

TABLE OF CONTENTS

What	is this D	ocument?	i
		this Document?	
		anged?	
		ary of Changes	
		ary of Environmental Analysis Changes	
		tion of Need for CEQA Recirculation or NEPA Supplementation	
\//hat		s Next?	
vviiat		sfield to Palmdale Milestone Schedule	
SUMMARY	′		S-1
S.1	Introdu	ıction and Background	S-1
S.2	Summa	ary of Changes Between Draft and Final EIR/EIS	S-6
	S.2.1	Summary of Design Refinements Made in Response to Comments on the Draft EIR/EIS	S-6
	S.2.2	Design Revisions to Reduce Environmental Impacts	
	S.2.3	Other Minor Design Revisions	
	S.2.4	Selection of Preferred Maintenance Facility Location	
	S.2.5	Summary of Environmental Analysis Revisions	
	S.2.6	Evaluation of Need for CEQA Recirculation or NEPA	0-12
	0.2.0	Supplementation	S ₋ 12
S.3	Tiered	Environmental Review—California High-Speed Rail Authority Final	0-12
0.0		ride Program EIR/EIS and Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	
		S	S-13
S.4		Raised during the Scoping Process	
S.5		se and Need for the High-Speed Rail System and the Bakersfield to	
0.0	Palmda	ale Project Section	S-15
	S.5.1	Purpose of the High-Speed Rail System	
	S.5.2	Purpose of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	
	S.5.3	CEQA Project Objectives of the High-Speed Rail System in	0-10
	5.5.5	California and in the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	
		Vicinity	C 15
	S.5.4	Need for the High-Speed Rail System, Statewide and in the	3-13
	3.5.4	Bakersfield to Palmdale Region	C 16
S.6	Altorno	atives	
3.0	S.6.1	No Project Alternative	
	S.6.2	Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives	
	S.6.3	Station Sites	
	S.6.4	Maintenance Facilities	
C 7	_	Avoidance and Minimization Features	
S.7 S.8		oject Alternative Impacts	
S.8 S.9		sfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives Evaluation	
0.9	S.9.1	Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Alternatives Benefits and	
	0.3.1	Impacts	S-33
	S.9.2	Comparison of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build	
	0.5.2	Alternatives	S_15
	S.9.3	Preferred Alternative	
	S.9.4	Comparison of High-Speed Rail Stations	
	S.9.4 S.9.5	Comparison of Maintenance Facility Alternatives	
C 10	S.9.6	Capital and Operational Costsn 4(f)	
S.10			
S.11 S.12		n 6(f)nmental Justice	
0.12		IIII GI I GI JUSTICE	



		S.12.1	Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives	S-51
		S.12.2	Bakersfield Station —Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated	
			Alternative from the Intersection of 34th Street and L Street to	0.54
		0.400	Oswell Street	
		S.12.3	Palmdale Station Site	
		S.12.4		
		S.12.5		
	S.13		f Controversy	
	S.14		R/EIS Circulation and Review	
		S.14.1		
	S.15		d Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS Circulation and Review	
		S.15.1	Comments on the Revised Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS	
	S.16		eps in the Environmental Process	
		S.16.1	California High-Speed Rail Authority Decision-Making	
		S.16.2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
		S.16.3	1	
		S.16.4	Project Implementation	S-56
1	DP∩ I	ECT DI I	RPOSE, NEED, AND OBJECTIVES	1 1
1	1.1		ction	
	1.1	1.1.1	The High-Speed Rail System	۱-۱ 1 م
		1.1.1		
			Decision to Develop a Statewide High-Speed Rail System	
		1.1.3	Implementation of the Statewide High-Speed Rail System	
		1.1.4	Lead Agencies, Cooperating Agencies, and Responsible Agencies	
	4.0	1.1.5	Compatibility with Federal Transportation Policy	1-10
	1.2		e of and Need for the High-Speed Rail System and the Bakersfield to	4 40
			le Project Section	
		1.2.1	Purpose of the High-Speed Rail System	
		1.2.2	Purpose of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	1-11
		1.2.3	CEQA Project Objectives of the High-Speed Rail System in	
			California and in the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	
			Vicinity	1-11
		1.2.4	Statewide and Regional Need for the High-Speed Rail System in	
			the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Vicinity	
	1.3		nship to Other Agency Plans, Policies, and Programs	1-34
		1.3.1	San Joaquin Corridor Strategic Plan and Corridor Service	
			Development Plan	
		1.3.2	San Joaquin Valley Blueprint	
		1.3.3	Kern Council of Governments Regional Transportation Plan	1-35
		1.3.4	Southern California Association of Governments 2012–2035	
			Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy	
		1.3.5	State Route 58 Corridor System Management Plan	
		1.3.6	District 6 System Management Plan	
		1.3.7	State Route 14 Transportation Concept Report	
		1.3.8	California Transportation Plan 2040	1-36
		1.3.9	Measure R (Los Angeles County)	1-36
		1.3.10	2020–2045 Southern California Association of Governments	
			Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy	1-37
		1.3.11	Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority Antelope Valley	
			Line Infrastructure Improvement Strategy	1-38
		1.3.12	Metrolink 5-Year Short-Range Transit Plan	
		1.3.13	Metrolink 10-Year Strategic Plan	
	1.4		nship to Other Transportation Projects in the Project Vicinity	
	-	1.4.1	High Desert Corridor	
		1.4.2	XpressWest	
		1.4.3	Measure M (Los Angeles County)	
		•		



