Act lands. | 114 acres of Williamson Act lands. |
| Parks, Recreation and Open Space | | |
| Construction Impacts: There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for parks, recreation, and open space. | | |
| Project Impacts: There is no significant differentiating project impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for parks, recreation, and open space. | | |
| Aesthetics and Visual Resources | | |
| Construction Impacts: There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for aesthetics and visual resources. | | |
| Project Impacts: There is no significant differentiating project impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for aesthetics and visual resources. | | |
| Cultural Resources | | |
| Construction Impacts: | | |
| CUL#1: Potential Adverse Effects on Archaeological Resources Due to Construction Activities | One archaeological resource identified within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) presumed NRHP-eligible for lack of access. | No archaeological resources identified within the APE. |

| Impact | May 2014 Project | F-B LGA |
|---|--|---|
| CUL#2: Potential Adverse Effects on Historic Architectural Resources Due to Construction Activities | Indirect adverse visual effect on one Section 106 historic property and substantial adverse changes to five CEQA historical resources. | Indirect visual effects on four historic properties (also considered CEQA historical resources). |
| | No direct adverse effects or indirect adverse visual effect on the Sociedad Juarez Mutualista Mexicana TCP with implementation of the conditions described in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to avoid and minimize potential adverse effects. | Indirect adverse visual effects on the Noriega Hotel from the introduction of visual features that would diminish the integrity of the historic property (Section 106). |

Project Impacts: There is no significant differentiating project impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for cultural resources.

Regional Growth

Construction Impacts: There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for regional growth.

Project Impacts: There is no significant differentiating project impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for regional growth.

Cumulative Impacts

Construction Impacts: There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for cumulative impacts.

Project Impacts: There is no significant differentiating project impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for cumulative impacts.

Section 4(f)-6(f) Evaluation

Construction Impacts: Construction impacts for the May 2014 Project exceed those of the F-B LGA for Section 4(f) Properties. Neither alternative has Section 6(f) impacts.

Project Impacts: Project impacts for the May 2014 Project exceed those of the F-B LGA for Section 4(f) Properties. Neither alternative has Section 6(f) impacts.

Environmental Justice

Construction Impacts: There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for environmental justice.

Project Impacts: Lesser impacts would occur under the F-B LGA as it would not pass through established neighborhoods, while the May 2014 Project would traverse residential areas in the Northwest District of Bakersfield and divide the community of Crome.

¹ Socioeconomic effects include displacement, temporary restricted access, impacts such as noise, dust, and glare during construction which would disrupt use.

² Community Facilities includes government and other public and quasi-public agency uses, public parks, and schools.

³ Agriculture includes mineral and petroleum, resource management areas and floodplains.

⁴ Other includes right-of-way, transportation, and vacant lands.

AG = Agricultural Resources

APE = Area of Potential Effects

BIO = Biological Resources and Wetlands

BTU = British thermal unit

CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act

CUL = Cultural Resources

EMF/EMI = electromagnetic field/electromagnetic interference

F-B LGA = Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated Alternative

FSZ = Farmland Security Zones

HW = Hazardous Wastes and Materials

LU = Land Use

MOA = memorandum of agreement

MOIF = maintenance of infrastructure facility

N&V = Noise and Vibration

NRHP = National Register of Historic Places

PEC = potential environmental concern

PU&E = Public Utilities and Energy

SO = Socioeconomics and Communities

TCP = traditional cultural property

TR = Transportation

Table S-3, F-B LGA Mitigation Measures identifies the potentially significant impacts of the F-B LGA, as well as any new mitigation measures applied to the F-B LGA. It should be noted that Table S-3 only shows impacts that are applicable to the F-B LGA. In cases where impacts are not applicable to the F-B LGA but are applicable to the May 2014 Project impact statements are not included in Table S-3. Mitigation measures developed specifically for the F-B LGA are N&V-MM#9, N&V-MM#10, and N&V-MM#11, as well as S&S-MM#2, S&S-MM#3, and S&S-MM#4. Some significant impacts would remain significant after mitigation. These impacts are: N&V#5, N&V#7, BIO#7, LU#2, AG#4, AVR#4, AVR#5, CUL#2, CUM-N&V and Environmental Justice impacts for noise, community impacts, and aesthetics.

