

Table of Contents

Volume 1

	Page
Preface	xxxiii
What Is This Document?	xxxiii
How Do I Use This Document?	xxxiii
What Happens Next?	xxxv
Public Review of the Revised Draft EIR / Supplemental Draft EIS	xxxv
Identification of Preferred Alternative	xxxv
Final EIR/EIS and Project Decision	xxxvi
Federal Approval	xxxvi
Fresno to Bakersfield HST Milestone Schedule.....	xxxvi
S.0 Summary	S-1
S.1 Introduction and Background	S-1
S.2 Tiered Environmental Review: Final Statewide Program EIR/EIS and Fresno to Bakersfield Section Project EIR/EIS	S-4
S.3 Issues Raised during the Scoping Process.....	S-5
S.4 Purpose of and Need for the HST System and the Fresno to Bakersfield Section.....	S-5
S.4.1 Purpose of the HST System	S-5
S.4.2 Purpose of the Fresno to Bakersfield Section	S-5
S.4.3 Objectives for the HST System Statewide and within the Central San Joaquin Valley Region	S-6
S.4.4 Need for the HST System Statewide and within the South San Joaquin Valley Region	S-6
S.5 Alternatives.....	S-7
S.5.1 No Project Alternative.....	S-7
S.5.2 Fresno to Bakersfield Section High-Speed Train Alternatives	S-8
S.5.3 Station Area Development	S-9
S.5.4 Heavy Maintenance Facility.....	S-10
S.6 Measures to Avoid and Minimize Impacts.....	S-11
S.7 No Project Alternative Impacts	S-11
S.8 HST Alternatives Evaluation.....	S-14
S.8.1 HST Benefits	S-16
S.8.2 Adverse Effects Common to All HST Alternatives.....	S-17
S.8.3 Comparison of HST Alignment Alternatives.....	S-25
S.8.4 Comparison of HST Stations.....	S-27
S.8.5 Comparison of HMF Alternative Sites	S-28
S.8.6 Capital Cost.....	S-28
S.9 Section 4(f)/Section 6(f).....	S-28
S.9.1 Section 4(f)	S-28
S.9.2 Section 6(f)	S-29
S.10 Areas of Controversy	S-29
S.11 Next Steps in the Environmental Process	S-29
S.11.1 Public and Agency Comment.....	S-29
S.11.2 Identification of Preferred Alternative	S-29
S.11.2.1 FRA Decision-Making.....	S-30
S.11.2.2 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers decision-making	S-30
S.11.2.3 California High-Speed Rail Authority Decision-making	S-30
S.11.2.4 Project Implementation	S-31

1.0	Project Purpose, Need, and Objectives	1-1
1.1	Introduction.....	1-1
1.1.1	The High-Speed Train System.....	1-1
1.1.2	The Fresno to Bakersfield HST Project.....	1-1
1.1.3	The HST Environmental Review Process	1-1
1.1.4	Consistency with Federal Transportation Policy.....	1-3
1.2	Purpose of and Need for the HST System and the Fresno to Bakersfield HST Section.....	1-4
1.2.1	Purpose of HST System.....	1-4
1.2.2	Purpose of Fresno to Bakersfield HST Project.....	1-4
1.2.3	CEQA Project Objectives of the HST System in California and in the South San Joaquin Valley.....	1-4
1.2.4	Statewide and Regional Need for the HST System in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section.....	1-5
1.2.4.1	Travel Demand and Capacity Constraints	1-7
1.2.4.2	Safety and Reliability.....	1-18
1.2.4.3	Modal Connections.....	1-19
1.2.4.4	Air Quality and greenhouse gas emissions.....	1-19
1.2.4.5	Protection and Preservation of Natural Resources and Agricultural Lands	1-21
1.3	Relationship to Other Agency Plans, Policies, and Programs	1-22
1.3.1	San Joaquin Valley Blueprint.....	1-22
1.3.2	San Joaquin Corridor Strategic Plan.....	1-23
1.3.3	2011 Fresno Forward Regional Transportation Plan	1-23
1.3.4	Kings County Association of Governments 2011 Regional Transportation Plan.....	1-24
1.3.5	Tulare County Association of Governments 2011 Transportation Plan.....	1-24
1.3.6	Kern Council of Governments Regional Transportation Plan	1-25
1.3.7	Fresno-Yosemite International Airport Master Plan.....	1-26
1.3.8	Meadows Field Airport Master Plan.....	1-26
1.4	Relationship to Other Transportation Projects in the Study Area	1-26
1.4.1	State Route 99 Corridor Business Plan.....	1-26
1.4.2	California State Rail Plan, 2007–08 to 2017–18.....	1-27
1.4.3	Fresno County Measure C Extension.....	1-27
1.4.4	Bakersfield Thomas Roads Improvement Program	1-27
1.5	Tiering of Program EIR/EIS Documents.....	1-28
1.6	Revised 2012 Business Plan	1-30
2.0	Alternatives	2-1
2.1	Background	2-1
2.1.1	California HST Project Background	2-1
2.1.2	Fresno to Bakersfield Section EIR/EIS Background.....	2-3
2.2	HST System Infrastructure.....	2-3
2.2.1	System Design Performance, Safety, and Security	2-3
2.2.2	Vehicles.....	2-5
2.2.3	Stations.....	2-6
2.2.3.1	Station Platforms and Trackway (Station Box)	2-6
2.2.3.2	Station Arrival/Departure Facility (Station House).....	2-8
2.2.4	Infrastructure Components.....	2-8
2.2.4.1	At-Grade Profile	2-8
2.2.4.2	Retained-Fill Profile	2-9
2.2.4.3	Retained-Cut Profile	2-9
2.2.4.4	Elevated Profile.....	2-9

2.2.5	Grade Separations	2-10
2.2.6	Traction Power Distribution.....	2-12
2.2.6.1	Traction Power Substations	2-12
2.2.6.2	Switching and Paralleling Stations.....	2-12
2.2.6.3	Backup and emergency Power Supply Sources for Stations and Facilities	2-13
2.2.6.4	Signaling and Train-Control Elements.....	2-13
2.2.7	Track Structure.....	2-14
2.2.8	Maintenance Facilities.....	2-14
2.2.8.1	Maintenance-of-Way Facilities	2-14
2.2.8.2	HST Heavy Maintenance Facility	2-14
2.2.8.3	Operations Control Center.....	2-16
2.3	Potential Alternatives Considered during Alternatives Screening Process.....	2-16
2.3.1	HST Project-Level Alternatives Development Process.....	2-17
2.3.2	Range of Potential Alternatives Considered and Findings	2-18
2.3.2.1	Fresno Subsection	2-19
2.3.2.2	Rural Subsection	2-22
2.3.2.3	Bakersfield Subsection	2-28
2.3.2.4	Heavy Maintenance Facility	2-30
2.3.3	Summary of Design Features for Alternatives Being Carried Forward	2-32
2.4	Alignment, Station, and Heavy Maintenance Facility Alternatives Evaluated in this Project EIR/EIS.....	2-35
2.4.1	No Project Alternative – Existing and Planned Improvements.....	2-35
2.4.1.1	Planned growth.....	2-35
2.4.1.2	Highway Element	2-40
2.4.1.3	Aviation Element	2-49
2.4.1.4	Intercity Transit Element.....	2-50
2.4.1.5	Freight Rail Element	2-52
2.4.2	BNSF Alternative.....	2-53
2.4.2.1	Alignment Requirements	2-53
2.4.2.2	BNSF Adjacency	2-60
2.4.2.3	North-south alignment.....	2-60
2.4.3	Alignment Alternatives.....	2-65
2.4.3.1	Hanford West Bypass 1 Alternative	2-65
2.4.3.2	Hanford West Bypass 2 Alternative	2-66
2.4.3.3	Corcoran Elevated Alternative.....	2-66
2.4.3.4	Corcoran Bypass Alternative.....	2-67
2.4.3.5	Allensworth Bypass Alternative	2-67
2.4.3.6	Wasco-Shafter Bypass Alternative.....	2-67
2.4.3.7	Bakersfield South Alternative	2-68
2.4.3.8	Bakersfield Hybrid Alternative.....	2-68
2.4.4	Station Alternatives.....	2-69
2.4.4.1	Fresno Station Alternatives.....	2-69
2.4.4.2	Kings/Tulare Regional Station Alternatives.....	2-76
2.4.4.3	Bakersfield Station Alternatives.....	2-77
2.4.5	Modification of Caltrans/State Facilities	2-86
2.4.5.1	State Route Reconfigurations	2-89
2.4.5.2	State Highway Underpasses	2-90
2.4.5.3	Roadway Overcrossings	2-90
2.4.5.4	Eliminating Leg of intersections	2-90
2.4.5.5	Ramp Modifications	2-90
2.4.6	Proposed Heavy-Maintenance Facility Locations.....	2-90

2.4.6.1	Fresno Works–Fresno HMF Site	2-91
2.4.6.2	Kings County–Hanford HMF Site	2-91
2.4.6.3	Kern Council of Governments–Wasco HMF Site	2-91
2.4.6.4	Kern Council of Governments–Shafter East HMF Site	2-91
2.4.6.5	Kern Council of Governments–Shafter West HMF Site	2-93
2.5	Travel Demand and Ridership Forecasts	2-99
2.5.1	Ridership and HST System Design	2-100
2.5.2	Ridership and Environmental Impact Analysis	2-100
2.5.3	Ridership and Station Area Parking	2-101
2.6	Operations and Service Plan	2-101
2.6.1	HST Service	2-101
2.6.2	Maintenance Activities	2-103
2.7	Additional High-Speed Train Development Considerations	2-105
2.7.1	High-Speed Train, Land Use Patterns, and Development around High-Speed Train Stations	2-105
2.8	Construction Plan	2-107
2.8.1	General Approach	2-108
2.8.2	Pre-Construction Activities	2-110
2.8.3	Major Construction Activities	2-111
2.8.3.1	Earthwork	2-111
2.8.3.2	Bridge, Aerial Structure, And Road Crossing Construction	2-111
2.8.3.3	Railroad Systems Construction	2-112
2.8.3.4	Station Construction	2-113
2.9	Permits	2-113
3.0	Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures	3.1-1
3.1	Introduction	3.1-1
3.1.1	Chapter 3 Purpose and Content	3.1-2
3.1.2	Organization of This Chapter	3.1-2
3.1.3	Approach to the Analysis	3.1-3
3.1.4	Legal Authority to Implement Offsite Mitigation	3.1-6
3.2	Transportation	3.2-1
3.2.1	Introduction	3.2-1
3.2.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	3.2-1
3.2.2.1	Federal	3.2-1
3.2.2.2	State	3.2-1
3.2.2.3	Regional and Local	3.2-2
3.2.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	3.2-3
3.2.3.1	Traffic Operation Standards	3.2-4
3.2.3.2	Baseline Operational Analysis	3.2-6
3.2.3.3	Operational/Project Impacts	3.2-7
3.2.3.4	Methods for Evaluating impacts under NEPA	3.2-8
3.2.3.5	CEQA Significance Criteria	3.2-9
3.2.3.6	Study Area for Analysis	3.2-10
3.2.4	Affected Environment	3.2-10
3.2.4.1	Regional Transportation System	3.2-11
3.2.4.2	Fresno Station Area	3.2-18
3.2.4.3	Kings/Tulare regional Station–EAST Alternative	3.2-31
3.2.4.4	Kings/Tulare regional Station–West Alternative	3.2-36
3.2.4.5	Bakersfield Station Area	3.2-42
3.2.4.6	Heavy Maintenance facility Alternatives	3.2-49
3.2.5	Environmental Consequences	3.2-50
3.2.5.1	Overview	3.2-50

	3.2.5.2	No Project Alternative.....	3.2-62
	3.2.5.3	High-Speed Train Alternatives	3.2-65
3.2.6		Project Design Features.....	3.2-125
3.2.7		Mitigation Measures	3.2-128
	3.2.7.1	Mitigation Measures for Potential Road Closures.....	3.2-128
	3.2.7.2	Mitigation Measures for Intersection and Roadway Impacts.....	3.2-128
	3.2.7.3	Mitigation Measures for Intersection and Roadway Impacts Around Heavy Maintenance Facility Sites.....	3.2-143
	3.2.7.4	Mitigation Measures for Intersection and Roadway Impacts Around The City of Corcoran.....	3.2-146
3.2.8		NEPA Impact Summary	3.2-146
3.2.9		CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.2-148
3.3		Air Quality and Global Climate Change.....	3.3-1
	3.3.1	Introduction	3.3-1
	3.3.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders.....	3.3-1
	3.3.2.1	Federal.....	3.3-1
	3.3.2.2	State.....	3.3-6
	3.3.2.3	Regional and Local	3.3-8
	3.3.3	Pollutants for Analysis	3.3-10
	3.3.3.1	Criteria Pollutants.....	3.3-10
	3.3.3.2	Toxic Air Contaminants.....	3.3-12
	3.3.3.3	Greenhouse Gases	3.3-13
	3.3.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	3.3-13
	3.3.4.1	Study Areas for Analysis	3.3-14
	3.3.4.2	Statewide and Regional Emission Calculations.....	3.3-14
	3.3.4.3	Microscale Co Analysis	3.3-17
	3.3.4.4	Particulate Matter Hot Spot	3.3-19
	3.3.4.5	Mobile Source Air Toxics Analysis.....	3.3-20
	3.3.4.6	Asbestos	3.3-21
	3.3.4.7	Greenhouse Gas Analysis	3.3-22
	3.3.4.8	HMF and MOWF Operations Impact Analysis.....	3.3-23
	3.3.4.9	Construction Phase Analysis	3.3-26
	3.3.4.10	Significance Thresholds	3.3-30
	3.3.5	Affected Environment.....	3.3-32
	3.3.5.1	Local Meteorological Conditions	3.3-33
	3.3.5.2	Local Monitored Air Quality Data.....	3.3-33
	3.3.5.3	Attainment Status of Study Area.....	3.3-37
	3.3.5.4	Air Quality Plans and Programs.....	3.3-38
	3.3.6	Environmental Consequences.....	3.3-39
	3.3.6.1	Overview.....	3.3-39
	3.3.6.2	No Project Alternative.....	3.3-40
	3.3.6.3	High-Speed Train Alternatives	3.3-40
	3.3.7	Compliance with Conformity Rules.....	3.3-77
	3.3.7.1	General Conformity	3.3-78
	3.3.7.2	Transportation Conformity	3.3-78
	3.3.8	Project Design Features.....	3.3-79
	3.3.9	Mitigation Measures	3.3-80
	3.3.9.1	CEQA and NEPA Level of Impact After Mitigation/Impacts Summary.....	3.3-82
	3.3.10	NEPA Impacts Summary.....	3.3-83
	3.3.10.1	Construction Period Impacts.....	3.3-83
	3.3.10.2	Project/Operational Phase Impacts	3.3-84