2	ALTERNATIVES			
	2.1	Introduc	stion	2-1
		2.1.1	Independent Utility	2-4
	2.2	Backgro	ound	
		2.2.1	California High-Speed Rail System Background	
		2.2.2	Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section EIR/EIS Background	
	2.3	High-Sp	peed Rail System Infrastructure	
		2.3.1	System Design Performance, Safety, and Security	
		2.3.2	Vehicles	
		2.3.3	Stations	
		2.3.4	Infrastructure Components	
		2.3.5	Grade Separations	
		2.3.6	Access Roads	
		2.3.7	Traction Power Distribution	
		2.3.8	Signaling and Train-Control Elements	
		2.3.9	Track Structure	2-28
		2.3.10	Maintenance Facilities	
		2.3.11	High-Speed Rail Project-Level Alternatives Development Process	
		2.3.12	Range of Potential Alternatives Considered and Findings	
	2.4		ent, Station Sites, Light Maintenance Facility, and Maintenance of	2-04
	2.7		icture Alternatives Evaluated in This Project EIR/EIS	2-64
		2.4.1	No Project Alternative—Existing and Planned Improvements	
		2.4.1	Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives	
	2.5		Demand and Ridership Forecasts	
	2.5	2.5.1	Ridership and High-Speed Rail System Design	
		2.5.1		
		2.5.2	Ridership and Environmental Impact Analysis	
	0.6		Ridership and Station-Area Parking	
	2.6		ons and Service Plan	
		2.6.1	High-Speed Rail Service	
	0.7	2.6.2	Maintenance Activities	
	2.7		nal High-Speed Rail Development Considerations	2-112
		2.7.1	High-Speed Rail, Land Use Patterns, and Development around	0.440
		0.7.0	High-Speed Rail Stations	2-112
		2.7.2	Right-of-Way Acquisition for Construction, Operation, and	0.440
	0.0	0 1	Maintenance of the High-Speed Rail System	
	2.8		ction Plan and Phased Implementation Strategy	
		2.8.1	Design-Build Project Delivery	
		2.8.2	Phased Implementation Strategy	
		2.8.3	General Approach	2-121
		2.8.4	Pre-Construction Activities	
		2.8.5	Major Construction Activities	
	2.9	Permits	and Approvals	2-135
3	ΔFFF	CTED EN	IVIRONMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES, AND	
•	MITIC	ATION M	MEASURES	3 1-1
	3.1		tion	
	0.1	3.1.1	Chapter 3 Purpose	
		3.1.2	Chapter 3 Organization	
		3.1.3	Chapter 3 Content	
		3.1.4	Outreach to Local Agencies	
		3.1.4	Legal Authority to Implement Off-Site Mitigation	
	3.2		ortation	
	J.Z	3.2.1	Introduction	
		3.2.1	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	
		3.2.2	Regional and Local Policy Analysis	
		3.2.3 3.2.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	
		. 1 / 4	DOCUMENTS OF EVALUATION FORMALIS	/ = 1



	3.2.5	Affected Environment	3 2-23
	3.2.6	Environmental Consequences	
	3.2.7	Mitigation Measures	
	3.2.8	NEPA Impact Summary	
	3.2.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions	
3.3		lity and Global Climate Change	
0.0	3.3.1	Introduction	
	3.3.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	
	3.3.3	Regional and Local Policy Analysis	
	3.3.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	
	3.3.5	Affected Environment	
	3.3.6	Environmental Consequences	
	3.3.7	Compliance with Conformity Rules	
	3.3.8	Mitigation Measures	
	3.3.9	NEPA Impact Summary	
	3.3.10	CEQA Significance Conclusions	
3.4		nd Vibration	
•	3.4.1	Introduction	
	3.4.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	
	3.4.3	Regional and Local Policy Analysis	
	3.4.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	
	3.4.5	Affected Environment	
	3.4.6	Environmental Consequences	
	3.4.7	Mitigation Measures	
	3.4.8	NEPA Impact Summary	
	3.4.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions	
3.5		nagnetic Interference and Electromagnetic Fields	
0.0	3.5.1	Introduction	
	3.5.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	
	3.5.3	Regional and Local Policy Analysis	
	3.5.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	
	3.5.5	Affected Environment	
	3.5.6	Environmental Consequences	
	3.5.7	Mitigation Measures	
	3.5.8	NEPA Impact Summary	
	3.5.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions.	
3.6		Jtilities and Energy	
0.0	3.6.1	Introduction	
	3.6.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	
	3.6.3	Regional and Local Policy Analysis	
	3.6.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	
	3.6.5	Affected Environment	
	3.6.6	Environmental Consequences	
	3.6.7	Mitigation Measures	
	3.6.8	NEPA Impact Summary	
	3.6.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions	
3.7		al and Aquatic Resources	
0.7		ry of Results	
	3.7.1	Introduction	
	3.7.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	
	3.7.2	Regional and Local Policy Analysis	
	3.7.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	
	3.7.4	Affected Environment	
	3.7.6	Environmental Consequences	
	3.7.7	Mitigation Measures	
	3.7.7 3.7.8	NEPA Impacts Summary	
	5.7.0	INLI A IIIPacio Guillilary	3.7-102



	3.7.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions	3.7-171
3.8	Hydrolo	gy and Water Resources	
	3.8.1	Introduction	3.8-2
	3.8.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	
	3.8.3	Regional and Local Policy Analysis	
	3.8.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	
	3.8.5	Affected Environment	
	3.8.6	Environmental Consequences	
	3.8.7	Mitigation Measures	
	3.8.8	NEPA Impact Summary	
	3.8.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions	
3.9		y, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources	
	3.9.1	Introduction	
	3.9.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	
	3.9.3	Regional and Local Policy Analysis	
	3.9.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	
	3.9.5	Affected Environment	
	3.9.6	Environmental Consequences	
	3.9.7	Mitigation Measures	
	3.9.8	NEPA Impact Summary	
	3.9.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions	
3.10	Hazardo	ous Materials and Wastes	
	3.10.1	Introduction	
	3.10.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	
	3.10.3	Regional and Local Policy Analysis	
	3.10.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	
	3.10.5	Affected Environment	
	3.10.6	Environmental Consequences	
	3.10.7	Mitigation Measures	
	3.10.8	NEPA Impact Summary	
	3.10.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions	
3.11	Safety a	and Security	3.11-1
	3.11.1	Introduction	3.11-2
	3.11.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	3.11-5
	3.11.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	
	3.11.4	Affected Environment	3.11-28
	3.11.5	Environmental Consequences	3.11-47
	3.11.6	Mitigation Measures	3.11-71
	3.11.7	NEPA Impact Summary	3.11-74
	3.11.8	CEQA Significance Conclusions	3.11-78
3.12	Socioed	conomics and Communities	3.12-1
	3.12.1	Introduction	
	3.12.2	Laws, Regulations and Orders	3.12-6
	3.12.3	Regional and Local Policy Analysis	
	3.12.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	3.12-12
	3.12.5	Affected Environment	3.12-23
	3.12.6	Environmental Consequences	3.12-67
	3.12.7	Mitigation Measures	3.12-183
	3.12.8	NEPA Impact Summary	3.12-186
	3.12.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions	3.12-192
3.13	Station	Planning, Land Use, and Development	3.13-1
	3.13.1	Introduction	
	3.13.2	Laws, Regulations and Orders	3.13-3
	3.13.3	Regional and Local Policy Analysis	
	3.13.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	
	3.13.5	Affected Environment	3.13-13