Table S-3 F-B LGA Mitigation Measures

| Impact | Mitigation Measure |
|---|--|
| Transportation | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| TR #1: Construction (Not Including Stations) Impacts on Circulation and Emergency Access TR #5: Impacts on Circulation from Bakersfield Station Alternatives Construction TR #7: Impacts on Circulation from Rural Area Construction TR #8: Regional Transportation Impacts from Construction Material Hauling TR #9: Construction (Not Including Stations) Impacts on School Districts | No mitigation required. |
| Project Impacts | |
| TR #10: Impacts on Regional Transportation System TR #11: Changes in Vehicle Movements and Flow on Highways and Roadways TR #12: Loss of Property Access as a Result of Road Closures | No mitigation required. |
| TR #13: Impacts on the Local Roadway Network due to Station Activity Existing Plus Project Conditions. | TR MM#3: Add Signal to Intersection to Improve LOS/Operation. TR MM#5: Revise Signal Cycle Length. TR MM#6: Widen Approaches to Intersections. TR MM#7: Add Exclusive Turn Lanes to Intersections. TR MM#8: Add New Lanes to Roadway. TR MM#9: Restripe Roadway Segment TT MM#10: Convert Intersection to an all-way stop. |
| Air Quality and Global Climate Change | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| AQ #1: Regional Air Quality Impacts During Construction | AQ-MM#1: Reduce Criteria Exhaust Emissions from Construction Equipment. AQ-MM#2: Reduce Criteria Exhaust Emissions from On-Road Construction Equipment. AQ-MM#4: Offset Emissions Through the VERA Program. |

| Impact | Mitigation Measure |
|---|--|
| AQ #2: Compliance with Air Quality Plans | AQ-MM#1: Reduce Criteria Exhaust Emissions from Construction Equipment. AQ-MM#2: Reduce Criteria Exhaust Emissions from On-Road Construction Equipment. AQ-MM#4: Offset Emissions Through the VERA Program. |
| AQ #3: Material hauling outside of SJVAB | AQ-MM#2: Reduce Criteria Exhaust Emissions from On-Road Construction Equipment. AQ-MM#5: Purchase Offsets for Emissions Associated with Hauling Ballast Material in Certain Air Districts (i.e., Mojave Desert AQMD, BAAQMD, and the South Coast AQMD). |
| AQ # 8: Localized Air Quality Impacts from Concrete Batch Plants | AQ-MM #3: Reduce the potential impact of concrete batch plants. |
| AQ #4: Greenhouse Gas Emissions During Construction AQ #5: Asbestos and Lead-Based Paint Exposure During Construction AQ #6: Localized Air Quality Impacts During Guideway/Alignment Construction AQ #7: Localized Air Quality Impacts to Schools and Other Sensitive Receptors During Station Construction AQ #9: Localized Air Quality Impacts from MOIF | No mitigation required. |
| Project Impacts | |
| AQ #10: Regional Criteria Pollutant Emissions AQ #11: Greenhouse Gas Analysis During Operation AQ # 12: Localized Air Quality Impacts During Train Operations AQ #13: Localized Mobile Air Toxics Analysis AQ #14: Microscale CO Impact Analysis AQ #15: Localized PM ₁₀ /PM _{2.5} Hot-Spot Impact Analysis AQ #16: Localized Air Quality Impacts to Sensitive Receptors Including Schools AQ #17: Odor Impacts from Operations AQ #18: Compliance with Air Quality Plans | No mitigation required. |
| Noise and Vibration | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| N&V #1: Construction noise | N&V-MM#1: Construction noise mitigation measures. |
| N&V #2: Construction vibration | N&V-MM#2: Construction vibration mitigation measures. |