3.3.11	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.3-84
3.4	Noise and Vibration	3.4-1
3.4.1	Introduction	3.4-1
3.4.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders.....	3.4-1
3.4.2.1	Federal	3.4-1
3.4.2.2	State.....	3.4-1
3.4.2.3	Regional and Local.....	3.4-2
3.4.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	3.4-2
3.4.3.1	What is Noise?.....	3.4-3
3.4.3.2	What Is Vibration?	3.4-4
3.4.3.3	Impact Assessment Guidance.....	3.4-4
3.4.3.4	Methods for Evaluating Effects under NEPA	3.4-14
3.4.3.5	CEQA Significance Criteria.....	3.4-15
3.4.3.6	Study Area for Analysis.....	3.4-15
3.4.4	Affected Environment.....	3.4-17
3.4.4.1	Existing Noise Levels	3.4-17
3.4.4.2	Existing Vibration Levels	3.4-26
3.4.5	Environmental Consequences	3.4-27
3.4.5.1	Overview of Project Impacts	3.4-27
3.4.5.2	No Project Alternative.....	3.4-29
3.4.5.3	High-Speed Train Alternatives	3.4-30
3.4.6	Project Design Features	3.4-52
3.4.7	Mitigation Measures	3.4-52
3.4.7.1	Construction Period.....	3.4-52
3.4.7.2	PROJECT.....	3.4-53
3.4.8	NEPA Impacts Summary.....	3.4-72
3.4.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.4-73
3.5	Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference	3.5-1
3.5.1	Introduction	3.5-1
3.5.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders.....	3.5-3
3.5.2.1	Introduction	3.5-3
3.5.2.2	Federal	3.5-5
3.5.2.3	State.....	3.5-6
3.5.2.4	Regional and Local.....	3.5-6
3.5.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	3.5-6
3.5.3.1	Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference Data Collection and Analysis	3.5-6
3.5.3.2	Methods for Evaluating effects under NEPA	3.5-7
3.5.3.3	CEQA Significance Criteria.....	3.5-8
3.5.3.4	Study Area for Analysis.....	3.5-8
3.5.4	Affected Environment.....	3.5-9
3.5.4.1	Sources of EMF, EMI, and RFI	3.5-9
3.5.4.2	Local Conditions.....	3.5-9
3.5.4.3	Receivers Susceptible to EMF/EMI/RFI Effects	3.5-12
3.5.4.4	Railroad/Transportation Equipment Susceptible to EMF/EMI/RFI Effects from Airports, Military, or Other Commercial Transmitters along the Right-of-Way	3.5-13
3.5.5	Environmental Consequences	3.5-13
3.5.5.1	Overview.....	3.5-13
3.5.5.2	No Project Alternative.....	3.5-14
3.5.5.3	High-Speed Train Alternatives	3.5-14
3.5.6	Project Design Features	3.5-21
3.5.7	Mitigation Measures	3.5-21

3.5.8	NEPA Impacts Summary	3.5-22
3.5.9	CEQA Significance Conclusion	3.5-23
3.6	Public Utilities and Energy	3.6-1
3.6.1	Introduction	3.6-1
3.6.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	3.6-1
3.6.2.1	Federal.....	3.6-1
3.6.2.2	State.....	3.6-2
3.6.2.3	Regional and Local	3.6-4
3.6.3	Methods of Evaluation of Impacts.....	3.6-10
3.6.3.1	Public Utilities and Energy Data Collection and Analysis ..	3.6-10
3.6.3.2	Methods for Evaluating Effects under NEPA	3.6-14
3.6.3.3	CEQA Significance Criteria.....	3.6-14
3.6.3.4	Study Area	3.6-15
3.6.4	Affected Environment	3.6-15
3.6.4.1	Public Utilities	3.6-15
3.6.4.2	ENERGY	3.6-32
3.6.5	Environmental Consequences.....	3.6-37
3.6.5.1	Overview	3.6-37
3.6.5.2	No Project Alternative.....	3.6-43
3.6.5.3	High-Speed Train Alternatives	3.6-44
3.6.6	Project Design Features.....	3.6-77
3.6.7	Mitigation Measures	3.6-77
3.6.8	NEPA Impacts Summary.....	3.6-78
3.6.8.1	Summary of Impacts	3.6-78
3.6.8.2	Significance Under NEPA.....	3.6-79
3.6.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.6-79
3.7	Biological Resources and Wetlands.....	3.7-1
3.7.1	Introduction	3.7-1
3.7.1.1	Key Definitions.....	3.7-1
3.7.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	3.7-3
3.7.2.1	Federal.....	3.7-3
3.7.2.2	State.....	3.7-5
3.7.2.3	Regional and Local	3.7-6
3.7.2.4	Habitat Conservation Plans in the Project Vicinity	3.7-6
3.7.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	3.7-6
3.7.3.1	Study Areas	3.7-7
3.7.3.2	Literature Review	3.7-7
3.7.3.3	Field Surveys	3.7-10
3.7.3.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	3.7-12
3.7.3.5	Methods for Evaluating Effects Under NEPA.....	3.7-13
3.7.3.6	CEQA Significance Criteria.....	3.7-14
3.7.4	Affected Environment.....	3.7-15
3.7.4.1	Regional Setting.....	3.7-15
3.7.4.2	Plant Communities and Land Cover Types	3.7-16
3.7.4.3	Native Fauna Assemblage	3.7-20
3.7.4.4	Special-Status Species	3.7-21
3.7.4.5	Habitats of Concern.....	3.7-25
3.7.4.6	Wildlife Movement Corridors.....	3.7-38
3.7.5	Environmental Consequences.....	3.7-41
3.7.5.1	Overview	3.7-41
3.7.5.2	No Project Alternative.....	3.7-42
3.7.5.3	High-Speed Train Alternatives	3.7-43
3.7.6	Project Design Features.....	3.7-160

3.7.7	Mitigation Measures	3.7-161
3.7.7.1	Common Mitigation Measures for Biological Resources ..	3.7-162
3.7.7.2	Construction Period Mitigation Measures	3.7-168
3.7.7.3	Project Mitigation Measures	3.7-182
3.7.8	NEPA Impacts Summary	3.7-190
3.8	Hydrology and Water Resources	3.8-1
3.8.1	Introduction	3.8-1
3.8.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	3.8-1
3.8.2.1	Federal	3.8-1
3.8.2.2	State	3.8-3
3.8.2.3	Regional and Local	3.8-5
3.8.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	3.8-9
3.8.3.1	Methods for Analyzing Study Area Impacts	3.8-10
3.8.3.2	Methods for Evaluating Effects under NEPA	3.8-12
3.8.3.3	CEQA Significance Criteria	3.8-13
3.8.3.4	STUDY AREA FOR ANALYSIS	3.8-13
3.8.4	Affected Environment	3.8-14
3.8.4.1	Climate, Precipitation, and Topography	3.8-14
3.8.4.2	Regional Hydrology and Water Quality	3.8-16
3.8.4.3	Hydrology and Water Quality in the Study Area	3.8-28
3.8.5	Environmental Consequences	3.8-38
3.8.5.1	Overview	3.8-38
3.8.5.2	No Project Alternative	3.8-39
3.8.5.3	High-Speed Train Alternatives	3.8-40
3.8.6	Project Design Features	3.8-66
3.8.7	NEPA Impact Summary	3.8-69
3.8.8	CEQA Significance Conclusions	3.8-70
3.9	Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	3.9-1
3.9.1	Introduction	3.9-1
3.9.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	3.9-2
3.9.2.1	State	3.9-2
3.9.2.2	Regional and Local	3.9-3
3.9.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	3.9-6
3.9.3.1	Methods for Evaluating Effects under NEPA	3.9-6
3.9.3.2	CEQA Significance Criteria	3.9-7
3.9.3.3	Study Area for Analysis	3.9-7
3.9.4	Affected Environment	3.9-8
3.9.4.1	Physiography and Regional Geologic Setting	3.9-8
3.9.4.2	Geology Along the Proposed High-Speed Train Alternatives	3.9-10
3.9.4.3	Site Soils	3.9-12
3.9.4.4	Geologic Hazards	3.9-15
3.9.4.5	Primary Seismic Hazards	3.9-15
3.9.4.6	Secondary Seismic Hazards	3.9-18
3.9.4.7	Areas of Difficult Excavation	3.9-23
3.9.4.8	Mineral and Energy Resources	3.9-23
3.9.4.9	Affected Environment By HST Alternative	3.9-25
3.9.5	Environmental Consequences	3.9-25
3.9.5.1	Overview	3.9-25
3.9.5.2	No Project Alternative	3.9-26
3.9.5.3	High-Speed Train Alternatives	3.9-27
3.9.6	Project Design Features	3.9-37
3.9.7	NEPA Impact Summary	3.9-39

3.9.8	CEQA Significance Conclusions	3.9-40
3.10	Hazardous Materials and Wastes.....	3.10-1
3.10.1	Introduction	3.10-1
3.10.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	3.10-1
3.10.2.1	Federal.....	3.10-1
3.10.2.2	State.....	3.10-2
3.10.2.3	Local Jurisdiction Plans and Policies	3.10-3
3.10.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	3.10-5
3.10.3.1	Methods for Evaluating Effects under NEPA	3.10-6
3.10.3.2	CEQA Significance Criteria.....	3.10-7
3.10.3.3	Study Area for Analysis	3.10-7
3.10.4	Affected Environment	3.10-7
3.10.4.1	General Areas of Concern	3.10-8
3.10.4.2	Specific Sites of Concern.....	3.10-13
3.10.5	Environmental Consequences.....	3.10-28
3.10.5.1	Overview.....	3.10-28
3.10.5.2	No Project Alternative.....	3.10-29
3.10.5.3	High-Speed Train Alternatives	3.10-29
3.10.6	Project Design Features.....	3.10-36
3.10.7	Mitigation Measures	3.10-37
3.10.8	NEPA Impacts Summary.....	3.10-38
3.10.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.10-39
3.11	Safety and Security.....	3.11-1
3.11.1	Introduction	3.11-1
3.11.2	Regulatory Requirements.....	3.11-3
3.11.2.1	Federal.....	3.11-3
3.11.2.2	State.....	3.11-4
3.11.2.3	Regional and Local.....	3.11-4
3.11.2.4	Other Requirements	3.11-6
3.11.3	Methods of Evaluation of Impacts.....	3.11-6
3.11.3.1	Methods for Evaluating Effects under NEPA	3.11-6
3.11.3.2	CEQA Significance Criteria	3.11-7
3.11.3.3	Study Area	3.11-7
3.11.4	Affected Environment.....	3.11-8
3.11.4.1	Emergency Services	3.11-8
3.11.4.2	Community Safety.....	3.11-17
3.11.5	Environmental Consequences.....	3.11-24
3.11.5.1	Overview.....	3.11-24
3.11.5.2	No Project Alternative.....	3.11-25
3.11.5.3	High-speed train alternatives.....	3.11-25
3.11.6	Project Design Features.....	3.11-41
3.11.7	Mitigation Measures	3.11-43
3.11.8	NEPA Impacts Summary.....	3.11-43
3.11.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.11-45
3.12	Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice	3.12-1
3.12.1	Introduction	3.12-1
3.12.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	3.12-1
3.12.2.1	Federal.....	3.12-1
3.12.2.2	State.....	3.12-2
3.12.2.3	Regional and Local	3.12-3
3.12.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	3.12-4
3.12.3.1	Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice Data Collection and Analysis	3.12-4