	3.13.6	Environmental Consequences	
	3.13.7	Mitigation Measures	
	3.13.8	NEPA Impact Summary	3.13-39
	3.13.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions	3.13-41
3.14	Agricultu	ural Farmland and Forest Land	3.14-1
	3.14.1	Introduction	3.14-3
	3.14.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	
	3.14.3	Regional and Local Policy Analysis	
	3.14.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	
	3.14.5	Affected Environment	
	3.14.6	Environmental Consequences	
	3.14.7	Mitigation Measures	
	3.14.8	NEPA Impacts Summary	
	3.14.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions	
3.15		Recreation, and Open Space	
0.10	3.15.1	Introduction	
	3.15.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	
	3.15.3	Regional and Local Policy Analysis	
	3.15.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	
	3.15.5	Affected Environment	
	3.15.6	Environmental Consequences	
	3.15.7	Mitigation Measures	
	3.15.8	NEPA Impact Summary	
	3.15.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions	
3.16		ics and Visual Quality	
5.10	3.16.1	Introduction	
	3.16.1	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	
	3.16.3	Regional and Local Policy Analysis	
	3.16.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	
	3.16.5	Affected Environment	
	3.16.6	Environmental Consequences	
	3.16.7	Mitigation Measures	
	3.16.8	NEPA Impact Summary	
	3.16.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions	
3.17		Resources	
3.17	3.17.1	Introduction	
	3.17.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	
	3.17.3	Regional and Local Policy Analysis	3.17-12
	3.17.4	Coordination of Section 106 Process with NEPA and CEQA	2 47 44
	2 47 5	Compliance	3.17-14
	3.17.5	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	
	3.17.6	Affected Environment	
	3.17.7	Environmental Consequences	
	3.17.8	Mitigation Measures	
	3.17.9	NEPA Impact Summary	
0.40		CEQA Significance Conclusions	
3.18	_	al Growth	
	3.18.1	Introduction	
	3.18.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	
	3.18.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	
	3.18.4	Affected Environment	
	3.18.5	Environmental Consequences	
	3.18.6	Mitigation Measures	
	3.18.7	Impact Summary	
	3.18.8	CEQA Significance Conclusions	3.18-30



	3.19	Cumula 3.19.1	tive ImpactsIntroduction	
		3.19.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	3.19-4
		3.19.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts	3.19-5
		3.19.4	Affected Environment	3.19-13
		3.19.5	Environmental Consequences	3.19-26
		3.19.6	Mitigation Measures (for Any Newly Identified Significant	
			Cumulative Impacts)	3.19-69
		3.19.7	Impacts Summary	3.19-71
4	FINAL	SECTIO	N 4(F)/6(F) EVALUATIONS	4-1
	4.1	Introduc	ction	4-2
		4.1.1	Laws, Regulations, and Orders	
		4.1.2	Study Area	
		4.1.3	Section 4(f) Applicability	
		4.1.4	Section 4(f) Use Definitions	
	4.2	Coordin	ation	
		4.2.1	Section 4(f) Consultation	
	4.3		e and Need	
	4.4		ives	
		4.4.1	No Project Alternative for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project	
		4.4.0	Section	
		4.4.2	Alternative 1	_
		4.4.3	Alternative 2	
		4.4.4	Alternative 3	
		4.4.5	Alternative 5	
		4.4.6	Design Options	
		4.4.7	Station Sites	
		4.4.8	Maintenance Facilities	
	4.5		4(f) Applicability Analysis	
		4.5.1	Public Parks and Recreation Resources	
		4.5.2	Cultural Resources	4-45
		4.5.3	Resources Evaluated and Determined Not to Be Subject to	
			Protection under Section 4(f)	
	4.6		4(f) Use Assessment	4-55
		4.6.1	Public Park and Recreation Resources	
		4.6.2	Cultural Resources	4-66
		4.6.3	Section 4(f) Analysis of La Paz as a Historic Property and Public Park and Recreation Resource	171
	4.7	Avoidan	nce Alternatives	
	4.7	4.7.1	Introduction	
		4.7.1	Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Supplemental Alternatives	4-94
		4.7.2		4.05
		4.7.3	Analysis	
		4.7.3 4.7.4	No Project Alternative	
	4.8			
	_		es to Minimize Harm	
	4.9		4(f) Least-Harm Analysis	
	4.10	4.9.1 Section	Least-Harm Analysis for Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5	
_				
Ó			ITAL JUSTICE	
	5.1		ction	
	5.2		Regulations, and Orders	
		5.2.1	Federal	
		5.2.2	State	
		523	Regional and Local	5_7



5.3		ology	
	5.3.1	Data Collection and Analysis	
	5.3.2	Environmental Justice Engagement	
5.4		Environment	
	5.4.1	Reference Community and Resource Study Area Definition	
	5.4.2	Reference Community Demographics	
	5.4.3	Resource Study Area Demographics	
5.5		mental Justice Engagement	5-18
	5.5.1	Affected Populations and Communities	
	5.5.2	Issues and Concerns	
5.6		mental Consequences	
	5.6.1	No Project Alternative	
	5.6.2	Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives	5-25
	5.6.3	Bakersfield Station—Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated	
		Alternative from the Intersection of 34th Street and L Street to	
	4	Oswell Street	
	5.6.4	Palmdale Station	
	5.6.5	Lancaster North B Maintenance-of-Way Facility	
	5.6.6	Avenue M Light Maintenance Facility/Maintenance-of-Way Facility	
	5.6.7	Electric Power Utility Improvements	
5.7		ry of Effects	
	5.7.1	Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives	5-88
	5.7.2	Bakersfield Station—Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated	
		Alternative from the Intersection of 34th Street and L Street to	- 0-
	5 7 0	Oswell Street	
	5.7.3	Palmdale Station	
	5.7.4	Lancaster North B Maintenance-of-Way Facility	
	5.7.5	Avenue M Light Maintenance Facility/Maintenance-of-Way Facility	
F 0	5.7.6	Electric Power Utility Improvements	
5.8		es to Minimize Harm	
	5.8.1 5.8.2	Avoidance	
		Mitigation	
F 0	5.8.3	Environmental Justice Community Engagementia High-Speed Rail Authority's Environmental Justice Determination	
5.9	5.9.1	Community Cohesion	
	5.9.1	Noise	
	5.9.2	Residential and Business Displacements and Relocation	
	5.9.4	Maintenance Facilities, Electric Power Utility Improvements, and	5-115
	3.3.4	Station Locations	5 117
	5.9.5	Beneficial Effects	
	5.9.6	Determination	
PROJ		STS AND OPERATIONS	
6.1		tion	
6.2		Costs	
	6.2.1	Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives	
	6.2.2	Maintenance Facilities	
6.3	•	ons and Maintenance Costs	
	6.3.1	Operating Speeds	
	6.3.2	Development of Operations and Maintenance Costs	6-5
OTHE	R CEQA/	NEPA CONSIDERATIONS	7-1
7.1		ant and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	
7.2		Benefits	
7.3		ship between Short-term Use of the Environment and the	
		ement of Long-term Productivity	7-4