| Impact | Mitigation Measure |
|---|---|
| Project Impacts | |
| N&V #3: Moderate and severe noise impacts from project operation to sensitive receptors. | N&V-MM #3: Installation of noise barriers, installation of building insulation, or full property acquisition for noise impacts from HSR operations. |
| N&V #5: Impacts from Project Vibration | N&V-MM #5: Special trackwork at crossovers and turnouts |
| N&V #7: Noise from HSR Stationary Facilities | N&V-MM #7: Station, Maintenance of Infrastructure Facility, and Traction Power Supply Station noise mitigation measure. |
| N&V #4: Noise Effects on Wildlife and Domestic Animals N&V #6: Traffic Noise | No mitigation required. |
| Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| EMF/EMI #1: Impacts During Construction | No mitigation required. |
| Project Impacts | |
| EMF/EMI #2: General Human Exposure to EMF EMF/EMI #3: People with Implanted Medical Devices and Exposure to EMF EMF/EMI #4: Livestock and Poultry Exposure EMF/EMI #5: Effects on Sensitive Equipment from EMI EMF/EMI #6: EMI Effects on Schools EMF/EMI #7: Potential for Corrosion of Underground Pipelines and Cables and Adjoining Rail EMF/EMI #8: Potential for Nuisance Shocks EMF/EMI #9: Effects on Adjacent Existing Rail Lines | No mitigation required. |
| Public Utilities and Energy | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| PU&E #1: Temporary Interruption of Utility Service PU&E #2: Accidents and Disruption of Service PU&E #3: Water Demand during Construction PU&E #4: Waste Generation during Construction PU&E #5: Energy Consumption during Construction | No mitigation required. |

| Impact | Mitigation Measure |
|---|--|
| Project Impacts | |
| PU&E #6: Conflicts with Existing Utilities PU&E #7: Reduced Access to Existing Utilities in the HSR Right-of-Way PU&E #8: Upgrade or Construction of Power Lines PU&E #9: Potential Conflicts with Electrical Facilities PU&E #10: Potential Conflicts with Natural Gas Lines (High Pressure) PU&E #11: Potential Conflicts with Petroleum and Fuel Pipelines PU&E #12: Potential Conflicts with Water Facilities PU&E #13: Wastewater Facilities – Conflicts and Capacity PU&E #14: Storm Drain Facilities – Conflicts and Capacity PU&E #15: Waste Generation during Operation PU&E #16: Hazardous Waste Generation during Operation PU&E #17: Energy Consumption – Project Period Impacts | No mitigation required. |
| Biological Resources and Wetlands | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| <i>Special-Status Plants</i> | |
| BIO #1: Construction Effects on Special-Status Plant Species | BIO-MM #1: Designate Project Biologist(s), Regulatory Specialist (Waters), Project Botanist, and Project Biological Monitor(s) BIO-MM #2: Regulatory Agency Access BIO-MM #3: Prepare and Implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program BIO-MM #4: Prepare and Implement a Weed Control Plan and Annual Vegetation Control Plan BIO-MM #5: Prepare and Implement a Biological Resource Management Plan BIO-MM #6: Prepare and Implement a Restoration and Revegetation Plan BIO-MM #7: Delineate Environmentally Sensitive Areas and Environmentally Restricted Areas (on plans and in field) BIO-MM #9: Equipment Staging Areas BIO-MM #11: Vehicle Traffic BIO-MM #13: Work Stoppage BIO-MM #14: "Take" Notification and Reporting BIO-MM #15: Post-Construction Compliance Reports BIO-MM #16: Conduct Protocol-Level Preconstruction Surveys for Special-Status Plant Species and Special-Status Plant Communities BIO-MM #17: Prepare and Implement Plan for Salvage, Relocation and/or Propagation of Special-Status Plant Species |

| Impact | Mitigation Measure |
|--------|---|
| | BIO-MM #47: Restore Temporary Riparian Impacts BIO-MM #53: Compensate for Impacts on Special-Status Plant Species BIO-MM #61: Compensate for Permanent Riparian Impacts BIO-MM #62: Prepare and Implement a Site-Specific Comprehensive Mitigation and Monitoring Plan BIO-MM #65: Offsite Habitat Restoration, Enhancement, and Preservation |