3.12.3.2	Methods for Evaluating Effects under NEPA	3.12-10
3.12.3.3	CEQA Significance Criteria.....	3.12-10
3.12.3.4	Study Area for Analysis.....	3.12-11
3.12.3.5	Environmental Justice Outreach and Interest Groups ...	3.12-12
3.12.4	Affected Environment.....	3.12-14
3.12.4.1	Population Characteristics	3.12-14
3.12.4.2	Housing Setting	3.12-24
3.12.4.3	Economic Setting	3.12-30
3.12.4.4	Communities and Neighborhoods	3.12-34
3.12.4.5	Environmental Justice.....	3.12-39
3.12.5	Environmental Consequences	3.12-46
3.12.5.1	No Project Alternative.....	3.12-47
3.12.5.2	High-Speed Train Alternatives	3.12-49
3.12.6	Project Design Features	3.12-115
3.12.7	Mitigation Measures	3.12-117
3.12.8	NEPA Impacts Summary.....	3.12-120
3.12.8.1	Construction Period Impacts	3.12-120
3.12.8.2	Project Impacts	3.12-120
3.12.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.12-122
3.13	Station Planning, Land Use, and Development	3.13-1
3.13.1	Introduction	3.13-1
3.13.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders.....	3.13-2
3.13.2.1	Federal	3.13-2
3.13.2.2	State.....	3.13-2
3.13.2.3	Regional and local.....	3.13-3
3.13.2.4	Consistency with Local and Regional Plans	3.13-13
3.13.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	3.13-16
3.13.3.1	Methods for Evaluating Effects under NEPA	3.13-17
3.13.3.2	CEQA Significance Criteria.....	3.13-17
3.13.3.3	Study Area	3.13-18
3.13.4	Affected Environment.....	3.13-18
3.13.4.1	BNSF Alternative	3.13-18
3.13.4.2	Other Alignment Alternatives	3.13-19
3.13.4.3	HST Station Area	3.13-20
3.13.4.4	Heavy Maintenance Facility Alternatives	3.13-32
3.13.4.5	Planned Development.....	3.13-32
3.13.5	Environmental Consequences	3.13-33
3.13.5.1	Overview.....	3.13-33
3.13.5.2	No Project Alternative.....	3.13-33
3.13.5.3	High-Speed Train Alternatives	3.13-34
3.13.6	Project Design Features	3.13-57
3.13.7	Mitigation Measures	3.13-57
3.13.8	NEPA Impacts Summary.....	3.13-58
3.13.9	CEQA Significance Conclusion	3.13-59
3.14	Agricultural Lands	3.14-1
3.14.1	Introduction	3.14-1
3.14.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders.....	3.14-1
3.14.2.1	Federal	3.14-1
3.14.2.2	State.....	3.14-2
3.14.2.3	Regional and Local.....	3.14-4
3.14.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	3.14-8
3.14.3.1	Methods for Evaluating Effects under NEPA	3.14-9
3.14.3.2	CEQA Significance criteria	3.14-10

3.14.3.3	Study Area for Analysis	3.14-10
3.14.4	Affected Environment	3.14-11
3.14.4.1	Regional Agriculture	3.14-11
3.14.4.2	Important and Protected Farmlands	3.14-12
3.14.4.3	Agricultural Lands Along the Proposed HST Alternatives	3.14-31
3.14.5	Environmental Consequences	3.14-33
3.14.5.1	Overview	3.14-33
3.14.5.2	No Project Alternative	3.14-39
3.14.5.3	High-Speed Train Alternatives	3.14-40
3.14.6	Project Design Features	3.14-57
3.14.7	Mitigation Measure	3.14-58
3.14.8	NEPA Impact Summary	3.14-59
3.14.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions	3.14-61
3.15	Parks, Recreation, and Open Space	3.15-1
3.15.1	Introduction	3.15-1
3.15.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	3.15-1
3.15.2.1	Federal	3.15-1
3.15.2.2	State	3.15-3
3.15.2.3	Regional and local	3.15-3
3.15.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	3.15-4
3.15.3.1	Methods for Evaluating Effects Under NEPA	3.15-5
3.15.3.2	CEQA Significance Criteria	3.15-6
3.15.3.3	Study Area for Analysis	3.15-6
3.15.3.4	Agency Outreach	3.15-7
3.15.4	Affected Environment	3.15-7
3.15.4.1	BNSF Alternative	3.15-18
3.15.4.2	Hanford West Bypass 1 and 2 Alternatives	3.15-21
3.15.4.3	Kings/Tulare Regional Station–West Alternative	3.15-21
3.15.4.4	Corcoran Elevated Alternative	3.15-22
3.15.4.5	Corcoran bypass alternative	3.15-22
3.15.4.6	Allensworth Bypass Alternative	3.15-22
3.15.4.7	Wasco-Shafter Bypass Alternative	3.15-22
3.15.4.8	Bakersfield South Alternative	3.15-23
3.15.4.9	Bakersfield Hybrid Alternative	3.15-23
3.15.4.10	Heavy Maintenance Facility Site Alternatives	3.15-24
3.15.5	Environmental Consequences	3.15-24
3.15.5.1	Overview of Project Impacts	3.15-24
3.15.5.2	No Project Alternative	3.15-25
3.15.5.3	High-Speed Train Alternatives	3.15-26
3.15.6	Project Design Features	3.15-45
3.15.7	Mitigation Measures	3.15-45
3.15.7.1	Construction Period	3.15-46
3.15.7.2	Project	3.15-46
3.15.8	NEPA Impacts Summary	3.15-46
3.15.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions	3.15-48
3.16	Aesthetics and Visual Resources	3.16-1
3.16.1	Introduction	3.16-1
3.16.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	3.16-1
3.16.2.1	Federal	3.16-1
3.16.2.2	State	3.16-2
3.16.2.3	Local and Regional	3.16-2
3.16.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	3.16-6
3.16.3.1	Method for Evaluating Effects under NEPA	3.16-9

3.16.3.2	CEQA Significance Criteria.....	3.16-10
3.16.3.3	Study Area	3.16-10
3.16.4	Affected Environment.....	3.16-11
3.16.4.1	Fresno to Bakersfield Section Visual Resources	3.16-11
3.16.4.2	Landscape Units, Key Viewpoints, and Establishing Existing Visual Quality Categories	3.16-12
3.16.5	Environmental Consequences	3.16-58
3.16.5.1	Overview.....	3.16-58
3.16.5.2	No Project Alternative.....	3.16-59
3.16.5.3	High-Speed Train Alternatives	3.16-59
3.16.6	Project Design Features	3.16-138
3.16.7	Mitigation Measures	3.16-138
3.16.7.1	Construction Period.....	3.16-139
3.16.7.2	Project	3.16-140
3.16.8	NEPA Impacts Summary.....	3.16-143
3.16.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.16-144
3.17	Cultural and Paleontological Resources.....	3.17-1
3.17.1	Introduction	3.17-1
3.17.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders.....	3.17-2
3.17.2.1	Federal	3.17-2
3.17.2.2	State.....	3.17-5
3.17.2.3	Regional and Local.....	3.17-6
3.17.3	Methods for Evaluating Effects/Impacts	3.17-10
3.17.3.1	Study Area/Area of Potential Effects	3.17-10
3.17.3.2	Cultural and Paleontological Resource Data Sources.....	3.17-12
3.17.3.3	Agency, Native American, and Public Outreach.....	3.17-19
3.17.3.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts under NEPA	3.17-32
3.17.3.5	Methods for Evaluating Impacts under CEQA.....	3.17-33
3.17.4	Affected Environment.....	3.17-33
3.17.4.1	Archaeological Resources.....	3.17-33
3.17.4.2	Historic Archaeological Resources.....	3.17-35
3.17.4.3	Historic Architectural Resources	3.17-44
3.17.4.4	Paleontological Resources.....	3.17-85
3.17.5	Environmental Consequences	3.17-92
3.17.5.1	Overview.....	3.17-92
3.17.5.2	No Project Alternative.....	3.17-93
3.17.5.3	Construction Period Impacts	3.17-93
3.17.5.4	Project Impacts	3.17-117
3.17.6	Section 106 Commitments and Mitigation Measures.....	3.17-117
3.17.6.1	Archaeological Resources.....	3.17-119
3.17.6.2	Historic Architectural Resources	3.17-122
3.17.6.3	Paleontological Resources.....	3.17-126
3.17.7	NEPA Impact Summary	3.17-127
3.17.7.1	Cultural Resources	3.17-127
3.17.7.2	Paleontological Resources.....	3.17-128
3.17.8	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.17-128
3.18	Regional Growth	3.18-1
3.18.1	Introduction	3.18-1
3.18.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders.....	3.18-2
3.18.2.1	Federal	3.18-2
3.18.2.2	State.....	3.18-2
3.18.2.3	Regional.....	3.18-4
3.18.2.4	Local.....	3.18-6

3.18.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	3.18-9
3.18.3.1	Regional Modeling	3.18-9
3.18.3.2	Study Area	3.18-11
3.18.4	Affected Environment	3.18-11
3.18.4.1	Population	3.18-11
3.18.4.2	Employment	3.18-14
3.18.4.3	Unemployment Rates	3.18-16
3.18.4.4	Housing Demand.....	3.18-18
3.18.5	Environmental Consequences.....	3.18-19
3.18.5.1	Overview	3.18-19
3.18.5.2	No Project Alternative.....	3.18-20
3.18.5.3	High-Speed Train Alternatives	3.18-20
3.18.6	Summary	3.18-36
3.19	Cumulative Impacts	3.19-1
3.19.1	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	3.19-1
3.19.1.1	National Environmental Policy Act	3.19-1
3.19.2	Methods.....	3.19-2
3.19.3	Cumulative Projects and Growth Forecasts	3.19-2
3.19.3.1	Historical Context of Project Area.....	3.19-3
3.19.3.2	Projected Growth Trends	3.19-4
3.19.3.3	Cumulative Project List	3.19-4
3.19.4	Analysis of Cumulative Impacts	3.19-5
3.19.4.1	Cumulative Condition.....	3.19-5
3.19.4.2	High-Speed Train Alternatives Contributions	3.19-5
4.0	Section 4(f)/6(f) Evaluation	4-1
4.1	Introduction	4-1
4.1.1	Study Area	4-3
4.1.1.1	Public Park and Recreation Lands, Open Space, and Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges.....	4-3
4.1.1.2	Historic properties	4-3
4.1.2	Section 4(f) Use Definition	4-5
4.1.2.1	Permanent Use	4-5
4.1.2.2	Temporary Occupancy.....	4-5
4.1.2.3	Constructive Use	4-5
4.1.2.4	De Minimis Impact	4-5
4.1.3	Section 4(f) Applicability	4-6
4.2	Coordination	4-7
4.3	Purpose and Need	4-8
4.4	Alternatives.....	4-8
4.4.1	No Project Alternative.....	4-8
4.4.2	BNSF Alternative.....	4-9
4.4.3	Hanford West Bypass 1 Alternative	4-9
4.4.4	Hanford West Bypass 2 Alternative	4-10
4.4.5	Corcoran Elevated Alternative	4-10
4.4.6	Corcoran Bypass Alternative.....	4-11
4.4.7	Allensworth Bypass Alternative.....	4-11
4.4.8	Wasco-Shafter Bypass Alternative	4-11
4.4.9	Bakersfield South Alternative	4-11
4.4.10	Bakersfield Hybrid Alternative	4-11
4.4.11	Heavy Maintenance Facility Site Alternatives.....	4-12
4.5	Section 4(f) Applicability Analysis	4-12
4.5.1	Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges	4-12

4.5.2	Cultural Resources	4-22
4.6	Preliminary Section 4(f) Use Assessment	4-31
4.6.1	Park, Recreation, and Wildlife Refuge Resources	4-31
4.6.2	Cultural Resources	4-38
4.6.2.1	Historic Resources	4-38
4.7	Avoidance Alternatives	4-45
4.7.1	Preliminary Individual Resource Avoidance Assessments	4-46
4.7.1.1	Colonel Allensworth State Historic Park/Allensworth Historic District	4-46
4.7.1.2	Allensworth Ecological Reserve	4-49
4.7.1.3	Washington Irrigated Colony Historic Rural Landscape, Washington Colony Canal and North Branch of Oleander Canal	4-49
4.7.1.4	People's Ditch	4-49
4.7.1.5	13148 Grangeville Boulevard	4-49
4.7.1.6	Last Chance Ditch	4-50
4.7.1.7	9860 13th Avenue	4-50
4.7.1.8	11029 Kent Avenue	4-51
4.7.1.9	Friant-Kern Canal	4-51
4.7.1.10	2509 East California Avenue	4-52
4.8	Measures to Minimize Harm	4-52
4.9	Preliminary Section 4(f) Least Harm Analysis	4-57
4.9.1	Preliminary Least Harm Analysis for Hanford Area Alternatives	4-57
4.9.2	Preliminary Least Harm Analysis for Bakersfield Area Alternatives	4-63
4.10	Section 6(f)	4-67
4.10.1.1	Converted area: description	4-68
4.10.1.2	Section 6(f) Summary	4-69
5.0	Project Costs and Operations	5-1
5.1	Introduction	5-1
5.2	Capital Costs	5-1
5.2.1	High-Speed Train Alternatives	5-2
5.2.2	Heavy Maintenance Facility	5-9
5.3	Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Costs	5-9
5.3.1	Operating Speeds	5-10
5.3.2	Travel Times	5-10
5.3.3	Development of Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Costs	5-10
6.0	Other CEQA/NEPA Considerations	6-1
6.1	Preferred Alternative	6-1
6.2	Environmentally Superior Alternative	6-2
6.3	Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative	6-2
6.4	Unavoidable Adverse Potentially Significant Impacts	6-3
6.5	Relationship between Short-Term Use of the Environment and the Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity	6-4
6.6	Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes That Would Result from the Proposed Project If Implemented	6-5
7.0	Public and Agency Involvement	7-1
7.1	Environmental Justice Outreach	7-2
7.2	Public and Agency Scoping	7-2
7.2.1	Notices of Preparation, Notices of Intent, and Public Information Materials	7-2
7.2.2	Scoping Meetings	7-2
7.2.3	Scoping Comments	7-3
7.3	Alternatives Analysis Process	7-4