6

7



	7.4		cant Irreversible Environmental Changes that Would Result from the if Implemented	7-5
8	PREF		ALTERNATIVE AND STATION SITES	
	8.1	Introdu	ction	
		8.1.1	Alignment Route	
		8.1.2	Maintenance Facilities	
		8.1.3	Project Characteristics	8-5
	8.2	Summa	ary of Public Comments	
		8.2.1	Areas of Concern Raised in Scoping Comments	
		8.2.2	Areas of Concern Raised in Comments on the Draft EIR/EIS	
	8.3		tives Considered	
		8.3.1	Preferred Alternative	
		8.3.2	Environmentally Superior Alternative	
		8.3.3	Environmentally Preferable Alternative	
		8.3.4	Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative	8-24
9	PUBL		AGENCY INVOLVEMENT	9-1
	9.1		to Bakersfield Locally Generated Alternative from the Intersection of	
		34th St	treet and L Street to Oswell Street Public and Agency Involvement	
		9.1.1	Environmental Justice Outreach	
		9.1.2	Public Agency Scoping	9-3
		9.1.3	Notification and Circulation of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS	9-3
		9.1.4	Outreach Leading up to Publication of the Final Supplemental EIR	
			and Final Supplemental EIS	
	9.2	Enviror	nmental Justice Outreach	9-3
	9.3		and Agency Scoping	9-4
		9.3.1	Notices of Preparation, Notices of Intent, and Public Information	
			Materials	
		9.3.2	Scoping Meetings	
		9.3.3	Scoping Comments	
	9.4		tives Analysis Process	
		9.4.1	Scoping and Identifying Potential Alternative Alignments	
		9.4.2	Public Outreach during Refinement of Alternatives	9-7
		9.4.3	Public Information Meetings and Materials during the Alternatives	
			Analysis Process	9-9
		9.4.4	Stakeholder Working Group Meetings during the Alternatives	
			Analysis Process	9-10
		9.4.5	Environmental Resource Agency Meetings During the Alternatives	
		_	Analysis Process	9-11
	9.5		ch during Development of the Draft EIR/EIS	
		9.5.1	Public Information Materials and Meetings	
		9.5.2	Stakeholder Working Group Meetings	
		9.5.3	Agreements and Memoranda of Understanding	
		9.5.4	Tribal Coordination Meetings	
		9.5.5	Agency Meetings and Consultation	
		9.5.6	Section 106 Consultation, National Historic Preservation Act	
		9.5.7	Section 404 Clean Water Act	
		9.5.8	Section 7 Consultation, Federal Endangered Species Act	
	9.6		ation and Circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS	
	9.7		ation and Review of the Draft EIR/EIS	
		9.7.1	Public and Agency Open Houses and Hearings	
		9.7.2	Comments on the Draft EIR/EIS	9-19
		9.7.3	Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR/EIS	9-20
		9.7.4	Engineering and Design Refinements after Publication of the Draft	<u> </u>
		0	EIR/EIS	
		9.7.5	Ongoing Outreach Leading Up to Publication of the Final EIR/EIS	9-21



	9.8	Publication and Review of the Revised Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS 9.8.1 Notification and Circulation of the Revised Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS	
		9.8.2 Comments on the Revised Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS9.8.3 Responses to Comments on the Revised Draft EIR/Supplemental	9-23
	9.9 9.10	Draft EIS Preferred Alternative and Authority Decision-Making Process Log of Public and Agency Outreach Meetings	9-23
10		EIR/EIS DISTRIBUTION	
	10.1	Repository Locations	
		10.1.1 Dakersheid	
		10.1.3 Mojave	
		10.1.4 Palmdale	
		10.1.5 Quartz Hill	
		10.1.6 Rosamond	
		10.1.7 Tehachapi	
		10.1.8 Los Angeles	
		10.1.9 Sacramento	
	10.2	Federal Agencies	
	10.3	State Agencies	
	10.4	Elected Officials	
		10.4.1 Federal Elected Officials	
		10.4.2 State Elected Officials	
		10.4.4 Mayors	
		10.4.5 City Council Members	
		10.4.6 Agricultural Commissions	
	10.5	Regional/Local Agencies	
	10.6	Organizations and Businesses	
	10.7	Native American Contacts	
	10.8	Schools and Districts	10-11
11	LIST	OF PREPARERS	11-1
12	REFE	RENCES/SOURCES USED IN DOCUMENT PREPARATION	12-1
	12.1	General	
	12.2	References/Sources by Chapter	
		Executive Summary	12-2
		Chapter 1: Project Purpose, Need, and Objectives	
		Chapter 2: Alternatives	12-8
		Chapter 3: Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and	10 11
		Mitigation MeasuresChapter 4: Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) Evaluations	
		Chapter 5: Environmental Justice	
		Chapter 6: Project Costs and Operations	
		Chapter 7: Other CEQA/NEPA Considerations	
		Chapter 8: Preferred Alternative and Station Site(s)	
		Chapter 9: Public and Agency Involvement	
13	GLOS	SARY OF TERMS	
14	INDEX	(14-1
15	ACDC	NIVMS AND ARRDEVIATIONS	15 1



