

California High-Speed Rail Authority

# *Fresno to Bakersfield* *Section*

## [Final] Supplemental Environmental Impact Report

Section S.0  
Summary

[October 2018]



**This page intentionally left blank**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....iii

S SUMMARY..... S-1

S.1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND ..... S-1

S.2 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ..... S-13

S.3 PURPOSE, NEED[, AND OBJECTIVES] FOR THE HIGH-SPEED RAIL SYSTEM AND THE FRESNO TO BAKERSFIELD SECTION, INCLUDING THE F-B LGA ..... S-18

S.4 ALTERNATIVES ..... S-19

S.4.1 Alternatives Evaluated in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section EIR/EIS ..... S-19

S.4.2 May 2014 Project..... S-19

S.4.3 Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated Alternative (F-B LGA).....S-20

S.5 MEASURES TO AVOID AND MINIMIZE IMPACTS..... S-20

S.6 F-B LGA COMPARISON WITH MAY 2014 PROJECT..... S-20

S.6.1 Transportation..... S-20

S.6.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change..... S-21

S.6.3 Noise and Vibration..... S-21

S.6.4 EMF/EMI ..... S-22

S.6.5 Public Utilities and Energy ..... S-22

S.6.6 Biological Resources and Wetlands ..... S-22

S.6.7 Hydrology and Water Resources..... S-23

S.6.8 Geology, Soils Seismicity, and Paleontology ..... S-23

S.6.9 Hazardous Materials and Wastes ..... S-23

S.6.10 Safety and Security..... S-24

S.6.11 Socioeconomics and Communities..... S-24

S.6.12 Station Planning, Land Use, and Development..... S-25

S.6.13 Agricultural Land ..... S-25

S.6.14 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space ..... S-26

S.6.15 Aesthetics and Visual Resources ..... S-27

S.6.16 Cultural Resources ..... S-27

S.6.17 Regional Growth ..... S-28

S.6.18 Cumulative and Secondary Impacts ..... S-28

S.6.19 Environmental Justice..... S-28

S.6.20 Capital Cost Comparison between F-B LGA and May 2014 Project..... S-29

S.7 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY ..... S-29

S.8 [DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIR/EIS CIRCULATION AND REVIEW] ..... S-29

S.9 PUBLIC AND AGENCY COMMENT SUMMARY ..... S-30

S.10 IDENTIFICATION OF PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE..... S-31

S.11 [CONTENTS AND ORGANIZATION OF THE FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL EIR] ..... S-31

S.11.1 California High-Speed Rail Authority Decision-Making ..... S-32

S.12 [USFWS ISSUANCE OF 2018 BIOLOGICAL OPINION AMENDMENT] S-32

S.13 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ..... S-33

## Tables

Table S-1 Cost and Operation Impact Comparison between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA ..... S-29

Table S-2 Impact Comparison between May 2014 Project and F-B LGA ..... S-33

Table S-3 F-B LGA Mitigation Measures ..... S-40

## Figures

Figure S-1 California HSR System Initial Study Corridors ..... S-3  
[Figure S-2 Fresno to Bakersfield Section project alternatives]..... S-5  
[Figure S-3 Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS Preferred Build Alternative] ... S-7  
[Figure S-4 F-B LGA Footprint through the F Street Station]..... S-11  
[Figure S-5 May 2014 Project and F-B LGA Alignment Comparison]..... S-15

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Authority	California High-Speed Rail Authority
BNSF	BNSF Freight Railway Network
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
DEIR/DEIS	Draft EIR/EIS
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EMF	electromagnetic field
EMI	electromagnetic interference
FRA	Federal Railroad Administration
F-B LGA	Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated Alternative
FSZ	Farmland Security Zones
HMF	Heavy Maintenance Facility
HSR	high-speed rail
HSR System	California High-Speed Rail System
MOIF	maintenance of infrastructure facility
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
ROD	Record of Decision
SR	State Route
UPRR	Union Pacific Railroad

**This page intentionally left blank**

## 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 [Final] Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Supplemental EIR).

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) [and the 2018 Business Plan (Authority 2018)], the Authority intends to implement this system in two phases. Phase 1<sup>1</sup> will connect the 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).

#### High-Speed Rail System

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

<sup>1</sup> 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


**This page intentionally left blank**



[Figure S-2 Fresno to Bakersfield Section project alternatives]

This page intentionally left blank





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

**This page intentionally left blank**

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 7<sup>th</sup> Standard Road, the city limit of the City of Bakersfield.

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 [the] 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 analyzed in [the] 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 [the] Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.

[This document evaluates impacts, and proposed mitigation if necessary, of the HSR alignment all the way to Oswell Street to disclose impacts of the tracks as they might extend to the southeast beyond the F Street Station. However, the Authority and FRA intend to approve for construction and operation, as part of this document, only the F Street station and the alignment from that station towards Fresno, as shown in Figure S-4. Any alignment to the southeast of the station would be approved, if at all, following environmental evaluation of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Section, currently programmed to be completed via an EIR/EIS for that Section in 2020. Accordingly, mitigation measures for impacts related to the alignment southeast of the F Street station would be imposed as part of the approval of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Section.]

**This page intentionally left blank**





[Figure S-4 F-B LGA Footprint through the F Street Station]

**This page intentionally left blank**

The Authority [has] prepared this [Final] Supplemental EIR to supplement the Final EIR/EIS for the Fresno to Bakersfield Section.<sup>2</sup> 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 [the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS and] this [Final] Supplemental EIR. 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-5]; 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).