7.3.1	Public Information Meetings and Materials during the Alternatives Analysis Process.....	7-6
7.3.2	Technical Working Group Meetings during the Alternatives Analysis Process	7-7
7.3.3	Environmental Resource Agency Meetings during the Alternatives Analysis Process	7-7
7.4	Development of the Draft EIR/EIS	7-8
7.4.1	Public Information Materials and Meetings	7-8
7.4.2	Technical Working Group Meetings.....	7-8
7.4.3	Agency Meetings and Consultation	7-8
7.5	Notification and Circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS.....	7-10
7.6	Publication and Review of the EIR/EIS	7-11
7.6.1	Public and Agency Information Meetings and Hearings.....	7-11
7.6.2	Comments on the EIR/EIS	7-12
8.0	EIR/EIS Distribution	8-1
8.1	Repository Locations.....	8-1
8.2	Federal Agencies	8-5
8.3	State Agencies	8-6
8.4	Elected Officials.....	8-7
8.5	Regional/Local Agencies.....	8-11
8.6	Organizations and Businesses.....	8-12
8.7	Native American Contacts.....	8-13
8.8	Schools and Districts.....	8-14
9.0	List of Preparers.....	9-1
9.1	California High Speed Rail Authority	9-1
9.2	List of Consultants	9-1
10.0	References/Sources Used in Document Preparation.....	10-1
11.0	Glossary of Terms.....	11-1
12.0	Index.....	12-1
13.0	Acronyms and Abbreviations	13-1

Volume 2 – Technical Appendices

1-A	Revised 2012 Business Plan
2-A	Road Crossings
2-B	Railroad Crossings
2-C	Operations and Service Plan Summary
2-D	Applicable Design Standards
3.1-A	Parcels within HST Footprint (bound separately)
3.4-A	Noise and Vibration
3.5-A	Technical Study: Pre-Construction Electromagnetic Measurement Survey of 10 Locations along the Fresno to Bakersfield Section
3.6-A	Existing Plus Project Conditions Energy Analysis
3.6-B	Water Usage Analysis Technical Memorandum
3.6-C	Energy Analysis Memorandum
3.7-A	Special-Status Species and Observed Habitats
3.7-B	Comparison of Impacts on Biological Resources by Alternative
3.8-A	Water Bodies Crossed by Fresno to Bakersfield Section Alternatives
3.11-A	Safety and Security Data
3.11-B	Airport Obstructions
3.12-A	Residential, Business, and Mobile Home Relocation Assistance Brochures
3.12-B	Effects on School District Funding and Transportation Bus Routes
3.12-C	Children's Health and Safety Risk Assessment

3.13-A Land Use Plans, Goals, and Policies
 3.14-A Results and Findings of Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Pursuant to the Farmland Protection Policy Act
 3.14-B Effects on Confined Animal Agriculture
 3.14-C High Speed Train Noise Disturbance on Grazing Lands
 3.17-A Programmatic Agreement
 3.19-A Planned and Potential Projects and Plans
 3.19-B Planned and Potential Transportation Projects
 5-A Operating Cost Memorandum

Volume 3– Alignments and Other Plans (submitted on Disk)

A: Alignment Plans, Part 1 of 2
 B: Alignment Plans, Part 2 of 2
 C: Roadway and Grade Separation Plans, Part 1 of 2
 D: Roadway and Grade Separation Plans, Part 2 of 2
 E: Station Plans

Tables

Table S-1 Design Features of Alternatives Carried Forward^a S-15
Table S-2 Comparison of Impacts of HST Alignment Alternatives Page 1A S-33
Table S-3 HST Mitigation Measures S-49
Table S-4 Environmental Impacts Differentiating HMF Alternatives S-82
Table 1-1 Population Growth in California, the San Joaquin Valley, and the Counties of the South San Joaquin Valley 1-8
Table 1-2 Unemployment and Income in California and the Counties of the South San Joaquin Valley 1-9
Table 1-3 Current and Projected Vehicle Miles Traveled in the South San Joaquin Valley 1-12
Table 1-4 Travel Growth for Intercity Highways 1-13
Table 1-5 Commercial Air Traffic and Central Valley Airports 1-15
Table 1-6 Estimated Total Travel Times (Door-to-Door in Hours and Minutes) between City Pairs by Auto, Air, and Rail (Peak Conditions) 1-17
Table 2-1 HST Performance Criteria 2-4
Table 2-2 Rural Subsection Initial Alternatives 2-23
Table 2-3 Design Features of Alternatives Carried Forward^a 2-33
Table 2-4 Regional Projected Population and Employment 2-36
Table 2-5 Planned Residential Development Projects Within the Fresno to Bakersfield Area as of March 2010 2-38
Table 2-6 Increase in Total Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled 2-40
Table 2-7 No Project Alternative – Planned Improvements in Fresno County 2-42
Table 2-8 No Project Alternative – Planned Improvements in Kings County 2-43
Table 2-9 No Project Alternative – Planned Improvements in Tulare County 2-43
Table 2-10 No Project Alternative – Planned Improvements in Kern County 2-44
Table 2-11 Passenger Boardings for Fresno, Visalia, and Bakersfield Airports 2-49
Table 2-12 Programmed Improvements in 2008 California State Rail Plan 2-51
Table 2-13 Planning and Design Assumptions 2-69
Table 2-14 Impact of HST Alternatives on Caltrans State Facilities 2-86
Table 2-15 Fresno to Bakersfield Section HMF Site Descriptions 2-93
Table 2-16 HST System Ridership Forecasts (in millions per year) 2-99
Table 2-17 Approximate Construction Schedule^a 2-109
Table 2-18 Potential Major Environmental Permits and Approvals 2-114
Table 3.2-1 Regional and Local Plans and Policies 3.2-2
Table 3.2-2 Roadway Segment Level of Service 3.2-4

Table 3.2-3 Level of Service and Average Vehicular Delay Definitions for Signalized Intersections..... 3.2-5

Table 3.2-4 Level of Service and Average Vehicular Delay Definition for Unsignalized Intersections..... 3.2-5

Table 3.2-5 Year 2035 Forecast Vehicle Trip Generation at HST Stations..... 3.2-7

Table 3.2-6 Intersections Operating at LOS E or F near the Proposed Fresno Station3.2-19

Table 3.2-7 City of Fresno Bus Routes and Weekday Service Frequency.....3.2-30

Table 3.2-8 Intersections Operating at LOS E or F near the Kings/Tulare Regional Station—East Alternative (Potential).....3.2-36

Table 3.2-9 Intersections Operating at LOS E or F near the Kings/Tulare Regional Station—West Alternative (Potential).....3.2-37

Table 3.2-10 Intersections Operating at LOS E or F near the Proposed Bakersfield Station3.2-46

Table 3.2-11 Proposed Bakersfield HST Station Bus Routes and Weekday Service Frequency3.2-48

Table 3.2-12 Intersections Operating at LOS E or F around the Proposed HMF Locations under Existing Conditions.....3.2-49

Table 3.2-13 Vehicle Miles Traveled.....3.2-72

Table 3.2-14 Existing Plus Project Roadway Segment Analysis Downtown Fresno Station – Tulare Street Underpass Option.....3.2-80

Table 3.2-15 Existing Plus Project Roadway Segment Analysis Downtown Fresno Station – Tulare Street Overpass Option.....3.2-80

Table 3.2-16 Future (2035) Plus Project Roadway Segment Analysis Downtown Fresno Station – Tulare Street Underpass Option.....3.2-81

Table 3.2-17 Future (2035) Plus Project Roadway Segment Analysis Downtown Fresno Station – Tulare Street Underpass Option.....3.2-83

Table 3.2-18 Existing Plus Project, Intersection Operating Conditions Proposed Fresno HST Stations – Tulare Street Underpass Option.....3.2-86

Table 3.2-19 Existing Plus Project, Intersection Operating Conditions Proposed Fresno HST Stations – Tulare Street Overpass Option3.2-87

Table 3.2-20 Future (2035) with Project, Intersection Operating Conditions Proposed Fresno Stations – Tulare Street Underpass Option.....3.2-88

Table 3.2-21 Future (2035) Plus Project, Intersection Operating Conditions Proposed Fresno HST Stations – Tulare Street Overpass Option.....3.2-94

Table 3.2-22 Existing Plus Project, Roadway Segment Analysis, Kings/Tulare Regional Station—East Alternative.....3.2-100

Table 3.2-23 Future (2035) with Project, Roadway Segment Analysis, Kings/Tulare Regional Station—East Alternative.....3.2-101

Table 3.2-24 Existing Plus Project, Intersection Analysis, Kings/Tulare Regional Station—East Alternative.....3.2-101

Table 3.2-25 Future (2035) Plus Project, Intersection Operating Conditions, Kings/Tulare Regional Station—East Alternative3.2-102

Table 3.2-26 Existing Plus Project, Intersection Analysis, Kings/Tulare Regional Station—West Alternative.....3.2-104

Table 3.2-27 Future (2035) with Project, Intersection Operating Conditions, Kings/Tulare Regional Station—West Alternative3.2-104

Table 3.2-28 Existing Plus Project, Roadway Segment Analysis, Bakersfield Station—North and Bakersfield—South Alternatives3.2-107

Table 3.2-29 Future (2035) Plus Project, Roadway Segment Analysis, Bakersfield Station—North and Bakersfield—South Alternatives3.2-108

Table 3.2-30 Existing Plus Project, Roadway Segment Analysis, Bakersfield Station—Hybrid.....3.2-109

Table 3.2-31 Future (2035) Plus Project, Roadway Segment Analysis, Bakersfield Station– Hybrid 3.2-110

Table 3.2-32 Existing Plus Project, Intersection Operating Conditions, Bakersfield Station–North and Bakersfield–South Alternatives 3.2-112

Table 3.2-33 Future (2035) with Project, Intersection Operating Conditions, Bakersfield Station–North and Bakersfield–South Alternatives 3.2-113

Table 3.2-34 Existing Plus Project, Intersection Operating Conditions, Bakersfield Hybrid Station 3.2-115

Table 3.2-35 Future (2035) with Project, Intersection Operating Conditions, Bakersfield Hybrid Station 3.2-116

Table 3.2-36 HMF Roadway Segment Analysis (Existing Plus Project) 3.2-119

Table 3.2-37 HMF Roadway Segment Analysis (Future [2035] Plus Project) 3.2-120

Table 3.2-38 HMF Intersection Analysis (Existing Plus Project) 3.2-121

Table 3.2-39 HMF Intersection Analysis (Future [2035] Plus Project) 3.2-122

Table 3.2-40 Existing Plus Project Roadway Segments Level-of-Service Summary Analysis for Corcoran 3.2-123

Table 3.2-41 Future Plus Project Roadway Segments Level-of-Service Summary Analysis for Corcoran 3.2-123

Table 3.2-42 Existing Plus Project Level-of-Service Summary Analysis for Corcoran Study Intersections 3.2-124

Table 3.2-43 Future (2035) Plus Project, Intersection Operating Conditions, Kings/Tulare Regional Station–East Alternative 3.2-124

Table 3.2-44 Existing Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Fresno Station Area 3.2-129

Table 3.2-45 Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Fresno Station Area 3.2-130

Table 3.2-46 Existing Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Kings/Tulare Regional Station–East Alternative 3.2-138

Table 3.2-47 Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Kings/Tulare Regional Station–East Alternative 3.2-139

Table 3.2-48 Existing Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Kings/Tulare Regional Station–West Alternative 3.2-140

Table 3.2-49 Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Kings/Tulare Regional Station–West Alternative 3.2-140

Table 3.2-50 Existing Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Bakersfield Stations* 3.2-141

Table 3.2-51 Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Bakersfield Stations 3.2-142

Table 3.2-52 Existing Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Fresno Heavy Maintenance Facility Site 3.2-143

Table 3.2-53 Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Fresno Heavy Maintenance Facility Site 3.2-144

Table 3.2-54 Existing Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Hanford Heavy Maintenance Facility Site 3.2-144

Table 3.2-55 Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Hanford Heavy Maintenance Facility Site 3.2-145

Table 3.2-56 Existing Plus Project and Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures - Wasco Heavy Maintenance Facility Site 3.2-145

Table 3.2-57 Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures - Shafter Heavy Maintenance Facility Site 3.2-146

Table 3.2-58 Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures – City of Corcoran 3.2-146

Table 3.2-59 Summary of Potential Impacts on Transportation Resources 3.2-148

Table 3.3-1 State and Federal Ambient Air Quality Standards 3.3-4

Table 3.3-2 General Conformity Thresholds 3.3-31

Table 3.3-3 SJVAPCD CEQA Construction and Operational Thresholds of Significance 3.3-32

Table 3.3-4 Ambient Criteria Pollutant Concentration Data at Air Quality Monitoring Stations Closest to the Project 3.3-35