Figures

Figure S-1 California High-Speed Rail System Alignments and Stations	S-2
Figure S-2 Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Alignment Alternatives	S-4
Figure S-3 Maintenance Facility Alternatives	S-7
Figure S-4 Bakersfield Station Detail Map	S-20
Figure S-5 Edison Area Detail Map	S-21
Figure S-6 Keene Area Detail Map	S-22
Figure S-7 Mojave Area Detail Map	S-23
Figure S-8 Lancaster Area Detail Map	S-24
Figure S-9 Palmdale Station Area Detail Map	S-25
Figure 1-1 Statewide High-Speed Rail System—Implementation Phases	1-2
Figure 1-2 Statewide High-Speed Rail System, Phase 1 and Phase 2—Project Sections	1-7
Figure 1-3 Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	1-8
Figure 1-4 Current and Future California Population (in millions)	1-13
Figure 1-5 Intercity Trips in California (in millions)	1-17
Figure 1-6 Major Intercity Travel Routes and Airports	1-18
Figure 1-7 Regional Freight/Passenger Network	1-22
Figure 1-8 Project Vicinity Amtrak Thruway Bus Routes	1-23
Figure 2-1 Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section—Alignment Alternatives	2-3
Figure 2-2 State Route 58 and Union Pacific Railroad Corridor	2-5
Figure 2-3 Examples of Japanese Shinkansen High-Speed Trains	2-7
Figure 2-4 Example of an At-Grade Profile Showing Contact Wire System and Vertical Arms of the Pantograph Power Pickups	2-8
Figure 2-5 Examples of Existing Stations	2-9
Figure 2-6 Simulated and Plan Views of a Functional Station and Its Various Components.	2-10
Figure 2-7 Typical At-Grade Cross Section	2-12
Figure 2-8 Typical Fill Cross Section	2-13
Figure 2-9 Typical Cut Cross Section	2-13
Figure 2-10 Dual-Bore Tunnel Typical Cross Section	2-14
Figure 2-11 Single Tunnel Typical Cross Section	2-14
Figure 2-12 Cut-and-Cover Tunnel Typical Cross Section	2-15
Figure 2-13 Tunnel Portal	2-16
Figure 2-14 Elevated Twin-Structure Typical Cross Sections	2-18
Figure 2-15 Elevated Single-Structure Typical Cross Sections	2-18
Figure 2-16 Straddle Bent Typical Cross Section	2-19
Figure 2-17 Replacing Local Surface Crossings with New Overheads above the High- Speed Rail Guideway and Existing Railroad Trackway	2-20



Figure 2-18 Adding Local Roadway Overheads above the High-Speed Rail Guideway	2-20
Figure 2-19 Typical Roadway Overhead	2-21
Figure 2-20 Typical Cross Section of Roadway Grade-Separated beneath the High- Speed Rail Guideway	2-21
Figure 2-21 Typical Cross Section of Wildlife Crossing Structure	2-22
Figure 2-22 Typical Plan View of Wildlife Crossing Structure	2-23
Figure 2-23 Traction Power Facility Typical Cross Section	2-24
Figure 2-24 Traction Power Substation	2-25
Figure 2-25 Traction Power Substation Overhead Contact System Gantry	2-25
Figure 2-26 Switching Station	2-26
Figure 2-27 Paralleling Station	2-26
Figure 2-28 Paralleling Station Overhead Contact System Gantry	2-27
Figure 2-29 Typical Cross Section of At-Grade Profile with Traction Power, Signaling, and Train-Control Features	2-28
Figure 2-30 Typical Maintenance-of-Way Facility Layout	2-30
Figure 2-31 Typical Double-Ended Light Maintenance Facility Layout Alternatives Considered during Alternatives Screening Process	2-32
Figure 2-32 Bakersfield to Los Angeles Corridor Alignments and Stations Carried Forward (2005 Statewide Program EIR/EIS)	2-36
Figure 2-33 2005 Statewide Program EIR/EIS Alignments Considered	2-37
Figure 2-34 Statewide Program EIR/EIS—Preferred Alignment	2-39
Figure 2-35 Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section—2010 PAA Alignment Subsections	2-41
Figure 2-36 Edison Subsection—2010 PAA Alignment Alternatives Considered	2-42
Figure 2-37 Tehachapi Subsection—2010 PAA Alignment Alternatives Considered	2-43
Figure 2-38 Vertical Profiles of Tehachapi Subsection Alternatives—2010 PAA Alignment Alternatives Considered	2-44
Figure 2-39 Antelope Valley Subsection—2010 PAA Alignment Alternatives Considered	2-45
Figure 2-40 Quantm Alignment Options—2010 PAA	2-46
Figure 2-41 2010 PAA Alignment Alternatives Carried Forward	2-50
Figure 2-42 2012 SAA Alignment Alternatives Carried Forward	2-52
Figure 2-43 Evolution of Alternatives	2-54
Figure 2-44 Edison Subsection—2016 SAA Alignment Options	2-55
Figure 2-45 Keene Subsection—2016 SAA Alignment Options	2-56
Figure 2-46 Tehachapi Subsection—2016 SAA Alignment Options	2-57
Figure 2-47 Lancaster Subsection—2016 SAA Alignment Options	2-58
Figure 2-48 2016 SAA Alignment Alternatives Considered (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5, Carried Forward to Project EIR/EIS)	2 60
Figure 2-49 Planned Transportation Improvements in Kern and Los Angeles Counties	
Figure 2-50 Bakersfield Station	
r 1941 - L 90 Danoi 311014 Otatioi 1	∠-'∪\



Figure 2-51 Bakersfield Station—F Street (Locally Generated Alternative)	2-81
Figure 2-52 Palmdale Station Alternative	2-83
Figure 2-53 Maintenance Facility Site Alternatives	2-84
Figure 2-54 Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section—State Highway Modifications	2-88
Figure 2-55 Bakersfield Area Detail Map	2-93
Figure 2-56 Edison Area Detail Map	2-94
Figure 2-57 Keene Area Detail Map	2-94
Figure 2-58 Tehachapi Area Detail Map	2-96
Figure 2-59 Mojave Area Detail Map	2-97
Figure 2-60 Rosamond Area Detail Map	2-98
Figure 2-61 Lancaster Area Detail Map	2-99
Figure 2-62 Palmdale Area Detail Map	2-100
Figure 2-63 La Paz Cross Section	2-105
Figure 2-64 Refined CCNM Design Option On-Site Stockpile Site	2-106
Figure 2-65 Bakersfield to Palmdale Transit Connectivity Map	2-114
Figure 2-66 Right-of-Way Process	2-120
Figure 2-67 Typical Pre-Casting Yard Layout	2-129
Figure 2-68 Edison Area Detour Map	2-132
Figure 2-69 Lancaster Area Detour Map	2-132
Figure 3.1-1 Typical Resource Study Area	3.1-5
Figure 3.1-2 Typical Shifts of Roadways and Other Infrastructure	3.1-7
Figure 3.2-1 Transportation Resource Study Area	3.2-13
Figure 3.2-2 Major Roadways and Rail Lines	3.2-26
Figure 3.2-3 Haul Routes	3.2-56
Figure 3.3-1 Projected National Mobile-Source Air Toxics Emission Trends (2010–2050) for Vehicles Operating on Roadways Using the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's MOVES2010b Model	3.3-32
Figure 3.3-2 Air Quality Monitoring Stations Closest to the California High-Speed Rail Project	3.3-48
Figure 3.3-3 Sensitive Receptors within the High-Speed Rail Project Vicinity	3.3-60
Figure 3.4-1 Noise Impact Criteria for High-Speed Rail Projects	3.4-15
Figure 3.5-1 EMI/EMF Measurement Site Locations	3.5-12
Figure 3.6-1 Electric Transmission Lines and Substations	3.6-29
Figure 3.6-2 Natural Gas Pipelines	3.6-30
Figure 3.6-3 Petroleum and Fuel Pipelines	3.6-31
Figure 3.6-4 Sewer Pipelines, Storm Drains, and Proposed Stormwater Retention Basins.	3.6-32
Figure 3.6-5 Water Pipelines and Irrigation Canals	3.6-33
Figure 3.6-6 Communication Facilities and Sites	3.6-34