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 7<sup>th</sup> Standard Road. See [Figure S-5] for a comparison of the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA alignments and stations. This [Final] Supplemental EIR in its entirety has been posted on the Authority’s [website](#). In addition, the Authority has published materials online (in English and Spanish) summarizing the purpose and contents of the document.


## S.2 Public Involvement

Pursuant to the requirements of CEQA, the Authority 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 [Section] 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> [This Final Supplemental EIR does not specifically address FRA’s NEPA compliance and should not be understood to substitute for a Final Supplemental EIS.]

**This page intentionally left blank**



FILE: Y:\HSR\_BFSS\GIS\WXD\Draft Environmental Impact Report Volume 1\FigS-4\_May2014ProjectAndFBLGAAAlignmentComparison.mxd (3/28/2018)

SOURCE: CHSRA (10/2016); NAIP (06/2016)

March 28, 2018



[Figure S-5 May 2014 Project and F-B LGA Alignment Comparison]

**This page intentionally left blank**

During the development of this [Final] Supplemental EIR for the F-B LGA, the Authority 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 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. [A total of] 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)<sup>3</sup>; and security concerns during operation. The Authority has also conducted numerous outreach meetings with potentially affected property owners, businesses, and school and special districts since 2015. See Chapter 9.0 of [the] 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. [Prior to the commencement of the public review period for the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS the Authority performed various types of public outreach to ensure that the public and stakeholders interested in the project were adequately informed about the upcoming availability and release of the document. The Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS was published on November 9, 2017 and was sent to recipients in the following four distribution categories:]

1. [Agencies: Cooperating Agencies, Elected Officials, Schools, Businesses and Organizations]
2. [Compact Disc Repositories: Repositories from the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS but outside of the F-B LGA affected area (therefore receiving Compact Discs rather than full hard copies of document)]
3. [Print Repositories: Repositories within the F-B LGA and May 2014 Project affected areas (therefore receiving hard copies for public review).]
4. [Tribes: Includes all Native American Tribes notified for Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS.]

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.

[A Notice of Availability, describing the project, the document being prepared for environmental clearance, and the availability of the document for public review, was published in the legal section of 10 publications of general circulation on or before the November 9, 2017 publication of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS. This original Notice of Availability listed the public comment period closing date erroneously. A corrected Notice of Availability was published in the same 10 publications. The corrected Notice of Availability was mailed via USPS First Class Mail on November 17, 2017 to property owners within the F-B LGA and May 2014 Project footprint, property owners within 300 feet of both footprints, and to all individuals and organizations who had previously requested notification. The Notice of Availability was sent to 14,756 recipients.]

[The Authority widely circulated the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS to affected local jurisdictions, state and federal agencies, tribes, community organizations, other interested groups and individuals. The document was also available at Authority offices, public libraries, and community centers for a 60-day review period commencing on November 9, 2017 and closing on January 16, 2018. The Authority held a public hearing on December 19, 2017 in Bakersfield to receive oral and written comments from the public on the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.]

[This Final Supplemental EIR addresses the comments received during the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS comment period. The Authority will continue to work with interested parties and stakeholders and to take into consideration public viewpoints through the environmental clearance process and into the design phases of the Project.]

### **S.3 Purpose, Need[, and Objectives] 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 Group<sup>4</sup> 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 Project<sup>5</sup> 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

<sup>4</sup> Technical Working Groups were composed of senior staff from county and city public works, planning, economic development, and administrative departments.

<sup>5</sup> 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.

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 7<sup>th</sup> Standard Road.

### **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 [the] 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.13 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 [the] 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.<sup>6</sup> Removal of the at-grade intersections

---

<sup>6</sup> 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

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.13 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 CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG, SO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. 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.

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.

---

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.

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 mili-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.13 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 [the] 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. [The May 2014 Project would generate 72 acres of new impervious surfaces and the F-B LGA would generate 82 acres of new impervious surfaces. Additionally, the May 2014 Project would disturb approximately 570 net acres whereas the F-B LGA would disturb 780 net acres.] 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 [the] 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 7<sup>th</sup> 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 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 [the] 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 [the] 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.6.20 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 [Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS Circulation and Review]**

[The Fresno to Bakersfield Section Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS was circulated for a 60-day review period, which closed on January 16, 2018. An advertised public hearing was held on December 19, 2017 in Bakersfield to present the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS and to give the public an opportunity to ask questions and collect information about the project. The Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS was made available for review in several ways. The document was posted on the Authority’s and FRA’s websites beginning November 9, 2017. Printed and electronic copies were distributed to 56 repository locations in Fresno County, Kings County, Tulare County, Madera County, Kern County, and Sacramento County. Copies were sent to cooperating federal agencies, state-responsible and trustee agencies (including copies sent through the State Clearinghouse), and were available at the Authority’s offices in Sacramento and Fresno. Compact

Discs with the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS in electronic form were sent, without charge, to all who requested them.]

[Chapter 9 of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS contains a list of all public agency meetings held to date.]

## S.9 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 [the] 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 [the] 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 [the] Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS and informing people of upcoming opportunities to provide comments. Those comments raised by the public have informed [the] 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 [the] 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 [the] Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS. Further discussion of this analysis is provided in Chapter 2 Section 2.1.1 of [the] Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.