Table 3.3-5 Federal and State Attainment Status3.3-37

Table 3.3-6 Planning Documents Relevant to Project's Study Area3.3-38

Table 3.3-7 BNSF Alternative At-Grade and Elevated Alignment Construction Emissions
 for Years 2013–2022^a (tons/year)3.3-44

Table 3.3-8 HST Alternative CO₂e Construction Emissions (metric tons/ year)^{a, b, c}3.3-47

Table 3.3-9 Summary of Estimated 2035 Statewide Emission Burden Changes (Project
 versus No Project -2035) (tons/year)3.3-52

Table 3.3-10 Summary of Estimated 2009 Statewide Emission Burden Changes (Existing
 Plus Project versus Existing Conditions–2009) (tons/year)3.3-53

Table 3.3-11 Summary of Regional Changes in Operational Emissions in (Project versus
 No Project 2035) (tons/year)3.3-54

Table 3.3-12 Summary of Regional Changes in Operational Emissions (Existing Plus
 Project versus Existing Condition 2009) (tons/year)3.3-55

Table 3.3-13 2035 Estimated Statewide GHG Emissions (Project versus No Project)
 (MMT/year)3.3-59

Table 3.3-14 2009 Estimated Statewide GHG Emission Changes (Existing Plus Project
 versus Existing Conditions) (MMT/year)3.3-59

Table 3.3-15 2035 On-Road Vehicles Regional GHG Emissions (Project versus No
 Project) (MMT/year)3.3-60

Table 3.3-16 2009 On-Road Vehicles Regional GHG Emissions (Existing Plus Project
 versus Existing Condition) (metric tons/year)3.3-61

Table 3.3-17 2035 Project Alternatives Regional GHG Emissions (Project Versus No
 Project) (MMT/year)3.3-62

Table 3.3-18 2009 Project Alternatives Regional GHG Emissions(Existing Plus Project
 versus Existing Condition) (MMT/year)3.3-63

Table 3.3-19 Maximum Modeled CO Concentrations at Intersections near the Fresno,
 Kings/Tulare Regional, Bakersfield HST Stations and HMF Sites3.3-68

Table 3.3-20 Maximum Modeled 2035 CO Concentrations at Fresno, Kings/Tulare
 Regional, and Bakersfield Parking Facilities3.3-71

Table 3.3-21 Summary of Significant Air Quality and Global Climate Change Impacts
 and Mitigation Measures3.3-85

Table 3.4-1 FTA Construction Noise Assessment Criteria 3.4-6

Table 3.4-2 Construction Vibration Damage Criteria 3.4-6

Table 3.4-3 FRA Noise-Sensitive Land Uses 3.4-7

Table 3.4-4 FHWA Traffic Noise Abatement Criteria 3.4-9

Table 3.4-5 Interim Criteria for High-Speed Train Noise Effects on Animals 3.4-9

Table 3.4-6 FRA Ground-Borne Vibration and Ground-Borne Noise Impact Criteria3.4-11

Table 3.4-7 FRA Ground-Borne Vibration and Ground-Borne Noise Impact Criteria for
 Special Buildings3.4-11

Table 3.4-8 Screening Distances for High-Speed Rail Speed Regime III^a3.4-16

Table 3.4-9 FRA Screening Distances for Vibration Assessment3.4-17

Table 3.4-10 Summary of Noise Impacts by Project Alternative from HST Operations3.4-27

Table 3.4-11 Sensitive Noise Receivers Surrounding HMF Sites 3.4-28

Table 3.4-12 Typical Equipment Noise for Rail Construction3.4-31

Table 3.4-13 Approximate Distances to Vibration Criterion-Level Contours –
 Construction 3.4-32

Table 3.4-14 Impacted Sensitive Noise Receivers along the BNSF Alternative3.4-33

Table 3.4-15 Noise Impacts for Hanford West Bypass 1 Alternative – At-Grade3.4-40

Table 3.4-16 Noise Impacts for Hanford West Bypass 1 Alternative – Below Grade3.4-40

Table 3.4-17 Noise Impacts for Hanford West Bypass 2 Alternative – At-Grade3.4-41

Table 3.4-18 Noise Impacts for Hanford West Bypass 2 Alternative – Below Grade3.4-41

Table 3.4-19 Sensitive Noise Receivers along the Corcoran Elevated Alternative3.4-42

Table 3.4-20 Sensitive Noise Receivers along the Corcoran Bypass Alternative3.4-42

Table 3.4-21 Sensitive Noise Receivers along the Allensworth Bypass Alternative 3.4-43

Table 3.4-22 Sensitive Noise Receivers along the Wasco-Shafter Bypass Alternative 3.4-43

Table 3.4-23 Sensitive Noise Receivers along the Bakersfield South Alternative 3.4-44

Table 3.4-24 Sensitive Noise Receivers along the Bakersfield Hybrid Alternative 3.4-44

Table 3.4-25 Impacts to Schools by Alternative 3.4-45

Table 3.4-26 Screening Distances for Effects on Wildlife and Domestic Animals 3.4-49

Table 3.4-27 Approximate Distances to Vibration Criterion Level Contours 3.4-49

Table 3.4-28 Sensitive Vibration Receivers along the BNSF Alternative 3.4-50

Table 3.4-29 Potential Sound Barrier Mitigation for Operational Noise for BNSF
 Alternative 3.4-56

Table 3.4-30 Potential Mitigation for Operational Noise for Corcoran Elevated 3.4-57

Table 3.4-31 Potential Mitigation for Operational Noise for Bakersfield South 3.4-58

Table 3.4-32 Potential Mitigation for Operational Noise for Bakersfield Hybrid 3.4-59

Table 3.4-33 Potential Vibration Mitigation Procedures and Descriptions 3.4-70

Table 3.4-34 Summary of Potential Impacts from Noise and Vibration 3.4-74

Table 3.5-1 IEEE C95.6 Magnetic Field MPE Levels for the General Public 3.5-3

Table 3.5-2 IEEE C95.6 Electric Field MPE Levels for the General Public 3.5-4

Table 3.5-3 RF Emissions Safety Levels Expressed as MPEs 3.5-5

Table 3.5-4 Summary Comparison of Measured and Calculated 60-Hz Magnetic Fields 3.5-11

Table 3.5-5 Expected Worst-Case 60-Hz Magnetic Fields based on Closest Distances to
 Sensitive Receptors from the Centerline for Two HST Alternative Alignments 3.5-12

Table 3.5-6 Summary of HST EMF Modeling Results 3.5-15

Table 3.5-7 Length of High-Speed Train Alternative Alignments At-Grade and Adjacent
 to Existing Rail Lines 3.5-20

Table 3.5-8 Length of Tracks Associated with Alternative HMF Sites Adjacent to Existing
 Rail Lines 3.5-20

Table 3.5-9 Summary of Potentially Significant EMF/EMI Impacts and Mitigation
 Measures 3.5-23

Table 3.6-1 Local Plans and Policies 3.6-5

Table 3.6-2 Construction Energy Consumption Assumptions for the Fresno to
 Bakersfield Section 3.6-13

Table 3.6-3 Study Area Utility and Energy Providers 3.6-16

Table 3.6-4 Water Suppliers in the Fresno to Bakersfield Study Area 3.6-20

Table 3.6-5 Wastewater Treatment Plant Existing Average Flow and Capacity Summary
 for Proposed HST Station and Maintenance Facility Locations in the Fresno to
 Bakersfield Section 3.6-24

Table 3.6-6 Number of Storm Drain Facility Conflicts within Study Area 3.6-27

Table 3.6-7 Landfill Facility Summary for Fresno County 3.6-30

Table 3.6-8 Landfill Facility Summary for Tulare County 3.6-31

Table 3.6-9 Landfill Facility Summary for Kern County 3.6-32

Table 3.6-10 2009 Electricity Consumption in Fresno, Kings, Tulare, and Kern Counties 3.6-34

Table 3.6-11 Fuel Sources for Electric Power in California in 2005 3.6-35

Table 3.6-12 2035 Estimated Change in Energy Consumption due to the HST System
 (50% to 83% Fare Scenario) 3.6-43

Table 3.6-13 Construction Water Use Summary 3.6-45

Table 3.6-14 Alternative Alignment Impacts: High-Risk Utilities 3.6-52

Table 3.6-15 Alternative Alignment Impacts: Low-Risk Utilities 3.6-53

Table 3.6-16 Estimated Existing Water Use and Anticipated Project Water Demand at
 Proposed High-Speed Train Stations for the Fresno to Bakersfield Section 3.6-62

Table 3.6-17 Estimated Project Wastewater (Sewage) Generated for Each High-Speed
 Train Station 3.6-66

Table 3.6-18 Analysis of High-Speed Train System Energy Use 3.6-72

Table 3.6-19 On-Road Vehicle Energy Changes for Counties within the Fresno to Bakersfield Section3.6-75

Table 3.6-20 Analysis of Energy Effects from Reduction of Number of Airplane Flights Statewide3.6-75

Table 3.6-21 Summary of Potentially Significant Utility Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..3.6-79

Table 3.7-1 Federal Laws and Regulations..... 3.7-3

Table 3.7-2 State Laws and Regulations..... 3.7-5

Table 3.7-3 Special-Status Plant Species with Potential to Occur in the Special-Status Plant Study Area3.7-21

Table 3.7-4 Special-Status Wildlife Species with Potential to Occur in the Habitat Study Area.....3.7-23

Table 3.7-5 Special-Status Species Included in Recovery Plans.....3.7-33

Table 3.7-6 Communities Potentially Affected by the Alternative Alignments (acres): Construction Period Impacts^{a,b} (Temporary Impacts)3.7-45

Table 3.7-7 Comparison of Construction Period Impacts on Jurisdictional Waters by Alternative.....3.7-76

Table 3.7-8 Communities Potentially Affected by the Alternative Alignments (acres): Project Impacts^a (Permanent Impacts).....3.7-97

Table 3.7-9 Communities Potentially Affected by the Heavy Maintenance Facility Alternatives (acres): Project (Permanent Impacts)3.7-104

Table 3.7-10 Terrestrial Communities Potentially Affected by the Heavy Maintenance Facility Alternatives (acres): Project Operation (Permanent Impacts)3.7-105

Table 3.7-11 Special-Status Wildlife Species Potentially Affected by the HMF Alternatives during Project Operation3.7-126

Table 3.7-12 Special-Status Wildlife Species Potentially Affected by the Station Alternatives during Project Operation (Permanent Impacts)3.7-127

Table 3.7-13 Comparison of Project Impacts on Jurisdictional Waters by Alternative3.7-132

Table 3.7-14 Habitats of Concern Potentially Affected by the HMF Alternatives during Project Operation3.7-151

Table 3.7-15 Habitats of Concern Potentially Affected by the Station Alternatives during Project Operation3.7-153

Table 3.7-16 Wildlife Movement Corridors Potentially Affected by the HMF Alternatives during Project Operation.....3.7-159

Table 3.7-17 California Department of Fish and Game recommended restricted activity dates and setback distances by level of disturbance for burrowing owls3.7-176

Table 3.7-18 Comparison of Intensity of Effects under NEPA During the Construction Period between HST Alignment Alternatives and the Corresponding Segments of the BNSF Alternative^a3.7-191

Table 3.7-19 Comparison of Intensity of Permanent Effects under NEPA from the Project between HST Alignment Alternatives and the Corresponding Segments of the BNSF Alternative^a3.7-192

Table 3.7-20 Summary of Intensity of Effects under NEPA for HMF and Station Alternatives 3.7-193

Table 3.7-21 Summary of CEQA Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation 3.7-197

Table 3.8-1 Local Policies and Plans..... 3.8-6

Table 3.8-2 Flow Data from FEMA Flood Insurance Studies Used in Flood Analyses.....3.8-12

Table 3.8-3 Districts Supplying Water, Sanitation, or Flood Control That Have Infrastructure Crossing the Proposed HST Alignments 3.8-24

Table 3.8-4 Beneficial Uses of Surface Water in the Project Vicinity3.8-26

Table 3.8-5 Section 303(d) List of Impaired Waters in the Project Vicinity3.8-27

Table 3.8-6 Major Water Bodies Crossed by the California High-Speed Train Alternative Alignments Fresno to Bakersfield Section.....3.8-29

Table 3.8-7 Major Irrigation Canals and Ditches Crossing the Proposed HST Alignments.... 3.8-30

Table 3.8-8 Groundwater Subbasins Crossed by the California High-Speed Train
 Alignment Alternatives—Fresno to Bakersfield Section 3.8-32

Table 3.8-9 FEMA Special Flood Hazard Zone Designations in the Study Area 3.8-34

Table 3.8-10 Floodplains and Floodways Crossed by the California High-Speed Train
 Alternative Alignments—Fresno to Bakersfield Section 3.8-35

Table 3.8-11 HST Alternatives Water Body Crossings^a 3.8-40

Table 3.8-12 Acres Disturbed During Construction of HST Alternatives 3.8-42

Table 3.8-13 Depth to Groundwater in the Vicinity of the HST Alternatives 3.8-45

Table 3.8-14 Water Quality Objectives Provided in the Water Quality Control Plan for
 the Tulare Lake Basin 3.8-49

Table 3.8-15 Estimated Basin Sizes for Infiltration Basins Located at the Kings/Tulare
 Regional Station, Proposed HMF Sites, and at the Aerial Structure Sections of the
 Alignment 3.8-54