Figure 3.6-7 Oil Wells and Pipelines	3.6-35
Figure 3.6-8 Wind Turbines	3.6-36
Figure 3.6-9 Solar Farm Impacts	3.6-48
Figure 3.7-1 Bureau of Land Management Parcels with Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan Information	3.7-14
Figure 3.7-2 Resource Study Areas	3.7-16
Figure 3.7-3 Species Modeling Study Areas	3.7-25
Figure 3.7-4 Springs near Tunnel #4	3.7-82
Figure 3.7-5 Zoomed View of Springs near Tunnel #4	3.7-83
Figure 3.7-6 Springs near Tunnel #8	3.7-84
Figure 3.7-7 Zoomed View of Springs near Tunnel #8	3.7-85
Figure 3.8-1 Watersheds and Surface Waters	3.8-21
Figure 3.8-2 Hydrologic Units, Areas, and Subareas	3.8-24
Figure 3.8-3 Floodplains	3.8-36
Figure 3.8-4 California Department of Water Resources Awareness Flood Zone Areas.	3.8-39
Figure 3.8-5 Groundwater Basins	3.8-41
Figure 3.9-1 California Geomorphic Provinces	3.9-22
Figure 3.9-2 Surficial Geology within the Resource Study Area	3.9-25
Figure 3.9-3 Aggregate Mines	3.9-30
Figure 3.9-4 Soil Associations in the Resource Study Area	3.9-31
Figure 3.9-5 Expansive Soils in the Resource Study Area	3.9-37
Figure 3.9-6 Soils Corrosive to Concrete	3.9-38
Figure 3.9-7 Soils Corrosive to Steel	3.9-39
Figure 3.9-8 Erodible Soils	3.9-41
Figure 3.9-9 Landslides, Liquefaction, Seismic Hazards, and Steep Slopes	3.9-42
Figure 3.9-10 Subsidence in the San Joaquin Valley	3.9-44
Figure 3.9-11 Subsidence in the Antelope Valley	3.9-45
Figure 3.9-12 Fault Hazard Zones in the Resource Study Area	3.9-47
Figure 3.9-13 Historic Earthquakes and Magnitudes within 62 Miles of the Project Vicini	ty3.9-50
Figure 3.9-14 Calculated Peak Ground Acceleration	3.9-51
Figure 3.9-15 Inundation Areas in the Resource Study Area Due to Catastrophic Dam Failures	3.9-53
Figure 3.9-16 Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Fields	3.9-56
Figure 3.9-17 Oil Wells	3.9-57
Figure 3.10-1 Oil and Gas Wells and Pipelines in the Resource Study Area	3.10-16
Figure 3.10-2 Educational Facilities in the Resource Study Area	3.10-19
Figure 3.11-1 Safety and Security Existing Conditions	3.11-15
Figure 3.11-2 Lancaster Police Station Impacts	3.11-64



Figure 3.11-3 U.S. Air Force Plant 42 Flight Zones	3.11-66
Figure 3.12-1 Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Subsections	3.12-14
Figure 3.12-2 Minority Group Representation (2000)	3.12-30
Figure 3.12-3 Minority Group Representation (2009–2013 American Community Survey)	3.12-31
Figure 3.12-4 Summary of Minority Group Representation (2000 Census and 2009–2013 American Community Survey)	
Figure 3.12-5 Population Age Distribution (2009–2013 American Community Survey)	3.12-35
Figure 3.12-6 Median Annual Household Income (2009–2013 American Community Survey)	3.12-36
Figure 3.12-7 Linguistic Isolation (2009–2013 American Community Survey)	3.12-41
Figure 3.12-8 Disability Status (2009–2013 American Community Survey)	3.12-42
Figure 3.14-1 Project Segments	3.14-17
Figure 3.14-2 Important Farmland and Grazing Land	3.14-18
Figure 3.14-3 Williamson Act Contract Land	3.14-24
Figure 3.14-4 Land Zoned for Agriculture	3.14-27
Figure 3.14-5 Important Farmland Mitigation Ratios	3.14-54
Figure 3.15-1 Resource Study Area for Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5, including the CCNM Design Option and the Refined CCNM Design Option	3.15-11
Figure 3.15-2 Impacts at Pacific Crest Trail	3.15-24
Figure 3.15-3 Impacts at Resources in Lancaster and Palmdale	3.15-25
Figure 3.15-4 Proposed Pacific Crest Trail Realignment	3.15-50
Figure 3.16-1 Overview of the East Bakersfield and Edison/Rural Valley Landscape Units	.3.16-12
Figure 3.16-2 Visual Resources, Viewer Groups, and Key Viewpoints in the East Bakersfield Landscape Unit	3.16-15
Figure 3.16-3 Visual Resources, Viewer Groups, and Key Viewpoints in the Edison/Rural Valley Landscape Unit	
Figure 3.16-4 Overview of Tehachapi Mountains East and West and Tehachapi Valley Landscape Units	3.16-19
Figure 3.16-5 Visual Resources, Viewer Groups, and Key Viewpoints in the Tehachapi Mountains West Landscape Unit	3.16-21
Figure 3.16-6 Tehachapi West Landscape Unit, La Paz, and Tehachapi Loop	3.16-22
Figure 3.16-7 Visual Resources, Viewer Groups, and Key Viewpoints in the Tehachapi Valley Landscape Unit	3.16-25
Figure 3.16-8 Visual Resources, Viewer Groups, and Key Viewpoints in the Tehachapi Mountains East Landscape Unit	3.16-27
Figure 3.16-9 Detailed View of Pacific Crest Trail	3.16-28
Figure 3.16-10 Overview of West Mojave, Rosamond Rural, and Lancaster-Palmdale Landscape Units	3.16-29
Figure 3.16-11 Visual Resources, Viewer Groups, and Key Viewpoints in the West Mojave Landscape Unit	3.16-31