Special-Status Wildlife Species

| | |
|---|---|
| BIO #2: Construction Effects on Special-Status Wildlife | BIO-MM #1 through 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 61, 62, and 65 as described above under Impact BIO #1. BIO-MM #8: Wildlife Exclusion Fencing BIO-MM #10: Mono-Filament Netting BIO-MM #22: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Special-Status Reptile and Amphibian Species BIO-MM #23: Conduct Special-Status Reptile and Amphibian Monitoring, Avoidance, and Relocation BIO-MM #29: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys and Delineate Active Nest Exclusion Areas for Other Breeding Birds BIO-MM #30: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys and Monitoring for Raptors BIO-MM #31: Bird Protection BIO-MM #32: Conduct Protocol and Preconstruction Surveys for Swainson's Hawks BIO-MM #33: Swainson's Hawk Nest Avoidance and Monitoring BIO-MM #34: Monitor Removal of Nest Trees for Swainson's Hawks BIO-MM #35: Conduct Protocol Surveys for Burrowing Owls BIO-MM #36: Burrowing Owl Avoidance and Minimization BIO-MM #37: Conduct Surveys for Nelson's Antelope Squirrel, Tipton Kangaroo Rat, Dulzura Pocket Mouse, and Tulare Grasshopper Mouse BIO-MM #38: Implement Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Nelson's Antelope Squirrel, Tipton Kangaroo Rat, Dulzura Pocket Mouse, and Tulare Grasshopper Mouse BIO-MM #40: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Special-Status Bat Species BIO-MM #41: Bat Avoidance and Relocation BIO-MM #42: Bat Exclusion and Deterrence BIO-MM #43: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for American Badger and Ringtail BIO-MM #44: American Badger and Ringtail Avoidance BIO-MM #45: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for San Joaquin Kit Fox BIO-MM #46: Minimize Impacts on San Joaquin Kit Fox BIO-MM #51: Install Flashing or Slats within Security Fencing BIO-MM #52: Construction in Wildlife Movement Corridors BIO-MM #57: Compensate for Impacts on Blunt-Nosed Leopard Lizard, Tipton Kangaroo Rat, and Nelson's Antelope Squirrel BIO-MM #58: Compensate for Loss of Swainson's Hawk Nesting Trees BIO-MM #59: Compensate for Loss of Burrowing Owl Active Burrows and Habitat BIO-MM #60: Compensate for Destruction of San Joaquin Kit Fox Habitat |
|---|---|