Table 3.8-16 Groundwater Extraction in the Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region 3.8-57

Table 3.8-17 Approximate Distances to Groundwater Wells near the HMF Facility
 Locations 3.8-59

Table 3.8-18 HST Alternatives Area in the Special Flood Hazard Area (acres) 3.8-61

Table 3.9-1 Local Plans and Policies 3.9-3

Table 3.9-2 Summary of Mapped Surficial Geologic Units 3.9-10

Table 3.9-3 Predominant Geologic Formations between City of Fresno and City of
 Bakersfield 3.9-11

Table 3.9-4 Summary of Groundwater Depth at Various Locations 3.9-11

Table 3.9-5 Summary of Soil Associations 3.9-14

Table 3.10-1 Local Plans and Policies 3.10-4

Table 3.10-2 Landfills within 0.25 Mile of the Study Area 3.10-10

Table 3.10-3 Potentially Affected PEC Sites by Alternative Alignment 3.10-21

Table 3.10-4 Potentially Affected PEC Sites by Heavy Maintenance Facility Alternative 3.10-25

Table 3.10-5 Educational Facilities within 0.25 Mile of the Construction Footprint of
 Alignment Alternatives 3.10-26

Table 3.10-6 Summary of Significant Hazardous Material and Waste Impacts and
 Mitigation Measures 3.10-39

Table 3.11-1 General Plans and Other Plans Considered 3.11-5

Table 3.11-2 Airport Plans Considered 3.11-6

Table 3.11-3 Fire Departments and Equipment in the Fresno to Bakersfield HST Study
 Area 3.11-8

Table 3.11-4 Fire, Law Enforcement, and Emergency Medical Services Locations by
 Heavy Maintenance Facility Site 3.11-16

Table 3.11-5 Airports, Airstrips, and Heliports within 2 Miles of Alternative Alignment
 Centerlines 3.11-18

Table 3.11-6 Educational Facilities within 0.25 Mile of Alignment Alternative
 Construction Footprints 3.11-20

Table 3.11-7 Number of Temporary Road Closures for Fresno to Bakersfield Alternatives 3.11-27

Table 3.11-8 Location of High-Speed Train Facilities Relative to Airport Airspace 3.11-37

Table 3.11-9 CEQA Significance Conclusions for Safety and Security 3.11-45

Table 3.12-1 Existing and Projected Populations 3.12-15

Table 3.12-2 Minority Group Representation in the Region 3.12-20

Table 3.12-3 Housing Characteristics (2010) 3.12-26

Table 3.12-4 County and City Fiscal Conditions for Fiscal Year 2008–2009 3.12-34

Table 3.12-5 Cities and Communities Affected by Alignment, Station, and HMF
 Alternatives 3.12-36

Table 3.12-6 Minority and Low-Income Percentages in the Region 3.12-41

Table 3.12-7 Environmental Justice Construction Impacts for the BNSF Alternative 3.12-57

Table 3.12-8 Resource Impacts from Project Operation Potentially Affecting Community Character and Cohesion — Impacts Common to All Alternatives 3.12-63

Table 3.12-9 Potential Impacts on Community Cohesion, Neighborhoods, and Community Resources during Operation—Proposed HMF Sites 3.12-76

Table 3.12-10 Residential Displacement under the BNSF Alternative 3.12-80

Table 3.12-11 Change in Residential Displacement Relative to the BNSF Alternative 3.12-83

Table 3.12-12 Commercial and Industrial Relocations under the BNSF Alternative 3.12-88

Table 3.12-13 Change in Commercial and Industrial Business Relocation Relative to the BNSF Alternative 3.12-90

Table 3.12-14 Agricultural Parcel Splits and Displaced Facilities under the BNSF Alternative 3.12-94

Table 3.12-15 Change in Agricultural Parcel Splits and Facilities Relative to the BNSF Alternative 3.12-95

Table 3.12-16 Effects of the Proposed Alignment Alternatives on Agricultural Revenues and Employment 3.12-105

Table 3.12-17 Operation-Related Environmental Justice Impacts for the BNSF Alternative 3.12-110

Table 3.12-18 Summary of Significant Social Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.12-124

Table 3.13-1 Permanent Land Use Impacts by Alternative (acres) 3.13-38

Table 3.13-2 Land Use Designations Permanently Affected by Each Alternative (acres)^a 3.13-39

Table 3.13-3 Permanent Land Impacts by Potential HMF Site (acres) 3.13-46

Table 3.13-4 Acreage of Existing Land Uses and Current Zoning Opportunities Within the HST Station Study Areas 3.13-54

Table 3.13-5 CEQA Significance Conclusions for Station Planning, Land Use, and Development 3.13-60

Table 3.14-1 Local Plans and Policies 3.14-5

Table 3.14-2 Important Farmland and Grazing Land in Fresno, Kings, Tulare, and Kern Counties (acres) 3.14-13

Table 3.14-3 Farmland Conversions in Fresno, Kings, and Tulare Counties from 2000 to 2008 and Kern County from 2004 to 2008 3.14-13

Table 3.14-4 Protected Farmland in Fresno, Kings, Tulare, and Kern Counties (acres) (2008) 3.14-25

Table 3.14-5 Important Farmlands Permanently Affected by Each Alternative Alignment in Comparison to the Corresponding Portion of the BNSF Alternative (acres) 3.14-35

Table 3.14-6 Protected Farmland Permanently Converted by Each Alignment^a 3.14-38

Table 3.14-7 Important Farmlands within Potential Heavy Maintenance Facility Alternative Sites (acres)^a 3.14-39

Table 3.14-8 Important Farmland Temporarily Used for Project Construction (acres) 3.14-41

Table 3.14-9 Farmland Conversion Impact Rating for the BNSF Alternative in Fresno, Kings, Tulare, and Kern Counties 3.14-46

Table 3.14-10 Protected Farmland Permanently Affected by the BNSF Alternative (acres) 3.14-50

Table 3.14-11 Protected Farmland Potentially Forced into Williamson Act and FSZ Nonrenewal (acres) 3.14-51

Table 3.14-12 Summary of Significant Agricultural Lands Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.14-61

Table 3.15-1 Plans and Policies of Local Jurisdictions 3.15-4

Table 3.15-2 Parks, Recreation, and Open-Space Resources Potentially Affected by HST Alternatives 3.15-13

Table 3.15-3 School District Play Areas and Recreation Facilities Potentially Affected by HST Alternatives 3.15-16

Table 3.15-4 Parks, Recreation, and Open-Space Resources and School District Play Areas and Recreation Facilities in the Study Area for the Fresno Station Alternatives 3.15-20

Table 3.15-5 Parks, Recreation, and Open-Space Resources and School District Play Areas and Recreation Facilities in the Study Area for the Bakersfield Station Alternatives 3.15-21

Table 3.15-6 Permanent Acquisition Acreage of Parks, Recreation, and Open-Space Resources by Alternative Alignment 3.15-34

Table 3.15-7 Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Parks, Recreation, and Open-Space Resources 3.15-49

Table 3.15-8 Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures for School District Play Areas and Recreation Facilities 3.15-52

Table 3.16-1 Summary of Local Plans and Policies 3.16-2

Table 3.16-2 Characteristics of Typical HST Components..... 3.16-60

Table 3.16-3 Summary of Impacts under CEQA and NEPA by HST Alternative..... 3.16-63

Table 3.16-4 Summary of Visual Quality Changes and Impacts at Key Viewpoints 3.16-68

Table 3.16-5 Summary of Significant Aesthetics and Visual Resources Impacts and Mitigation Measures 3.16-146

Table 3.17-1 Plans, Policies, and Ordinances 3.17-7

Table 3.17-2 FRA, SHPO, ACHP, and Agency Coordination..... 3.17-20

Table 3.17-3 Tribal Contacts and Consultation..... 3.17-23

Table 3.17-4 Prehistoric Cultural Periods..... 3.17-34

Table 3.17-5 Previously Recorded Historic Archaeological Sites Within 0.25 Mile of the Archaeological APE..... 3.17-38

Table 3.17-6 Archaeological Resources within the APE 3.17-40

Table 3.17-7 Significant Historic Architectural Resources by Alternative 3.17-47

Table 3.17-8 Paleontological Sensitivity Ratings Employed for this Analysis 3.17-86

Table 3.17-9 Geologic Units Underlying the Study Area 3.17-87

Table 3.17-10 Effects (Construction and/or Operation) on Historic Architectural Resources by Component of the HST Project 3.17-97

Table 3.17-11 CEQA Significant Impacts to Cultural Resources by Component of the HST Project 3.17-129

Table 3.18-1 Population Growth, 2000 – 2010..... 3.18-12

Table 3.18-2 Population Projections, 2010 – 2035 3.18-13

Table 3.18-3 Fresno, Kings, Tulare, and Kern County and Regional Employment by Industry, 2000 – 2016..... 3.18-15

Table 3.18-4 Regional Long-Range Employment Projections, 2010 and 2035 3.18-16

Table 3.18-5 Labor Force Characteristics – Counties, Major Cities, and Unincorporated Areas in the Study Area 3.18-17

Table 3.18-6 Existing Housing Units and Projected Housing Units 3.18-19

Table 3.18-7 BNSF Alternative Employment Impacts during Construction..... 3.18-21

Table 3.18-8 Hanford West Bypass 1 Alternative Employment Impacts during Construction Compared to the BNSF Alternative..... 3.18-23

Table 3.18-9 Hanford West Bypass 2 Alternative Employment Impacts during Construction Compared to the BNSF Alternative..... 3.18-23

Table 3.18-10 Corcoran Elevated Alternative Relative Employment Impacts during Construction Compared to the BNSF Alternative..... 3.18-24

Table 3.18-11 Corcoran Bypass Alternative Employment Impacts during Construction Compared to the BNSF Alternative..... 3.18-25

Table 3.18-12 Allensworth Bypass Alternative Employment Impacts during Construction Compared to the BNSF Alternative..... 3.18-25

Table 3.18-13 Wasco-Shafter Bypass Alternative Employment Impacts during Construction Compared to the BNSF Alternative..... 3.18-26

Table 3.18-14 Bakersfield Hybrid Alternative Employment Impacts during Construction Compared to the BNSF Alternative..... 3.18-27

Table 3.18-15 Fresno, Kings/Tulare Regional, and Bakersfield Stations and HMF Costs ... 3.18-27

(2010 \$M) 3.18-27

Table 3.18-16 Employment Impacts during Construction of the BNSF Stations 3.18-29

Table 3.18-17 Employment Impacts during Construction of the HMF 3.18-29

Table 3.18-18 Regional Projected and Induced Population and Employment Growth..... 3.18-36

Table 3.19-1 Construction Emissions for Combined HST Merced to Fresno and Fresno to Bakersfield Alignments for Years 2013–2022^a (tons/year) 3.19-11

Table 3.19-2 Cumulative Impacts Summary 3.19-48

Table 4-1 Section 4(f) Evaluation Consultation Summary 4-7

Table 4-2 Park, Recreation, Open Space, and Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges Evaluated for Section 4(f) Use 4-13

Table 4-3 Resources Listed in, or Determined or Recommended Eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places 4-22

Table 4-4 Summary of Section 4(f) Uses of NRHP-Listed or Eligible Properties 4-44

Table 4-5 Measures to Minimize Harm 4-53

Table 4-6 Preliminary Least Harm Analysis for BNSF Alternative and Hanford West Bypass Alternatives 4-58

Table 4-7 Preliminary Least-Harm Analysis for BNSF, Bakersfield South, and Bakersfield Hybrid Alternatives 4-64

Table 5.2-1 Capital Cost of the HST Alternatives 5-5

Table 5.2-2 Cost for Heavy Maintenance Facility Site Alternatives 5-9

Table 5.3-1 Optimal Express Travel Times from Fresno to Bakersfield and Other Cities (hours:minutes) 5-10

Table 5.3-2 Annual Phase Full System O&M Cost, Year 2035(2010 \$Millions)..... 5-11

Table 5.3-3 Annual 2035 O&M Costs Apportioned to the Fresno to Bakersfield Section (2010 \$millions) 5-12

Table 7-1 Public and Agency Meetings..... 7-13

Figures

Figure S-1 California HST System initial study corridors S-2

Figure S-2 Fresno to Bakersfield Section project alternatives S-3

Figure 1-1 Statewide HST System..... 1-2

Figure 1-2 Fresno to Bakersfield HST Project Corridor 1-6

Figure 1-3 Current and future California population (in millions) 1-7

Figure 1-4 Intercity trips in California (in millions) 1-10

Figure 1-5 Major intercity travel routes and airports 1-11

Figure 1-6 Preferred alignments and stations – State of California 1-29

Figure 2-1 California HST System Initial Study Corridors 2-2

Figure 2-2 Examples of Japanese Shinkansen high-speed trains 2-5

Figure 2-3 Example of an at-grade profile showing contact wire system and vertical arms of the pantograph power pickups 2-6

Figure 2-4 Examples of existing stations..... 2-7

Figure 2-5 Simulated and plan views of a functional station and its various components..... 2-7

Figure 2-6 At-grade typical cross section 2-8

Figure 2-7 Retained-fill typical cross section 2-9

Figure 2-8 Retained-cut typical cross section 2-9

Figure 2-9 Elevated structure typical cross sections 2-9

Figure 2-10 Straddle bent typical cross section 2-10

Figure 2-11 Replacing local at-grade crossings with new overcrossings above HST guideway and existing railroad trackway 2-11