During the development of the [Final] Supplemental EIR for the F-B LGA, the Authority 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 [the] Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.

[During the comment period for the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, the Authority received 286 comment submittals consisting of 1,068 individual comments. The comments covered a wide range of issues and represented viewpoints from government agencies (federal, state, and local), elected officials, businesses/organizations, and individuals (general population). Comments included support/opposition of the F-B LGA and/or May 2014 Project alternatives; comments that reflected the opinion of the commenter and did not remark on project design or the environmental document; comments regarding the proximity of F Street Station to downtown Bakersfield and the Amtrak Station; and comments regarding noise and vibration impacts.]

[Among comments received from the general public, commenters expressed the most concern about effects on agricultural and private property and community resources. The general public and business owners expressed concern about the location of the F Street Station; some requests were made for Authority consideration of a station in Old Town Kern on Sumner Street between Beale Avenue and Miller Street. Common issues brought up by the general public and businesses included safety, noise and vibration, construction effects, transportation effects, public transportation connectivity, and impact to neighborhoods.]

[Affected jurisdictions generally listed their preferences in their comment submittals. The City of Shafter raised an issue of concern on potential impacts to the Gossamer Grove Specific Plan

area as the F-B LGA alignment would traverse through the northern portion of the specific plan area. Kern County raised concerns about transportation designs and impacts.]

### S.10 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 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 [the] Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.

The Authority [has] determined that sufficient information [is] available to identify the F-B LGA as the Preferred Alternative as described in [the] Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS. The Preferred Alternative extends from Poplar Avenue, north of Shafter, to Oswell Street in Bakersfield. The station associated with the 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.11 [Contents and Organization of the Final Supplemental EIR]

[The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15132) require a final EIR to include the components listed below.]

- [Draft EIR, or a revision of the Draft EIR.]
- [Comments received on the Draft EIR.]
- [A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR.]
- [The lead agency's responses to significant environmental points raised.]
- [Any other information added by the lead agency.]

[This Final Supplemental EIR is presented in errata format (i.e., changes to the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS are shown in errata format [Chapter 16] rather than republishing the entire Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS). The Final Supplemental EIR therefore comprises the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS and the Final Supplemental EIR. The Final Supplemental EIR is organized into five main sections as follows:]

- **[Executive Summary.** This section provides an overview of the F-B LGA and its potential impacts. Also included in this section are areas of controversy, an overview of the public review process that was completed for the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, and the identification of the Preferred Alternative for the Fresno to Bakersfield Section from just north of Poplar Avenue south to Oswell Street.]

- **[Chapter 16, Changes to the Final Report Resulting from Comments on the Draft Report.** This new chapter shows changes made to the text, tables, and figures (as applicable) in the Final Supplemental EIR that were made since publication of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.]
- **[Technical Appendix 2-I.** This new technical appendix evaluates the feasibility of an interim terminal station at the F Street Station location, consistent with the 2018 Business Plan.
- **[Section H, Sound Barrier Plans.** This section includes the sound barrier plans that were inadvertently omitted from Volume III of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.]
- **[Standard Responses.** This section provides the Authority’s Standard Responses that address the most frequently raised issues. Following the numbering sequence of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, Standard Responses are provided in Chapter 18 (English) and Chapter 19 (Spanish).]
- **[Comments on the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS and Responses to Comments.** Chapters 20 through 26 provide a list of all commenters on the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, reproductions of the original written comments, and responses to the comments.]

### S.11.1 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 7<sup>th</sup> 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 [the] Draft Supplemental EIR, agency comments, public comments and testimony, and a Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, it will approve the F-B LGA, the comparable segment of the May 2014 Project, or no project at all.

[If the Authority proceeds with approval of the F-B LGA, the Authority would file a Notice of Determination that describes the project and whether the project will have a significant effect on the environment. If the Authority approves a project that will result in significant impacts identified in the Final Supplemental EIR not avoided or substantially lessened through project design and features or avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures, CEQA requires the preparation of a Statement of Overriding Considerations. This statement must provide specific reasons to support the project, including economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the proposed project that outweigh unavoidable adverse environmental effects. If such a statement is prepared, the Authority’s Notice of Determination will reference the statement.]

### S.12 [USFWS Issuance of 2018 Biological Opinion Amendment]

[Subsequent to publication of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, in May 2018, the Authority, on behalf of the FRA, requested reinitiation of formal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and was issued a Biological Opinion Amendment for the Fresno to Bakersfield Section in July 2018 (USFWS 2018). The Biological Opinion Amendment incorporates the F-B LGA into the overall Fresno to Bakersfield Section Biological Opinion (08ESMF00-2012-F-0247). The USFWS’s Biological Opinion Amendment determined that construction of the F-B LGA was not likely to jeopardize listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. As discussed in Table 3.7-1 of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, the conservation measures identified in the 2014 and 2017 Biological Opinions would still apply to the F-B LGA.]

### S.13 Project Implementation

After the Authority’s [filing of the] 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 late 2018.

Table S-2 provides a high-level comparison of key features associated with each of the alternative alignments presented in [the] 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 [the] Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.