| Impact | Mitigation Measure |
|--|---|
| <i>Special-Status Plant Communities</i> | |
| <p>BIO #3: Construction Effects on Habitats of Concern</p> | <p>BIO-MM #1 through 7, 9, 11, 13 through 17, 47, 53, 61, 62, and 65 as described above under Impact BIO #1 and Impact BIO #2.</p> <p>Jurisdictional Waters: BIO-MM #1 through 7, 9, 11, 13, 47, 61, 62, and 65 described above under Impact BIO #1 and Impact BIO #2.</p> <p>BIO-MM #48: Restore Temporary Riparian Impacts</p> <p>BIO-MM #49: Monitor Construction Activities within Jurisdictional Waters</p> <p>BIO-MM #63: Compensate for Permanent and Temporary Impacts on Jurisdictional Waters</p> <p>Conservation Areas: BIO-MM #1 through 7, 17, 47, 48, 49, 52, 61, 62, 63, and 65 described above under Impact BIO #1, Impact BIO #2, and under Jurisdictional Waters of Impact BIO #3.</p> <p>Protected Trees:</p> <p>BIO-MM #50: Mitigation and Monitoring of Protected Trees</p> <p>BIO-MM #64: Compensate for Impacts on Protected Trees</p> |
| <i>Wildlife Movement Corridors</i> | |
| <p>BIO #4: Construction Effects on Wildlife Movement Corridors</p> | <p>BIO-MM #52 as described under Impact BIO #2.</p> |
| Project Impacts | |
| <i>Special-Status Plant Species</i> | |
| <p>BIO #5: Project Effects on Special-Status Plant Species</p> | <p>Same Mitigation Measures as listed above under Impact BIO #1.</p> |
| <i>Special-Status Wildlife Species</i> | |
| <p>BIO #6: Project Effects on Special-Status Wildlife Species</p> | <p>Same Mitigation Measures as listed above under Impact BIO #2.</p> |
| <i>Habitats of Concern</i> | |
| <p>BIO #7: Project Effects on Habitats of Concern</p> | <p>Same Mitigation Measures as listed above under Impact BIO #3.</p> |
| <i>Wildlife Movement Corridors</i> | |
| <p>BIO #8: Project Effects on Wildlife Movement Corridors</p> | <p>Same Mitigation Measures as listed above under Impact BIO #4.</p> |
| Hydrology and Water Resources | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| <p>HWR #1: Temporary Changes to Drainage Patterns and Stormwater Runoff</p> <p>HWR #2: Temporary Water Quality Impacts</p> <p>HWR #3: Temporary Impacts on Groundwater</p> | <p>No mitigation required.</p> |

| Impact | Mitigation Measure |
|---|--|
| HWR #4: Temporary Impacts on Floodplains | HWR-MM#1: Implement floodplain protection measures during Construction. |
| Project Impacts | |
| HWR #5: Permanent Impacts on Hydraulic Capacity and Connectivity HWR #6: Permanent Impacts on Surface Water Quality HWR #7: Permanent Impacts on Groundwater Quality and Volume | No mitigation required. |
| HWR#8: Permanent Impacts on Floodplains | HWR-MM#2: Implement Best Management Practices for water quality protection. |
| Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontology | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| GSSP #1: Encountering Unstable Soils during Construction GSSP #2: Soil Settlement as Structures or along Trackway during Construction GSSP #3: Soil Erosion during Construction GSSP #4: Difficult Excavations due to Hardpan Soil and Shallow Groundwater GSSP #5: Encountering Mineral and Energy Resources during Construction and Loss of Availability of Known Mineral or Energy Resources of Statewide or Regional Significance | No mitigation required. |
| Project Impacts | |
| GSSP #6: Effects of Unstable Soils on Operations GSSP #7: Effects of Soil Settlement on Operations GSSP #8: Effects of Moderate to High Shrink-Swell Potential on Operations GSSP #9: Effects of Moderately to Highly Corrosive Soils on Operations GSSP #10: Effects of Slope Failure on Operations GSSP # 11: Effects of Seismicity on Operations | No mitigation required. |
| GSSP #12: Sensitive Paleontological Resources | CUL-MM#16: Engage a Paleontological Resources Specialist to Direct Monitoring during Construction CUL-MM#17: Prepare and Implement a Paleontological Resource Monitoring and Mitigation Plan CUL-MM#18: Halt Construction When Paleontological Resources Are Found |