Figure 3.16-12 Visual Resources, Viewer Groups, and Key Viewpoints in the Rosamond Rural Landscape Unit	3.16-33
Figure 3.16-13 Visual Resources, Viewer Groups, and Key Viewpoints in the Lancaster-Palmdale Landscape Unit—Northern Subsection	3.16-36
Figure 3.16-14 Visual Resources, Viewer Groups, and Key Viewpoints in the Lancaster-Palmdale Landscape Unit—Southern Subsection	3.16-39
Figure 3.16-15 Key Viewpoint 1: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 Looking South from Sterling Road	3.16-51
Figure 3.16-16 Key Viewpoint 2: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 Looking South from State Route 148/Morning Drive	3.16-53
Figure 3.16-17 Key Viewpoint 3: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 Looking Southwest from School Street	3.16-55
Figure 3.16-18 Key Viewpoint 4: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from Jacober Avenue Looking South	3.16-57
Figure 3.16-19 Key Viewpoint 5: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from State Route 58 Looking East-Southeast	3.16-59
Figure 3.16-20 Key Viewpoint 6: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 Looking North from Bena Road	3.16-61
Figure 3.16-21 Key Viewpoint 7: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 Looking East-Northeast from State Route 58	3.16-62
Figure 3.16-22 Key Viewpoint 8: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 Looking Northeast from the Bakersfield National Cemetery	3.16-64
Figure 3.16-23 Key Viewpoint 9: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 Looking Northwest from State Route 58	3.16-65
Figure 3.16-24 Key Viewpoint 10: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 Looking East from Hart Flat Road	3.16-67
Figure 3.16-25 Key Viewpoint 11a: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from La Paz—Villa La Paz Conference Center Looking North	3.16-69
Figure 3.16-26 Key Viewpoint 11b: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from La Paz—Villa La Paz Conference Center Looking Northeast	3.16-70
Figure 3.16-27 Key Viewpoint 11c: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from La Paz—Memorial Garden and César Chávez's Gravesite Looking North	3.16-71
Figure 3.16-28 Key Viewpoint 11d: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from La Paz—Peace Rocks Looking Northeast	3.16-72
Figure 3.16-29 Key Viewpoint 11e: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from La Paz—Road to Villa La Paz Looking North	3.16-73
Figure 3.16-30 Key Viewpoint 12: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from State Route 58 Looking Southeast	3.16-76
Figure 3.16-31 Key Viewpoint 13: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from Tehachapi Loop Looking North-Northwest	3.16-77
Figure 3.16-32 Key Viewpoint 14: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from Mill Street Overpass Looking North-Northeast	3.16-80
Figure 3.16-33 Key Viewpoint 15: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from State Route 58 Looking Southeast	3.16-82



Figure 3.16-34 Key Viewpoint 16: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from Arabian Drive Looking South-Southwest	3.16-84
Figure 3.16-35 Key Viewpoint 17: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from Dennison Road Looking East-Northeast	3.16-85
Figure 3.16-36 Key Viewpoint 18a: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from the Existing Alignment of the Pacific Crest Trail Looking West	3.16-87
Figure 3.16-37 Key Viewpoint 18b: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from the Existing Alignment of the Pacific Crest Trail Looking Southwest	3.16-88
Figure 3.16-38 Key Viewpoint 19: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from Rosamond Boulevard Looking West-Northwest	3.16-92
Figure 3.16-39 Key Viewpoint 20: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from Gobi Avenue Looking West	3.16-94
Figure 3.16-40 Key Viewpoint 21: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from 40th Street Looking Southwest	3.16-95
Figure 3.16-41 Key Viewpoint 24: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from Sierra Highway Bike Path Looking North	.3.16-101
Figure 3.16-42 Key Viewpoint 25: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from Avenue L Overpass Looking Northwest	.3.16-103
Figure 3.16-43 Key Viewpoint 26: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from Desert Sands Park Looking East	.3.16-105
Figure 3.16-44 Key Viewpoint 27: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from East Avenue Q Looking Northeast	.3.16-107
Figure 3.16-45 Key Viewpoint 29: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from Avenue Q7 Looking West	.3.16-109
Figure 3.16-46 Key Viewpoint 30: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from E Palmdale Boulevard Looking West	.3.16-111
Figure 3.16-47 Key Viewpoint 3: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 2 from School Street Looking Southwest	.3.16-113
Figure 3.16-48 Key Viewpoint 4 Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 2 from Jacober Avenue Looking South	.3.16-114
Figure 3.16-49 Key Viewpoint 18a: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 3 from the Pacific Crest Trail Looking West	.3.16-118
Figure 3.16-50 Key Viewpoint 18b: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 3 from the Pacific Crest Trail Looking Southwest	.3.16-119
Figure 3.16-51 Key Viewpoint 22: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 5 from Whit Carter Park	.3.16-122
Figure 3.16-52 Key Viewpoint 23: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 5 from Lancaster Town Center	.3.16-125
Figure 3.16-53 Key Viewpoint 11b: Existing and Simulated Views of CCNM Design Option from La Paz—Villa la Paz Conference Center Looking Northeast	.3.16-129
Figure 3.16-54 Key Viewpoint 11d: Existing and Simulated Views of CCNM Design Option from La Paz—Peace Rocks Looking Northeast	
Figure 3.16-55 Key Viewpoint 11e: Existing and Simulated Views of CCNM Design Ontion from La Paz—Road to Villa la Paz Looking North	3 16-131