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

Impact	May 2014 Project	F-B LGA
<b>Project Costs</b>		
Project Costs Base Year 2010 Dollars (millions)	\$2,893.7	\$2,687.5
<b>Transportation Impacts</b>		
<b>Construction Impacts:</b> 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.		
<b>Project Impacts:</b>		
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.
	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.
<b>Air Quality and Global Climate Change Impacts</b>		
<b>Construction Impacts:</b> There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for air quality and global climate change.		
<b>Project Impacts:</b> There is no significant differentiating project impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for air quality and global climate change.		
<b>Noise and Vibration Impacts</b>		
<b>Construction Impacts:</b> There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for noise and vibration.		
<b>Project Impacts:</b>		

Impact	May 2014 Project	F-B LGA
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.

#### 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
BIO#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



Impact	May 2014 Project	F-B LGA
<b>Hydrology and Water Resources</b>		
<b>Construction Impacts:</b> There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for hydrology and water resources.		
<b>Project Impacts:</b> There is no significant differentiating project impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for hydrology and water resources.		
<b>Geology, Soils, Seismicity and Paleontology</b>		
<b>Construction Impacts:</b> There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for geology, soils, seismicity, and paleontology.		
<b>Project Impacts:</b> There is no significant differentiating project impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for geology, soils, seismicity, and paleontology.		
<b>Hazardous Materials and Wastes</b>		
<b>Construction Impacts:</b>		
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.
	2 active oil wells within 150 feet of centerline.	0 active oil wells within 150 feet of centerline.
<b>Project Impacts:</b> There is no significant differentiating project impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for hazardous materials and wastes.		
<b>Safety and Security</b>		
<b>Construction Impacts:</b> There is no significant differentiating construction impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for safety and security.		
<b>Project Impacts:</b> There is no significant differentiating project impact between the May 2014 Project and F-B LGA for safety and security.		
<b>Socioeconomics and Communities</b>		
<b>Construction Impacts:</b>		
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
<b>Project Impacts:</b>		
SO#6: Disruption to Community Cohesion or Division of Existing Communities from Project Operation	20 key community facilities affected <sup>1</sup> 2 religious facilities displaced	15 key community facilities affected <sup>1</sup> 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).

Impact	May 2014 Project	F-B LGA
SO#11: Project Effects on Agricultural Businesses	Splits 10 agricultural parcels	Splits 22 agricultural parcels
SO#15: Changes in School District Funding and School Access Effects	384 residential units, displacing 101 students.	86 residential units; displacing 22 students.
SO#17: 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

### 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.

#### Project Impacts:

LU#2: Permanent Conversion of Existing Land Uses to Transportation Use.	<p>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.</p> <table> <tr> <td>Single-Family</td> <td>53 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Multi-family</td> <td>4 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial</td> <td>25 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Industrial</td> <td>54 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Community Facilities<sup>2</sup></td> <td>17 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agriculture<sup>3</sup></td> <td>429 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other<sup>4</sup></td> <td>394 acres</td> </tr> </table>	Single-Family	53 acres	Multi-family	4 acres	Commercial	25 acres	Industrial	54 acres	Community Facilities <sup>2</sup>	17 acres	Agriculture <sup>3</sup>	429 acres	Other <sup>4</sup>	394 acres	<p>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.</p> <table> <tr> <td>Single-Family</td> <td>1 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Multi-family</td> <td>2 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial</td> <td>20 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Industrial</td> <td>115 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Community Facilities<sup>2</sup></td> <td>76 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agriculture<sup>3</sup></td> <td>323 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other<sup>4</sup></td> <td>281 acres</td> </tr> </table>	Single-Family	1 acres	Multi-family	2 acres	Commercial	20 acres	Industrial	115 acres	Community Facilities <sup>2</sup>	76 acres	Agriculture <sup>3</sup>	323 acres	Other <sup>4</sup>	281 acres
Single-Family	53 acres																													
Multi-family	4 acres																													
Commercial	25 acres																													
Industrial	54 acres																													
Community Facilities <sup>2</sup>	17 acres																													
Agriculture <sup>3</sup>	429 acres																													
Other <sup>4</sup>	394 acres																													
Single-Family	1 acres																													
Multi-family	2 acres																													
Commercial	20 acres																													
Industrial	115 acres																													
Community Facilities <sup>2</sup>	76 acres																													
Agriculture <sup>3</sup>	323 acres																													
Other <sup>4</sup>	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.	372 acres of Important Farmland.
	Farmland conversion impact rating is 144.	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.

Impact	May 2014 Project	F-B LGA
--------	------------------	---------

**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.
CUL#2: Potential Adverse Effects on Historic Architectural Resources Due to Construction Activities	[S]ubstantial adverse changes to five CEQA historical resources.	Indirect visual effects on four 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.	[T]he introduction of visual features [in proximity to the Noriega Hotel] would [not] diminish the integrity of the historic [resource].

**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.

**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.

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

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

<sup>3</sup> Agriculture includes mineral and petroleum, resource management areas and floodplains.

<sup>4</sup> 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

LU = Land Use

MOA = memorandum of agreement

MOIF = maintenance of infrastructure facility

N&V = Noise and Vibration

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

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 [HWR-MM#1, HWR-MM#2], 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#[3], AG#4, AVR#4, AVR#5, CUM-N&V[, CUM-AG, CUM-VQ,] and [CUM-CUL], and Environmental Justice impacts for noise, community impacts, and aesthetics.