Figure 2-12 Adding local roadway overcrossings above HST guideway..... 2-11

Figure 2-13 Typical cross section of roadway grade-separated beneath HST guideway..... 2-11

Figure 2-14 Traction power substation..... 2-13

Figure 2-15 Switching station..... 2-13

Figure 2-16 Paralleling station.....2-13
Figure 2-17 Conceptual HMF layout.....2-15
Figure 2-18 Fresno subsection alternatives2-20
Figure 2-19 Rural subsection alternatives.....2-24
Figure 2-20 Bakersfield subsection alternatives2-31
Figure 2-21 HST alternatives and HMF sites carried forward for further study2-34
Figure 2-22 Existing intercity transportation network2-41
Figure 2-23 No Project Alternative planned improvements in Fresno County2-45
Figure 2-24 No Project Alternative planned improvements in Kings County2-46
Figure 2-25 No Project Alternative planned improvements in Tulare County2-47
Figure 2-26 No Project Alternative planned improvements in Kern County2-48
Figure 2-27 Fresno County HST alternatives.....2-54
Figure 2-28 Kings County HST alternatives.....2-55
Figure 2-29 Tulare County HST alternatives2-56
Figure 2-30 Kern County HST alternatives.....2-57
Figure 2-31 Wildlife crossing structure2-59
Figure 2-32 BNSF Alternative without shared right-of-way.....2-61
Figure 2-33 BNSF Alternative showing opportunity for shared right-of-way2-62
Figure 2-34 Fresno Station conceptual designs2-72
Figure 2-35 Fresno Station–Mariposa Alternative2-73
Figure 2-36 Southern Pacific Railroad depot property and Fresno Station-Mariposa
 Alternative.....2-74
Figure 2-37 Fresno Station–Kern Alternative2-75
Figure 2-38 Kings/Tulare Regional Station–East Alternative2-79
Figure 2-39 Kings/Tulare Regional Station–West Alternative (at-grade option)2-80
Figure 2-40 Kings/Tulare Regional Station–West Alternative (below-grade option).....2-81
Figure 2-41 Bakersfield Station conceptual designs.....2-82
Figure 2-42 Bakersfield Station–North Alternative2-83
Figure 2-43 Bakersfield Station–South Alternative.....2-84
Figure 2-44 Bakersfield Station–Hybrid Alternative.....2-85
Figure 2-45 Location of state facilities affected by HST alternatives.....2-88
Figure 2-46 State Route 46 reconfiguration.....2-89
Figure 2-47 State Route 137 reconfiguration2-89
Figure 2-48 Locations of potential heavy maintenance facility sites2-92
Figure 2-49 Potential Fresno Works–Fresno HMF Site.....2-95
Figure 2-50 Potential Kings County–Hanford HMF Site2-96
Figure 2-51 Potential Kern Council of Governments–Wasco HMF Site2-97
Figure 2-52 Potential Kern Council of Governments–Shafter East and West HMF sites.....2-98
Figure 2-53 Revenue service and ridership build-up2-103
Figure 3.1-1 Shifts of Roadways and Other Infrastructure3.1-5
Figure 3.2-1 Regionally significant roads in Fresno3.2-12
Figure 3.2-2 Regionally significant roads in Hanford.....3.2-13
Figure 3.2-3 Regionally significant roads in Corcoran3.2-14
Figure 3.2-4 Regionally significant roads in Wasco.....3.2-15
Figure 3.2-5 Regionally significant roads in Bakersfield3.2-16
Figure 3.2-6a Study intersections–Fresno Station area3.2-20
Figure 3.2-6b Study intersections–Fresno Station area.....3.2-21
Figure 3.2-6c Study intersections–Fresno Station area3.2-22
Figure 3.2-7 Roadway classifications–Fresno Station area3.2-23
Figure 3.2-8a Average daily traffic, number of lanes, and speed–Fresno Station area3.2-24
Figure 3.2-8b Average daily traffic, number of lanes, and speed–Fresno Station area3.2-25
Figure 3.2-8c Average daily traffic, number of lanes, and speed–Fresno Station area3.2-26
Figure 3.2-9a Intersection level of service–Fresno Station area.....3.2-27

Figure 3.2-9b Intersection level of service–Fresno Station area3.2-28

Figure 3.2-9c Intersection level of service–Fresno Station area3.2-29

Figure 3.2-10 Study intersections: potential Kings/Tulare Regional Station—East area3.2-32

Figure 3.2-11 Roadway classifications: potential Kings/Tulare Regional Station—East area3.2-33

Figure 3.2-12 Average daily traffic, number of lanes, and speed: potential Kings/Tulare Regional Station—East area3.2-34

Figure 3.2-13 Intersection level of service: potential Kings/Tulare Regional Station—East area3.2-35

Figure 3.2-14 Study intersections: potential Kings/Tulare Regional Station—West area3.2-38

Figure 3.2-15 Roadway classifications: potential Kings/Tulare Regional Station—West area3.2-39

Figure 3.2-16 Average daily traffic, number of lanes, and speed: potential Kings/Tulare Regional Station—West3.2-40

Figure 3.2-17 Intersection level of service: potential Kings/Tulare Regional Station—West area3.2-41

Figure 3.2-18 Study intersections—Bakersfield Station area3.2-43

Figure 3.2-19 Roadway classifications—Bakersfield Station area3.2-44

Figure 3.2-20 Average daily traffic, number of lanes, and speed—Bakersfield Station area3.2-45

Figure 3.2-21 Intersection level of service—Bakersfield Station area3.2-47

Figure 3.2-22a Future (2035) Plus Project intersection LOS in the Fresno Station area – Underpass Alternative3.2-52

Figure 3.2-22b Future (2035) Plus Project intersection LOS in the Fresno Station area – Underpass Alternative3.2-53

Figure 3.2-22c Future (2035) Plus Project intersection LOS in the Fresno Station area – Underpass Alternative3.2-54

Figure 3.2-23a Future (2035) Plus Project intersection LOS in the Fresno Station area – Overpass Alternative3.2-55

Figure 3.2-23b Future (2035) Plus Project intersection LOS in the Fresno Station area – Overpass Alternative3.2-56

Figure 3.2-23c Future (2035) Plus Project intersection LOS in the Fresno Station area – Overpass Alternative3.2-57

Figure 3.2-24 Future (2035) Plus Project intersection LOS in the potential Kings/Tulare Regional Station—East Alternative3.2-58

Figure 3.2-25 Future (2035) Plus Project intersection LOS in the potential Kings/Tulare Regional Station—West Alternative3.2-59

Figure 3.2-26 Future (2035) Plus Project intersection LOS in the Bakersfield Station—North and South Alternatives3.2-60

Figure 3.2-27 Future (2035) Plus Project intersection LOS in the Bakersfield Station—Hybrid Alternative3.2-61

Figure 3.3-1 San Joaquin Valley Air Basin3.3-16

Figure 3.3-2 National MSAT emission trends (1999–2050) for vehicles operating on roadways using EPA’s Mobile 6.2 model3.3-21

Figure 3.3-3 Air Quality Ambient Air Monitors3.3-34

Figure 3.3-4 CO hot-spot evaluation intersection locations3.3-67

Figure 3.4-1 Typical L_{max} noise levels3.4-3

Figure 3.4-2 Typical levels of ground-borne vibration3.4-4

Figure 3.4-3 FRA noise impact criteria3.4-8

Figure 3.4-4 Fresno area: Noise and vibration measurement sites3.4-19

Figure 3.4-5 Hanford / Alt 1 area: Noise and vibration measurement sites3.4-20

Figure 3.4-6 Hanford /Alt 2 area: Noise and vibration measurement sites3.4-21

Figure 3.4-7 Corcoran area: Noise and vibration measurement sites3.4-22

Figure 3.4-8 Bakersfield area: Noise and vibration measurement sites..... 3.4-23

Figure 3.4-9 Fresno area: Noise impacts..... 3.4-35

Figure 3.4-10 Hanford / Alt 1 area: Noise impacts..... 3.4-36

Figure 3.4-11 Hanford / Alt 2 area: Noise impacts..... 3.4-37

Figure 3.4-12 Corcoran area: Noise impacts 3.4-38

Figure 3.4-13 Bakersfield area: Noise impacts..... 3.4-39

Figure 3.4-14 Examples of sound barriers for rail corridors..... 3.4-55

Figure 3.4-15 Fresno area: Potential sound barrier sites 3.4-60

Figure 3.4-16 Hanford / Alt 1 area: Potential sound barrier sites..... 3.4-61

Figure 3.4-17 Hanford / Alt 2 area: Potential sound barrier sites..... 3.4-62

Figure 3.4-18 Corcoran area: Potential sound barrier sites 3.4-63

Figure 3.4-19 Bakersfield area: Potential sound barrier sites 3.4-64

Figure 3.5-1 EMF/EMI measurement site locations..... 3.5-10

Figure 3.6-1 Boundaries of agricultural water districts and community water service areas 3.6-23

Figure 3.6-2 California energy consumption by sector, 2008..... 3.6-33

Figure 3.6-3 California transportation energy consumption by source, 2008 3.6-33

Figure 3.6-4 Electric transmission lines 3.6-38

Figure 3.6-5 Natural gas pipelines 3.6-39

Figure 3.6-6 Petroleum and fuel pipelines 3.6-40

Figure 3.6-7 Communication facilities and sites 3.6-41

Figure 3.7-1a Habitats of concern observed within the Special-Status Plant Study Area (special-status plant communities)..... 3.7-26

Figure 3.7-1b Habitats of concern observed within the Wetlands Study Area (jurisdictional waters)..... 3.7-27

Figure 3.7-1c Habitats of concern (critical habitat, public lands, conservation easements and banks)..... 3.7-31

Figure 3.7-1d Habitats of concern (recovery plans and habitat conservation plans) 3.7-34

Figure 3.7-2 Wildlife movement corridors..... 3.7-39

Figure 3.7-3 Special-status species (plants) within the Special-Status Plant Study Area 3.7-47

Figure 3.7-4 Special-status species (wildlife) within the Habitat Study Area..... 3.7-53

Figure 3.8-1 Regional hydrologic setting 3.8-15

Figure 3.8-2 Floodplains within Fresno to Bakersfield study area..... 3.8-18

Figure 3.8-3 Floodplains in Fresno..... 3.8-19

Figure 3.8-4 Floodplains in Hanford..... 3.8-20

Figure 3.8-5 Floodplains in Bakersfield..... 3.8-21

Figure 3.8-6 Boundaries of agricultural water districts and community water service areas 3.8-25

Figure 3.8-7 Groundwater basins 3.8-33

Figure 3.9-1 Surficial geology within the study area 3.9-9

Figure 3.9-2 Soil associations within the study area 3.9-13

Figure 3.9-3 Hazardous and potentially hazardous faults within 62 miles of the HST alternatives..... 3.9-17

Figure 3.9-4 Historic earthquakes and magnitudes within 62 miles of the HST alternatives..... 3.9-19

Figure 3.9-5 Calculated peak ground acceleration (2% probability of exceedance in 50 years)..... 3.9-20

Figure 3.9-6 Inundation in the study area due to catastrophic dam failures 3.9-22

Figure 3.9-7 Oil, gas, and geothermal fields in the Fresno to Bakersfield Section..... 3.9-24

Figure 3.9-8 Erodible soils in the study area..... 3.9-30

Figure 3.10-1 Fresno area: Locations of conceivable and current PECs and schools within the project study area..... 3.10-15

Figure 3.10-2 Hanford area: Locations of conceivable and current PECs and schools within the project study area 3.10-16

Figure 3.10-3 Corcoran area: Locations of conceivable and current PECs and schools within the project study area 3.10-17

Figure 3.10-4 Wasco-Shafter area: Locations of conceivable and current PECs and schools within the project study area 3.10-18

Figure 3.10-5 Bakersfield area: Locations of conceivable and current PECs and schools within the project study area 3.10-19

Figure 3.11-1 Fatalities (per 100 million passenger miles in 2008) 3.11-2

Figure 3.11-2 Total passenger fatalities in 2008 3.11-2

Figure 3.11-3 Fresno area: Safety and security existing conditions 3.11-10

Figure 3.11-4 Hanford area: Safety and security existing conditions 3.11-11

Figure 3.11-5 Corcoran area: Safety and security existing conditions 3.11-12

Figure 3.11-6 Wasco-Shafter area: Safety and security existing conditions 3.11-13

Figure 3.11-7 Bakersfield area: Safety and security existing conditions 3.11-14

Figure 3.11-8 Derailment wall and parapet 3.11-31

Figure 3.11-9 High-speed train derailment 3.11-32

Figure 3.12-1 Fresno to Bakersfield HST alignments 3.12-16

Figure 3.12-2 Districts within the city of Fresno 3.12-18

Figure 3.12-3 Districts within the city of Bakersfield 3.12-23

Figure 3.12-4 Communities of Concern Fresno County 3.12-42

Figure 3.12-5 Communities of Concern Kings County 3.12-43

Figure 3.12-6 Communities of Concern Tulare County 3.12-44

Figure 3.12-7 Communities of Concern Kern County 3.12-45

Figure 3.13-1 Existing land use—Fresno stations 3.13-22

Figure 3.13-2 Current zoning—Fresno stations 3.13-23

Figure 3.13-3 Existing land use – Kings/Tulare Regional Station—East Alternative 3.13-24