| Impact | Mitigation Measure |
|---|--|
| Hazardous Materials and Wastes | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| HMW #1: Temporary Transport, Use, Storage, and Disposal of Hazardous Materials and Wastes HMW #2: Inadvertent Disturbance of Hazardous Materials or Wastes HMW #3: Construction on or Near Potential Environmental Concern Sites HMW #5: Construction in Proximity to Landfills and Oil Well Sites | No mitigation required. |
| HMW #4: Temporary hazardous material and waste activities in proximity of schools (within 0.25 mile of a school). | HMW-MM#1: Limit use of extremely hazardous materials near schools during construction. |
| Project Impacts | |
| HMW #6: Transport, Use, Storage, and Disposal of Hazardous Materials and Wastes HMW #7: Hazardous Materials and Wastes in the Proximity of Schools HMW #8: Operation in Proximity to Landfills and Oil Well Sites | No mitigation required. |
| Safety and Security | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| S&S #1: Accidents and Accidental Releases at Construction Sites S&S #2: Accidents Associated with Construction-Related Detours S&S #3: Crime at Construction Sites | No mitigation required. |
| Project Impacts | |
| S&S #4: Train Accidents S&S #5: Motor Vehicle, Pedestrian, and Bicycle Accidents Associated with HSR Operations S&S #6: HSR Accidents Associated with Seismic Events S&S #9: Increased Response Times for Fire, Rescue, and Emergency Services Associated with Access to Elevated Track S&S #11: Accident Risks to Airports, Private Airstrips, and Heliports S&S #12: Hazards to the HSR from Nearby Facilities S&S #13: Hazards to Residences from HSR Derailment S&S #14: Safety Impacts to Schools | No mitigation required. |

| Impact | Mitigation Measure |
|---|---|
| S&S #15: Hazards to HSR Passengers and Employees from Flooding S&S #16: Criminal Activity aboard Trains at the F Street Station | |
| S&S #7: Risk of Fire and Explosions. | S&S-MM #2: Site-specific mitigation for the continued operation of the Halliburton Facility. S&S-MM #3: Site-specific mitigation for the continued operation of the Rain-for-Rent Facility. S&S-MM #4: Site-specific mitigation for the continued operation of the Golden Empire Gleaners Facility. |
| S&S #8: Increased Response Times for Fire, Rescue, and Emergency Services from Permanent Road Closures S&S #10: Need for Expansion of Existing Fire, Rescue, and Emergency Services Facilities. | S&S-MM #1: Monitor response of local fire, rescue, and emergency service providers to incidents at the Bakersfield F Street Station and provide a fair share cost of service. |
| Socioeconomics and Communities | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| SO #1: Disruption to Community Cohesion or Division of Existing Communities from Project Construction | SO-MM #3: Implement measures to reduce impacts associated with the displacement of religious facilities. |
| SO #2: Construction Effects on Children's Health and Safety SO #3: Construction-Related Property Tax Revenue Reductions SO #4: Construction-Related Sales Tax Revenue Gains SO #5: Temporary Construction Employment | No mitigation required. |
| Project Impacts | |
| SO #6: Displacement of the Bakersfield Homeless Shelter. | SO-MM #1: Disruption to community cohesion and division of existing rural communities during operation. |
| SO #7: Effects to the Regional Agricultural Community | SO-MM #4: Partial-property acquisitions via measures that will design overcrossings and under crossings to allow farm equipment passage where feasible. |
| SO #18: Potential for Physical Deterioration | SO-MM #3: Implement measures to reduce impacts associated with the displacement of religious facilities. SO-MM #5: Physical deterioration via measures that will design station and non-station structures to allow for contextual design responses to site-specific or unique conditions |
| SO #8: Effects of Project Operations on Children's Health and Safety SO #9: Residential Displacements SO #10: Commercial and Industrial Business Displacements SO #11: Project Effects on Agricultural Business | No mitigation required. |