[Table S-3 in the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS erroneously omitted certain impacts identified in the individual resources sections in Chapter 3 of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS. This omission has been corrected in the Final Supplemental EIR and, where appropriate, the corresponding mitigation measures (also identified in Chapter 3 of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS), have been incorporated into Table S-3. The revisions made to Table S-3 in this Final Supplemental EIR incorporate language consistent with that documented in Chapter 3 of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS. The revisions to Table S-3 do not result in new significant impacts resulting from the project that were not previously identified in the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, and there has been no substantial increase in the severity of impacts (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088.5).]

[The Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS identified that the following impacts would remain significant even after the application of mitigation:]

- [Noise and Vibration Impacts N&V#5 and N&V#7. The text preceding Table S-3 in the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS erroneously listed Impacts N&V#5 and N&V#7 as significant after application of mitigation. As identified on page 3.4-35 of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, Impact N&V#5 “requires special track work and mitigation strategies to reduce operational vibration levels to less than significant under CEQA.” As identified on pages 3.4-40 and 3.4-41 of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, Impact N&V#7 with implementation of mitigation measure N&V-MM#7 “such as noise barriers to reduce long-term operational noise impacts would result in a less than significant impact under CEQA.” This error has been corrected in the Final Supplemental EIR, and the correct list of impacts is listed in the preceding text.]
- [Biological Resources Impact BIO#7. The text preceding Table S-3 in the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS erroneously listed Impact BIO #7 as significant after application of mitigation. As identified on page 3.7-87 of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, “operational activities that require maintenance of the railway are not expected to result in effects” on habitats of concern. This error has been corrected in the Final Supplemental EIR, and the correct list of impacts is listed in the preceding text.]
- [Station Planning, Land Use, and Development Impact LU#2. The text preceding Table S-3 in the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS erroneously listed Impact LU#2 as significant after application of mitigation. As identified on pages 3.13-13 and 3.13-14 of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, Impact LU #2 would be less than significant under CEQA. This error has been corrected in the Final Supplemental EIR, and the correct list of impacts is listed in the preceding text.]
- [Agricultural Land Impact AG#4. The text preceding Table S-3 in the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS correctly lists Impact AG#4 as significant after application of mitigation. No change has been made with regard to this impact in this Final Supplemental EIR.]
- [Aesthetics and Visual Resources AVR#4 and AVR#5. The text preceding Table S-3 in the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS correctly lists Impacts AVR#4 and AVR#5 as significant after

application of mitigation. No change has been made with regard to this impact in this Final Supplemental EIR.]

- [Cultural Resources Impact CUL#2. The text preceding Table S-3 in the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS erroneously listed Impact CUL#2 as significant after application of mitigation. As identified in Table 3.17-7 of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS (pages 3.17-50 and 3.17-51), Impact CUL #2 would be less than significant under CEQA. This error has been corrected in the Final Supplemental EIR, and the correct list of impacts is listed in the preceding text.]
- [Cumulative Impacts CUM N&V. The text preceding Table S-3 in the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS correctly lists Impact CUM N&V as significant after application of mitigation. No change has been made with regard to this impact in this Final Supplemental EIR.]
- [Environmental Justice impacts for noise, community impacts, and aesthetics. The text preceding Table S-3 in the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS correctly lists Environmental Justice impacts for noise, community impacts, and aesthetics as significant after application of mitigation (specifically related to operation of the project). No change has been made with regard to this impact in this Final Supplemental EIR.]

[As indicated by the shaded text, the Final Supplemental EIR includes the impacts that had been inadvertently omitted from the list of impacts that would remain significant after implementation of mitigation.]

- [Impact N&V#3. The text preceding Table S-3 in the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS erroneously omitted Impact N&V#3 as significant after application of mitigation. As identified on pages 3.4-28, 3.4-30, and 3.4-31 of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, “implementation of mitigation measure N&V-MM#3 [for Impact N&V#3] would reduce project noise impacts. However, the construction of noise barriers may not be feasible or economically reasonable, sound insulation may not be acoustical feasible or practical for certain structures, and special track work may not reduce noise impacts. Therefore, project noise impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures would still remain significant under CEQA.” This omission has been corrected in the Final Supplemental EIR, and the correct list of impacts is listed in the preceding text.]
- [Impact CUM-AG. The text preceding Table S-3 in the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS erroneously omitted Impact CUM-AG as significant after application of mitigation. As identified on page 3.19-26 of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, “the F-B LGA’s incremental contribution to farmland conversion would be cumulatively considerable under CEQA.” This omission has been corrected in the Final Supplemental EIR, and the correct list of impacts is listed in the preceding text.]
- [Impact CUM-VQ. The text preceding Table S-3 in the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS erroneously omitted Impact CUM-VQ as significant after application of mitigation. As identified on page 3.19-29 of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, “While mitigation measure CUM-VQ-MM#1 from the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS (Authority and FRA 2014: page 3.19-48) would minimize this cumulative impact, the contribution of the F-B LGA to cumulative visual impacts would be cumulatively considerable under CEQA.” This omission has been corrected in the Final Supplemental EIR, and the correct list of impacts is listed in the preceding text.]
- [Impact CUM-CUL. The text preceding Table S-3 in the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS erroneously omitted Impact CUM-CUL as significant after application of mitigation. As identified on page 3.19-20 of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, “the F-B LGA’s contribution to cumulative impacts during construction would be cumulatively considerable under CEQA.” This omission has been corrected in the Final Supplemental EIR, and the correct list of impacts is listed in the preceding text.]