Figure 3.13-4 Current zoning – Kings/Tulare Regional Station—East Alternative 3.13-26

Figure 3.13-5 Existing land use – Kings/Tulare Regional Station—West Alternative 3.13-27

Figure 3.13-6 Current zoning – Kings/Tulare Regional Station—West Alternative 3.13-28

Figure 3.13-7 Existing land use—Bakersfield stations 3.13-30

Figure 3.13-8 Current zoning—Bakersfield stations 3.13-31

Figure 3.14-1 Important Farmland and Grazing Land in the Fresno project vicinity 3.14-15

Figure 3.14-2 Important Farmland and Grazing Land in the Hanford project vicinity 3.14-16

Figure 3.14-3 Important Farmland and Grazing Land in the Corcoran project vicinity 3.14-17

Figure 3.14-4 Important Farmland and Grazing Land in the Wasco–Shafter project vicinity 3.14-18

Figure 3.14-5 Important Farmland and Grazing Land in the Bakersfield project vicinity ... 3.14-19

Figure 3.14-6 Distribution of crop cover in the Fresno project vicinity 3.14-20

Figure 3.14-7 Distribution of crop cover in the Hanford project vicinity 3.14-21

Figure 3.14-8 Distribution of crop cover in the Corcoran project vicinity 3.14-22

Figure 3.14-9 Distribution of crop cover in the Wasco–Shafter project vicinity 3.14-23

Figure 3.14-10 Distribution of crop cover in the Bakersfield project vicinity 3.14-24

Figure 3.14-11 Protected lands in Fresno project vicinity 3.14-26

Figure 3.14-12 Protected lands in Hanford project vicinity 3.14-27

Figure 3.14-13 Protected lands in Corcoran project vicinity 3.14-28

Figure 3.14-14 Protected lands in Wasco–Shafter project vicinity 3.14-29

Figure 3.14-15 Protected lands in Bakersfield project vicinity 3.14-30

Figure 3.15-1 Fresno area: Parks, recreation, and open-space resources and school district play areas and recreation facilities in the project study areas 3.15-8

Figure 3.15-2 Hanford area: Parks, recreation, and open-space resources and school district play areas and recreation facilities in the project study areas 3.15-9

Figure 3.15-3 Corcoran area: Parks, recreation, and open-space resources and school district play areas and recreation facilities in the project study areas..... 3.15-10

Figure 3.15-4 Wasco-Shafter area: Parks, recreation, and open-space resources and school district play areas and recreation facilities in the project study areas 3.15-11

Figure 3.15-5 Bakersfield area: Parks, recreation, and open-space resources and school district play areas and recreation facilities in the project study areas..... 3.15-12

Figure 3.15-6 Chukchansi Park, City of Fresno 3.15-35

Figure 3.15-7 Colonel Allensworth State Historic Park, Tulare County 3.15-36

Figure 3.15-8 Allensworth Ecological Reserve, Tulare County 3.15-37

Figure 3.15-9 Proposed Orchard Park, City of Shafter 3.15-38

Figure 3.15-10 Owens Intermediate School, City of Bakersfield 3.15-39

Figure 3.16-1 Fresno to Bakersfield alignments and landscape units 3.16-14

Figure 3.16-2 City of Fresno Landscape Units 3.16-15

Figure 3.16-3 Central Fresno landscape unit: Representative views, Photo Locations..... 3.16-16

Figure 3.16-4 Central Fresno Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Industrial Image Type 3.16-17

Figure 3.16-5a Central Fresno Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Typical Central Business District Image Types 3.16-18

Figure 3.16-5b Central Fresno Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Typical Central Business District Image Types 3.16-19

Figure 3.16-6 Central Fresno Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Typical Fresno Chinatown Image Types 3.16-20

Figure 3.16-7 San Joaquin Valley Rural/Agricultural Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Typical Valley Image Types 3.16-23

Figure 3.16-8 San Joaquin Valley Rural/Agricultural Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Rural Residential Image Types 3.16-24

Figure 3.16-9 San Joaquin Valley Rural/Agricultural Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Riparian Corridor Image Type 3.16-26

Figure 3.16-10 Corcoran Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Photo Locations 3.16-27

Figure 3.16-11 Corcoran Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Downtown Corcoran (Photos)..... 3.16-28

Figure 3.16-12 Wasco Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Photo Locations..... 3.16-29

Figure 3.16-13 Wasco Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Downtown Wasco (Photos)..... 3.16-30

Figure 3.16-14 Shafter Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Photo Locations..... 3.16-31

Figure 3.16-15 Shafter Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Shafter (Photos)..... 3.16-32

Figure 3.16-16 Colonel Allensworth State Historic Park Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Photo Locations..... 3.16-34

Figure 3.16-17 Colonel Allensworth State Historic Park Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Colonel Allensworth State Historic Park (Photos)..... 3.16-35

Figure 3.16-18 City of Bakersfield Landscape Units 3.16-36

Figure 3.16-19 Rosedale/Greenacres Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Photo Locations..... 3.16-37

Figure 3.16-20 Rosedale/Greenacres Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Rosedale/Greenacres (Photos) 3.16-38

Figure 3.16-21 Kern River Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Photo Locations 3.16-40

Figure 3.16-22 Kern River Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Kern River (photos) ... 3.16-41

Figure 3.16-23 Central Bakersfield Landscape Unit: Representative Views, Photo Locations..... 3.16-43

Figure 3.16-24 Central Bakersfield Landscape Unit: Representative Views, rail yard industrial image type..... 3.16-44

Figure 3.16-25 Central Bakersfield Landscape Unit: Representative Views, residential image type 3.16-45

Figure 3.16-26a Central Bakersfield Landscape Unit: Representative Views, central business district image types 3.16-47

Figure 3.16-26b Central Bakersfield Landscape Unit: Representative Views, central business district image types 3.16-48

Figure 3.16-27 East Bakersfield Landscape Unit: Representative Views, photo locations . 3.16-50

Figure 3.16-28 East Bakersfield Landscape Unit: Representative Views, industrial image types..... 3.16-51

Figure 3.16-29 East Bakersfield Landscape Unit: Representative Views, residential image types..... 3.16-52

Figure 3.16-30 San Joaquin Valley Rural/Agricultural Landscape Unit: Key viewpoints - Hanford West alternatives alignments 3.16-53

Figure 3.16-31 Representative viewpoints: residential image types 3.16-56

Figure 3.16-32a Key viewpoint 1: Downtown Fresno Station – Mariposa Alternative from downtown (H Street at Tulare Street) looking west [existing view]..... 3.16-79

Figure 3.16-32b Key viewpoint 1: Downtown Fresno Station – Mariposa Alternative from downtown (H Street at Tulare Street) looking west [visual simulations] 3.16-80

Figure 3.16-33a Key viewpoint 2: Downtown Fresno Station – Mariposa Alternative from Chinatown (China Alley between F and G streets) looking north [existing view]..... 3.16-83

Figure 3.16-33b Key viewpoint 2: Downtown Fresno Station – Mariposa Alternative from Chinatown (China Alley between F and G streets) looking north [visual simulations] 3.16-84

Figure 3.16-34 Key viewpoint 1A: Downtown Fresno Station – Kern Alternative from downtown (H Street at Tulare Street) looking south 3.16-85

Figure 3.16-35 Key viewpoint 2A: Downtown Fresno Station – Kern Alternative from Chinatown (G Street near Kern Street) looking north 3.16-86

Figure 3.16-36 Key viewpoint 3: Simulations of high-speed train at-grade in rural landscape 3.16-87

Figure 3.16-37 Key viewpoint 3: Simulations of high-speed train on elevated guideway in rural landscape..... 3.16-88

Figure 3.16-38 Key viewpoint 4: Existing view and simulation of typical new rural road overcrossing (Floral Avenue) 3.16-90

Figure 3.16-39 Key viewpoint 5: Existing view and simulation of typical view of HST alignment as seen by motorists at foreground distance..... 3.16-91

Figure 3.16-40 Key viewpoint 6: Existing view and simulation of typical view of HST alignment as seen by rural residents at near-foreground distance..... 3.16-92

Figure 3.16-41 Key viewpoint 7: Existing view and simulation of typical view of HST alignment as seen by rural residents in proximity to rural agro-industrial settings 3.16-93

Figure 3.16-42 Key viewpoint 8: Existing and simulated views of Kings/Tulare Regional Station from 8th Avenue (SR43) 3.16-95

Figure 3.16-43 Key viewpoint 9: Existing view and simulated view of high-speed train in Corcoran, from Whitley Avenue near Otis Avenue, looking east 3.16-97

Figure 3.16-44 Key viewpoint 10: Existing view and simulated view of high-speed train in Wasco, from 7th Avenue and F Street, looking east toward the Amtrak Station.... 3.16-98

Figure 3.16-45 Key viewpoint 11: Existing view and simulated view of high-speed train in Shafter from Poso Avenue and SR 43, looking toward the Shafter Depot Museum 3.16-99

Figure 3.16-46 Key viewpoint 12: Existing view and simulated view of high-speed train from Colonel Allensworth State Historic Park..... 3.16-101

Figure 3.16-47 Key viewpoint 13: Existing view and simulated view of BNSF Alternative at-grade in Rosedale/Greenacres from Verdugo Lane, looking south 3.16-102

Figure 3.16-48 Key viewpoint 14: Existing view and simulated view of high-speed train on BNSF Alternative in Rosedale/Greenacres from Palm Avenue, looking east..... 3.16-103

Figure 3.16-49 Key viewpoint 15: Existing view and simulated view of high-speed train on BNSF Alternative from Kern River Parkway Bicycle Trail, looking north..... 3.16-105

Figure 3.16-50 Key viewpoint 16: Existing view and simulated view of high-speed train from Bakersfield High School stadium, looking northeast 3.16-107

Figure 3.16-51 Key viewpoint 17: Existing view and simulated view of high-speed train from L Street near Truxtun Avenue in downtown Bakersfield 3.16-108

Figure 3.16-52a Key viewpoint 18: Bakersfield Station – North Alternative, existing view..... 3.16-110

Figure 3.16-52b Key viewpoint 18: Bakersfield Station – North Alternative from Truxtun Avenue, visual simulations 3.16-111

Figure 3.16-52c Key viewpoint 18: Bakersfield Station – North Alternative, visual simulations 3.16-112

Figure 3.16-53 Key viewpoint 19: Existing and simulated views of BNSF Alternative from Robinson Street at Eureka Street, looking north 3.16-114

Figure 3.16-54 Key viewpoint 20: Existing view and simulated view of Hanford West Bypass alternatives from Mt. Whitney Avenue in Laton, looking east..... 3.16-117

Figure 3.16-55 Key viewpoint 21: Existing and simulated views of Kings Tulare Regional Station – West Alternative (below-grade option) from 13th Avenue, looking southeast..... 3.16-118

Figure 3.16-56 Key viewpoint 22: Existing and simulated views of Kings Tulare Regional Station – West Alternative (at-grade option) from 13th Avenue, looking northeast 3.16-119

Figure 3.16-57 Key viewpoint 23: Existing and simulated views of high-speed train on Allensworth Bypass Alternative, looking west from Colonel Allensworth State Historic Park 3.16-122

Figure 3.16-58 Key viewpoint 24: Bakersfield Station – South Alternative from S Street 3.16-124

Figure 3.16-59 Key viewpoint 25: Existing view and simulated view of high-speed train from Owens Street at Dolores Street, looking south 3.16-125

Figure 3.16-60 Key viewpoint 26: Existing view and simulated view of high-speed train on Bakersfield South Alternative from Martin Luther King Jr. Park, looking northeast3.16-126

Figure 3.16-61 Key viewpoint 27: Existing view and simulated view of high-speed train on Bakersfield South Alternative from Martin Luther King Jr. Park, looking east down E. California Avenue 3.16-127

Figure 3.16-62 Key viewpoint 28: Bakersfield Station – Hybrid Alternative from Truxton Avenue, looking south 3.16-130

Figure 3.16-63 Key viewpoint 29: Existing view and simulated view of Bakersfield Hybrid Alternative from Owens Middle School (King Street at Dolores Street) looking north 3.16-131

Figure 3.16-64 Conceptual HMF layout..... 3.16-132

Figure 3.16-65 Example of Power Substation in Urban Setting, with Landscape Screening and Fence 3.16-143

Figure 3.17-1 Historic properties and historical resources within the architectural APE Sheets 1 - 19..... 3.17-54

Figure 3.17-2 Paleontological sensitivity zones 3.17-91

Figure 4-1 HST alternatives and HMF sites carried forward for further study 4-4

Figure 4-2 Fresno area: Section 4(f) properties within the project study area4-17

Figure 4-3 Hanford area: Section 4(f) properties within the project study area4-18

Figure 4-4 Corcoran area: Section 4(f) and 6(f) properties within the project study area4-19

Figure 4-5 Wasco-Shafter area: Section 4(f) properties within the project study area.....4-20

Figure 4-6 Bakersfield area: Section 4(f) properties within the project study area4-21

Figure 4-7 Colonel Allensworth State Historic Park4-33

Figure 4-8 Allensworth Ecological Reserve land acquisition4-34

Figure 4-9 Hanford area: Hanford West Avoidance Alternative overview4-47

Figure 4-10 Hanford area: Hanford West Avoidance Alternative details.....4-48