| Impact | Mitigation Measure |
|--|--|
| SO #12: Displacement of Community Facilities SO #13: Relocations of Sensitive Populations SO #14: Economic Effects on Agriculture SO #15: Changes in School District Funding and School Access SO #16: Employment Growth SO #17: Operation-Related Property and Sales Tax Revenue Effects | |
| Station Planning, Land Use, and Development | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| LU #1: Potential for Construction to Alter Land Use Patterns | No mitigation required. |
| Project Impacts | |
| LU #2: Permanent Conversion of Existing Land Uses to Transportation Use LU #3: Land Use Effects of Parking Demand at Station Site LU #4: Indirect Effects on Surrounding Land Uses from the High-Speed Rail Alignment, High-Speed Rail Station, and the Maintenance of Infrastructure Facility | No mitigation required. |
| Agricultural Lands | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| AG #1: Temporary Use of Agricultural Land AG #2: Temporary Utility and Infrastructure Interruption AG #3: Temporary Noise and Vibration Effects on Adjacent Farm Animals | No mitigation required because agricultural lands would be restored to pre-project conditions. |
| Project Impacts | |
| AG #4: Permanent conversion of agricultural land to nonagricultural use. | AG-MM #1: Preserve the total amount of prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, farmland of local importance, and unique farmland. |
| AG #5: Effects on Agricultural Land from Parcel Severance. | AG-MM #1: Preserve the total amount of prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, farmland of local importance, and unique farmland. AG-MM#2: Conserve additional Important Farmland for indirect impacts adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure. |
| AG #6: Effects on Land under Williamson Act, Farmland Security Zone Contracts, or Local Zoning AG #7: Effects on Confined Animal Agriculture AG #8: Effects on Irrigation Distribution Canals AG #9: Noise Effects to Grazing Animals | No mitigation required. |

| Impact | Mitigation Measure |
|---|---|
| AG #10: Wind-Induced Effects AG #11: Effects on Aerial Spraying | |
| Parks, Recreation, and Open Space | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| PK #1: Construction Impacts on Parks, Recreation, Open Space and School Recreation Facilities | PP-MM #1: Provide Alternate Pedestrian and Bicycle Access During Temporary Closures of Portions of Park Property During Construction. |
| Project Impacts | |
| PK #2: Project Acquisition of Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Resources | PP-MM#3: Collect Additional Maintenance Funds. |
| PK #3: Project Acquisition of School District Play Areas and Recreation Facilities PK #4: Project Changes to Park Character | No mitigation required. |
| Aesthetics and Visual Resources | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| AVR #1: Construction Impacts on Scenic Vistas | No mitigation required. |
| AVR #2: Construction Impacts on Existing Visual Quality. | AVR-MM #1a: Minimize visual disruption during construction activities. |
| AVR #3: Construction Impacts from Light and Glare | AVR-MM #1b: Minimize light disturbance during construction. |
| Project Impacts | |
| AVR #4: Lower visual quality in the Shafter Town, Rural San Joaquin Valley, North Bakersfield, Kern River and East Bakersfield Landscape Units. | AVR-MM #2a: Incorporate Design Criteria for Elevated and Station Elements That Can Adapt to Local Context (Kings/Tulare Regional Station) AVR-MM #2b: Integrate Elevated Guideway into Affected Cities, Parks, Trail, and Urban Core Designs AVR-MM #2c: Screen Elevated Guideways Adjacent to Residential Areas AVR-MM #2e: Provide Offsite Landscape Screening Where Appropriate AVR-MM #2f: Landscape Treatments along the HST Project Overcrossings and Retained Fill Elements of the HST AVR-MM #2g: Provide Sound Barrier Treatments AVR-MM #2i: Install Decorative Parapet Design at Kern River Crossing |
| AVR #5: Lower visual quality at Valley Oaks Charter School. | AVR-MM #2a: Incorporate Design Criteria for Elevated and Station Elements That Can Adapt to Local Context AVR-MM #2b: Integrate Elevated Guideway into Affected Cities, Parks, Trail, and Urban Core Designs AVR-MM #2e: Provide Offsite Landscape Screening Where Appropriate AVR-MM #2f: Landscape Treatments along the HST Project Overcrossings and Retained Fill Elements of the HST AVR-MM #2e: Provide Offsite Landscape Screening Where Appropriate |