**Table S-3 F-B LGA Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measure
<b>Transportation</b>	
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
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.
<b>Project Impacts</b>	
TR #10: Impacts on Regional Transportation System TR #12: Loss of Property Access as a Result of Road Closures [TR #16: Impacts on School Districts Local Roadway Network]	No mitigation required.
[TR #11: Changes in Vehicle Movements and Flow on Highways and Roadways]	[TR MM#3: Add Signal to Intersection to Improve LOS/Operation.] [TR MM#8: Add New Lanes to Roadway.] [TR MM#9: Restripe Roadway Segment] [TR MM#10: Convert Intersection to an all-way stop.]
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#4: Restripe Intersections.] 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 [TR] MM#10: Convert Intersection to an all-way stop.
<b>Air Quality and Global Climate Change</b>	
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
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.
<b>Project Impacts</b>	
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 <sub>10</sub> /PM <sub>2.5</sub> 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.
<b>Noise and Vibration</b>	
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
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.
<b>Project Impacts</b>	

Impact	Mitigation Measure
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-MM #4: Vehicle Noise Specification.] [N&V-MM #5: Special Track Work.] [N&V-MM#6: Additional Noise and Vibration Analysis Following Final Design.]
N&V #5: Impacts from Project Vibration	[N&V-MM #5: Special Track Work.]
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.
<b>Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference</b>	
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
EMF/EMI #1: Impacts During Construction	No mitigation required.
<b>Project Impacts</b>	
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.
<b>Public Utilities and Energy</b>	
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
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.
<b>Project Impacts</b>	
PU&E #6: Conflicts with Existing Utilities	No mitigation required.



Impact	Mitigation Measure
<p>PU&amp;E #7: Reduced Access to Existing Utilities in the HSR Right-of-Way</p> <p>PU&amp;E #8: Upgrade or Construction of Power Lines</p> <p>PU&amp;E #9: Potential Conflicts with Electrical Facilities</p> <p>PU&amp;E #10: Potential Conflicts with Natural Gas Lines (High Pressure)</p> <p>PU&amp;E #11: Potential Conflicts with Petroleum and Fuel Pipelines</p> <p>PU&amp;E #12: Potential Conflicts with Water Facilities</p> <p>PU&amp;E #13: Wastewater Facilities – Conflicts and Capacity</p> <p>PU&amp;E #14: Storm Drain Facilities – Conflicts and Capacity</p> <p>PU&amp;E #15: Waste Generation during Operation</p> <p>PU&amp;E #16: Hazardous Waste Generation during Operation</p> <p>PU&amp;E #17: Energy Consumption – Project Period Impacts</p>	

**Biological Resources and Wetlands**

**Construction Impacts**

***Special-Status Plants***

<p>BIO #1: Construction Effects on Special-Status Plant Species</p>	<p>BIO-MM #1: Designate Project Biologist(s), Regulatory Specialist (Waters), Project Botanist, and Project Biological Monitor(s)</p> <p>BIO-MM #2: Regulatory Agency Access</p> <p>BIO-MM #3: Prepare and Implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program</p> <p>BIO-MM #4: Prepare and Implement a Weed Control Plan and Annual Vegetation Control Plan</p> <p>BIO-MM #5: Prepare and Implement a Biological Resource Management Plan</p> <p>BIO-MM #6: Prepare and Implement a Restoration and Revegetation Plan</p> <p>BIO-MM #7: Delineate Environmentally Sensitive Areas and Environmentally Restricted Areas (on plans and in field)</p> <p>BIO-MM #9: Equipment Staging Areas</p> <p>BIO-MM #11: Vehicle Traffic</p> <p>BIO-MM #13: Work Stoppage</p> <p>BIO-MM #14: “Take” Notification and Reporting</p> <p>BIO-MM #15: Post-Construction Compliance Reports</p> <p>BIO-MM #16: Conduct Protocol-Level Preconstruction Surveys for Special-Status Plant Species and Special-Status Plant Communities</p> <p>BIO-MM #17: Prepare and Implement Plan for Salvage, Relocation and/or Propagation of Special-Status Plant Species</p> <p>BIO-MM #47: Restore Temporary Riparian Impacts</p> <p>BIO-MM #53: Compensate for Impacts on Special-Status Plant Species</p>
---	---

Impact	Mitigation Measure
	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
<b><i>Special-Status Wildlife Species</i></b>	
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.

Impact	Mitigation Measure
	<p>BIO-MM #8: Wildlife Exclusion Fencing</p> <p>BIO-MM #10: Mono-Filament Netting</p> <p>[BIO-MM #12: Entrapment Prevention.]</p> <p>BIO-MM #22: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Special-Status Reptile and Amphibian Species</p> <p>BIO-MM #23: Conduct Special-Status Reptile and Amphibian Monitoring, Avoidance, and Relocation</p> <p>[BIO-MM#26: Conduct Protocol-Level Surveys for Blunt-Nosed Leopard Lizard]</p> <p>[BIO-MM#27: Phased Preconstruction Surveys for Blunt-Nosed Leopard Lizard]</p> <p>[BIO-MM#28: Blunt-Nosed Leopard Lizard Avoidance]</p> <p>BIO-MM #29: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys and Delineate Active Nest Exclusion Areas for Other Breeding Birds</p> <p>BIO-MM #30: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys and Monitoring for Raptors</p> <p>BIO-MM #31: Bird Protection</p> <p>BIO-MM #32: Conduct Protocol and Preconstruction Surveys for Swainson's Hawks</p> <p>BIO-MM #33: Swainson's Hawk Nest Avoidance and Monitoring</p> <p>BIO-MM #34: Monitor Removal of Nest Trees for Swainson's Hawks</p> <p>BIO-MM #35: Conduct Protocol Surveys for Burrowing Owls</p> <p>BIO-MM #36: Burrowing Owl Avoidance and Minimization</p> <p>BIO-MM #37: Conduct Surveys for Nelson's Antelope Squirrel, Tipton Kangaroo Rat, Dulzura Pocket Mouse, and Tulare Grasshopper Mouse</p> <p>BIO-MM #38: Implement Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Nelson's Antelope Squirrel, Tipton Kangaroo Rat, Dulzura Pocket Mouse, and Tulare Grasshopper Mouse</p> <p>BIO-MM #40: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Special-Status Bat Species</p> <p>BIO-MM #41: Bat Avoidance and Relocation</p> <p>BIO-MM #42: Bat Exclusion and Deterrence</p> <p>BIO-MM #43: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for American Badger and Ringtail</p> <p>BIO-MM #44: American Badger and Ringtail Avoidance</p> <p>BIO-MM #45: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for San Joaquin Kit Fox</p> <p>BIO-MM #46: Minimize Impacts on San Joaquin Kit Fox</p> <p>BIO-MM #51: Install Flashing or Slats within Security Fencing</p> <p>BIO-MM #52: Construction in Wildlife Movement Corridors</p> <p>BIO-MM #57: Compensate for Impacts on Blunt-Nosed Leopard Lizard, Tipton Kangaroo Rat, and Nelson's Antelope Squirrel</p> <p>BIO-MM #58: Compensate for Loss of Swainson's Hawk Nesting Trees</p> <p>BIO-MM #59: Compensate for Loss of Burrowing Owl Active Burrows and Habitat</p> <p>BIO-MM #60: Compensate for Destruction of San Joaquin Kit Fox Habitat</p> <p>[BIO-MM #66: Implement Avoidance and Minimization Measures for BVLOS]</p> <p>[BIO-MM #67: Compensate for Impacts on BVLOS]</p>

Impact	Mitigation Measure
<b><i>Special-Status Plant Communities</i></b>	
BIO #3: Construction Effects on Habitats of Concern	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.  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. BIO-MM #48: Restore Temporary Riparian Impacts BIO-MM #49: Monitor Construction Activities within Jurisdictional Waters BIO-MM #63: Compensate for Permanent and Temporary Impacts on Jurisdictional Waters  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.  Protected Trees: BIO-MM #50: Mitigation and Monitoring of Protected Trees BIO-MM #64: Compensate for Impacts on Protected Trees
<b><i>Wildlife Movement Corridors</i></b>	
BIO #4: Construction Effects on Wildlife Movement Corridors	[BIO-MM #9, 51, 52 and 57 through 60 as described above under Impact BIO #1 and Impact BIO #2.]
<b>Project Impacts</b>	
<b><i>Special-Status Plant Species</i></b>	
BIO #5: Project Effects on Special-Status Plant Species	Same Mitigation Measures as listed above under Impact BIO #1.
<b><i>Special-Status Wildlife Species</i></b>	
BIO #6: Project Effects on Special-Status Wildlife Species	Same Mitigation Measures as listed above under Impact BIO #2.
<b><i>Habitats of Concern</i></b>	
BIO #7: Project Effects on Habitats of Concern	Same Mitigation Measures as listed above under Impact BIO #3.
<b><i>Wildlife Movement Corridors</i></b>	
BIO #8: Project Effects on Wildlife Movement Corridors	Same Mitigation Measures as listed above under Impact BIO #4.
<b>Hydrology and Water Resources</b>	
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
HWR #1: Temporary Changes to Drainage Patterns and Stormwater Runoff HWR #2: Temporary Water Quality Impacts HWR #3: Temporary Impacts on Groundwater	No mitigation required.
HWR #4: Temporary Impacts on Floodplains	HWR-MM#1: Implement floodplain protection measures during Construction.

Impact	Mitigation Measure
<b>Project Impacts</b>	
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.
<b>Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontology</b>	
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
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.
<b>Project Impacts</b>	
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
<b>Hazardous Materials and Wastes</b>	
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
HMW #1: Temporary Transport, Use, Storage, and Disposal of Hazardous Materials and Wastes	No mitigation required.

Impact	Mitigation Measure
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	
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.
<b>Project Impacts</b>	
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.
<b>Safety and Security</b>	
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
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.
<b>Project Impacts</b>	
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 #8: Increased Response Times for Fire, Rescue, and Emergency Services from Permanent Road Closures] 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 S&S #15: Hazards to HSR Passengers and Employees from Flooding S&S #16: Criminal Activity aboard Trains at the F Street Station	No mitigation required.