| Impact | Mitigation Measure |
|---|---|
| Cultural Resources | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| CUL #1: Potential Adverse Effects on Archaeological Resources due to Construction Activities. | CUL-MM #4: Comply with State and Federal Law for Human Remains CUL-MM #5: Conduct Additional Testing and Recovery |
| CUL #2: Potential Adverse Effects on Historic Architectural (Built) Resources due to Construction Activities: Introduction of Visual Elements | CUL-MM #12: Prepare and Submit Additional Recordation and Documentation CUL-MM #13: Prepare Interpretive or Educational Materials |
| Project Impacts | |
| CUL #4: Potential Adverse Effects on Archaeological Resources Due to Operational Activities CUL #5: Potential Adverse Effects on Historic Architectural (Built) Resources due to Operational Activities | No mitigation required. |
| Regional Growth | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| Construction Effects | No mitigation required. |
| Project Impacts | |
| Operations Effects on Employment, Population Growth, Land Use Consumption, and, Consistency with Regional Growth Management Plans, Hydrology and Water Resources | No mitigation required. |
| Cumulative Impacts | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| Transportation, Air Quality, Noise and Vibration, EMF/EMI, Public Utilities and Energy, Biological Resources and Wetlands, Geology/Soils/Seismicity/Paleontological Resources, Hazardous Materials and Wastes, Safety and Security, Socioeconomics and Communities, Station Planning/Land Use and Development, Agricultural Lands, Parks/Recreation and Open Space, Aesthetics and Visual Resources, Cultural Resources | No mitigation required. |
| Project Impacts | |
| CUM-N&V: The project's contribution to cumulative construction noise and vibration impacts. | CUM-N&V-MM#1: Consult with agencies regarding construction activities to minimize potential overlapping construction activities occurring in the same area. |

| Impact | Mitigation Measure |
|--|-------------------------|
| Transportation, Air Quality, EMF/EMI, Public Utilities and Energy, Biological Resources and Wetlands, Geology/Soils/Seismicity/Paleontological Resources, Hazardous Materials and Wastes, Safety and Security, Socioeconomics and Communities, Station Planning/Land Use and Development, Agricultural Lands, Parks/Recreation and Open Space, Aesthetics and Visual Resources, Cultural Resources | No mitigation required. |
| Environmental Justice | |
| Construction Impacts | |
| EJ #1: Effect of Project Construction on Minority or Low-Income Populations | No mitigation required. |
| Project Impacts | |
| EJ #2: Effects of Project Operation on Minority or Low-Income Populations | No mitigation required. |

AG = Agricultural Resources
 AQ = Air Quality
 AQMD = air quality management district
 AVR = Aesthetics and Visual Resources
 BAAQMD = Bay Area Air Quality Management District
 BIO = Biological Resources and Wetlands
 CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act
 CO = carbon monoxide
 CRHR = California Register of Historical Resources
 CUL = Cultural Resources
 CUM = Cumulative Impacts
 HMF = heavy maintenance facility
 HSR = high-speed rail
 HST = high-speed train
 HWM = Hazardous Wastes and Materials
 HWR = Hydrology and Water Resources

LU = Land Use
 MM = Mitigation Measure
 N&V = Noise and Vibration
 NO₂ = nitrogen dioxide
 NO_x = nitrogen oxides
 NRHP = National Register of Historic Places
 O₃ = Ozone
 PK = Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
 PM_{2.5} = particulate matter smaller than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter
 PM₁₀ = particulate matter smaller than or equal to 10 microns in diameter
 PP = Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (Specific to Project Operations)
 S&S = Safety and Security
 SO = Socioeconomics and Communities
 TR = Transportation
 VERA = Voluntary Emission Reduction Agreement
 VOC = volatile organic compound