Impact	Mitigation Measure
S&S #7: Risk of Fire and Explosions.	<p>S&amp;S-MM #2: Site-specific mitigation for the continued operation of the Halliburton Facility.</p> <p>S&amp;S-MM #3: Site-specific mitigation for the continued operation of the Rain-for-Rent Facility.</p> <p>S&amp;S-MM #4: Site-specific mitigation for the continued operation of the Golden Empire Gleaners Facility.</p>
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**

<p>SO #1: Disruption to Community Cohesion or Division of Existing Communities from Project Construction</p> <p>SO #2: Construction Effects on Children’s Health and Safety</p> <p>SO #3: Construction-Related Property Tax Revenue Reductions</p> <p>SO #4: Construction-Related Sales Tax Revenue Gains</p> <p>SO #5: Temporary Construction Employment</p>	No mitigation required.
---	-------------------------

**Project Impacts**

SO #6: [Disruption of Community Cohesion or Division of Existing Communities from Project Operation.]	<p>SO-MM #1: Disruption to community cohesion and division of existing rural communities during operation.</p> <p>[SO-MM #3: Implement measures to reduce impacts associated with the displacement of key community facilities.]</p> <p>[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]</p>
[SO #12: Displacement of Community Facilities]	[SO-MM #3: Implement measures to reduce impacts associated with the displacement of key community facilities.]
SO #18: Potential for Physical Deterioration	<p>SO-MM #3: Implement measures to reduce impacts associated with the displacement of [key community] facilities.</p> <p>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</p>
<p>[SO #7: Effects to the Regional Agricultural Community]</p> <p>SO #8: Effects of Project Operations on Children’s Health and Safety</p> <p>SO #9: Residential Displacements</p> <p>SO #10: Commercial and Industrial Business Displacements</p>	No mitigation required.

Impact	Mitigation Measure
SO #11: Project Effects on Agricultural Business 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	
<b>Station Planning, Land Use, and Development</b>	
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
LU #1: Potential for Construction to Alter Land Use Patterns	No mitigation required.
<b>Project Impacts</b>	
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.
<b>Agricultural Lands</b>	
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
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.
<b>Project Impacts</b>	
AG #4: Permanent conversion of agricultural land to nonagricultural use.*	AG-MM #1: [Identify and 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 (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Farmland of Local Importance, and Unique Farmland) for Indirect Impacts Adjacent to HSR Permanently Fenced Infrastructure]
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-MM #1: Identify and preserve the total amount of prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, farmland of local importance, and unique farmland.]



Impact	Mitigation Measure
AG #7: Effects on Confined Animal Agriculture AG #8: Effects on Irrigation Distribution Canals AG #9: Noise Effects to Grazing Animals AG #10: Wind-Induced Effects AG #11: Effects on Aerial Spraying	No mitigation required.
<b>Parks, Recreation, and Open Space</b>	
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
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.
<b>Project Impacts</b>	
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.
<b>Aesthetics and Visual Resources</b>	
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
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.
<b>Project Impacts</b>	
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 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 #2d: Replant Unused Portions of Lands Acquired for the HSR] AVR-MM #2e: Provide Offsite Landscape Screening Where Appropriate AVR-MM #2f: Landscape Treatments along the [HSR] Project Overcrossings and Retained Fill Elements of the [HSR] AVR-MM #2g: Provide Sound Barrier Treatments [AVR-MM #2h: Screen Traction Power Distribution Stations and Radio Communication Towers] 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 #2d: Replant Unused Portions of Lands Acquired for the HSR] AVR-MM #2e: Provide Offsite Landscape Screening Where Appropriate

Impact	Mitigation Measure
	AVR-MM #2f: Landscape Treatments along the [HSR] Project Overcrossings and Retained Fill Elements of the [HSR] [AVR-MM #2g: Provide Sound Barrier Treatments]
<b>Cultural Resources</b>	
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
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
<b>Project Impacts</b>	
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.
<b>Regional Growth</b>	
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
Construction Effects	No mitigation required.
<b>Project Impacts</b>	
Operations Effects on Employment, Population Growth, Land Use Consumption, and, Consistency with Regional Growth Management Plans, Hydrology and Water Resources	No mitigation required.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>	
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
Transportation, Air Quality [and Global Climate Change], 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	No mitigation required.
[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.]

Impact	Mitigation Measure
[CUM-CUL: The project's contribution to cumulative cultural resources impacts during construction.*]	[No additional mitigation required.]
[CUM-VQ: The project's contribution to cumulative visual impacts.*]	[CUM-VQ-MM#1: Consult with agencies on the HSR project design.]
<b>Project Impacts</b>	
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, Parks/Recreation and Open Space, Cultural Resources	No mitigation required.
[CUM-AG: The project's contribution to cumulative farmland conversion.*]	[No additional mitigation required.]
[CUM-VQ: The project's contribution to cumulative visual impacts.*]	[CUM-VQ-MM#1: Consult with agencies on the HSR project design.]
<b>Environmental Justice</b>	
<b>Construction Impacts</b>	
EJ #1: Effect of Project Construction on Minority or Low-Income Populations	No mitigation required.
<b>Project Impacts</b>	
EJ #2: Effects of Project Operation on Minority or Low-Income Populations	No mitigation required.

[\* = indicates impacts that remain significant even with the application of mitigation]

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

NO<sub>2</sub> = nitrogen dioxide

NO<sub>x</sub> = nitrogen oxides

NRHP = National Register of Historic Places

O<sub>3</sub> = Ozone

PK = Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

PM<sub>2.5</sub> = particulate matter smaller than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter

PM<sub>10</sub> = 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