Figure 3.16-56 Key Viewpoint 11b: Existing and Simulated Views of Refined CCNM Design Option from La Paz—Villa la Paz Conference Center Looking Northeast	3.16-135
Figure 3.16-57 Key Viewpoint 12: Existing and Simulated Views of the Refined CCNM Design Option from State Route 58 Looking Southeast	3.16-137
Figure 3.16-58 Key Viewpoint 28: Existing and Simulated Views of Palmdale Station from E Avenue Q3 Looking Northeast	
Figure 3.16-59 Summary of Aesthetics and Visual Quality Impacts	3.16-158
Figure 3.17-1 Historic Properties Within the Area of Potential Effects	3.17-63
Figure 3.18-1 Resource Study Area	3.18-9
Figure 3.19-1 Historic Population Data for Bakersfield, Tehachapi, Lancaster, and Palmdale	3.19-14
Figure 4-1 Resource Study Area for Section 4(f)	4-6
Figure 4-2 Ramon Garza Elementary School and Sierra Middle School	4-23
Figure 4-3 Big Creek Hydroelectric System Historic District and Foothill High School	4-24
Figure 4-4 Keene Fire Station and La Paz	4-25
Figure 4-5 Pacific Crest Trail	4-26
Figure 4-6 First Los Angeles Aqueduct	4-27
Figure 4-7 Willow Springs Main Race Track	4-28
Figure 4-8 Lancaster Section 4(f) Resources	4-29
Figure 4-9 Palmdale Section 4(f) Resources	4-33
Figure 4-10 Alternatives 1, 2, and 5 Proposed Mitigation Measure for Pacific CrestTrail Realignment	4-56
Figure 4-11 Key Viewpoint 18a: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from the Pacific Crest Trail Looking West	4-59
Figure 4-12 Key Viewpoint 18b: Existing and Simulated Views of Alternative 1 from the Pacific Crest Trail Looking Southwest	4-60
Figure 4-13 La Paz, View Facing North toward Character-Defining View of Three Peaks from Water Tank, Existing Site	4-75
Figure 4-14 La Paz, View Facing North toward Character-Defining View of Three Peaks from Water Tank, Visual Simulation of Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5	4-75
Figure 4-15 La Paz, View Facing North toward Character-Defining View of Three Peaks from Water Tank, Visual Simulation of CCNM Design Option	4-76
Figure 4-16 La Paz, View from Water Tank, Facing Northeast, Existing Site	4-77
Figure 4-17 La Paz, View from Water Tank, Facing Northeast, Visual Simulation of Refined CCNM Design Option	4-77
Figure 4-18 La Paz, View Facing Northwest toward Character-Defining View along Entrance Road, Existing Site	4-78
Figure 4-19 La Paz, View Facing Northwest toward Character-Defining View along Entrance Road (Project Not Visible), Visual Simulation of Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5.	4-78
Figure 4-20 La Paz, View Facing Northwest toward Character-Defining View along Entrance Road (Project Not Visible), Visual Simulation CCNM Design Option/Refine CCNM Design Option	
	 75



Figure 4-21 La Paz, View Facing Northeast from North Unit Conference Room, Existing Site	4-80
Figure 4-22 La Paz, View Facing Northeast from North Unit Conference Room, Visual Simulation of Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5	4-80
Figure 4-23 La Paz, View from Parking Lot, Existing Site	4-81
Figure 4-24 La Paz, View from Parking Lot, Visual Simulation of Refined CCNMDesign Option	4-81
Figure 4-25 La Paz, View from State Route 58, Facing Northeast, Existing Site	4-82
Figure 4-26 La Paz, View from State Route 58, Facing Northeast, Visual Simulation of Refined CCNM Design Option	4-82
Figure 4-27 La Paz, View Facing Northeast from North Unit Conference Room, Visual Simulation of CCNM Design Option	4-87
Figure 4-28 La Paz, Road Leading to Villa La Paz, View Facing North, Existing Site	4-87
Figure 4-29 La Paz, Road Leading to Villa La Paz, View Facing North, Visual Simulation of Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5	4-88
Figure 4-30 La Paz, Road Leading to Villa La Paz, View Facing North, Visual Simulation of CCNM Design Option	4-88
Figure 4-31 Recreational Resources at La Paz	4-91
Figure 5-1 Minority Populations	5-16
Figure 5-2 Low-Income Populations	5-17
Figure 8-1 Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Alternative 2 Alignment with the Refined CCNM Design Option	8-3
Figure 9-1 Public Outreach during the Environmental and Alternatives Analysis Processes	9-7
Tables	
Table S-1 Summary of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Design Features	S-19
Table S-2 Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives Differentiators	S-46
Table S-3 Capital Costs of the B-P Build Alternatives from Bakersfield Station to Palmdale Station (2020\$ in millions)	S-48
Table S-4 Annual Operations and Maintenance Costs Apportioned to the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section (2015\$ in millions)	S-49
Table S-5 Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features	S-57
Table S-6 Comparison of Potential Adverse Impacts of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives	S-65
Table S-7 Comparison of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives	S-90
Table S-8 Comparison of Potential Adverse Impacts of Station Sites	S-98
Table S-9 Comparison of Potential Adverse Impacts of Maintenance Facility Alternatives	S-113
Table 1-1 Population Growth in California, the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Vicinity, and Kern and Los Angeles Counties	1-14



Table 1-2 Agriculture in Kern County	1-15
Table 1-3 Travel Time to Work in the Cities of Lancaster and Palmdale	1-16
Table 1-4 Unemployment and Income in California and in Kern and Los Angeles Counties	1-16
Table 1-5 Current and Projected Vehicle Miles Traveled in the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Vicinity	1-19
Table 1-6 Travel Growth for Intercity Highways	1-20
Table 1-7 Commercial Air Traffic and Airports Serving the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	1-25
Table 1-8 Estimated Total Travel Times (Door-to-Door in Hours and Minutes) between City Pairs by Auto, Air, and Rail (Peak Conditions)	1-27
Table 1-9 Bakersfield to Burbank Travel Time Comparison	1-29
Table 1-10 Monitored Air Quality in the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Vicinity	1-32
Table 2-1 High-Speed Rail Performance Criteria	2-6
Table 2-2 2010 Preliminary Alignment Alternatives Considered	2-48
Table 2-3 2016 Supplemental Alternatives Analysis Alternatives	2-59
Table 2-4 Previous and Current Alternatives	2-61
Table 2-5 Regional Projected Population, Employment, and Housing	2-65
Table 2-6 Planned Residential Development Projects within the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Area by 2040	2-66
Table 2-7 Total Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled—Kern County	2-67
Table 2-8 Total Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled—Los Angeles County	2-67
Table 2-9 No Project Alternative—Planned Improvements in Kern County (near Project Site)	2-70
Table 2-10 No Project Alternative—Planned Improvements in Northern Los Angeles County (near Project Site)	2-70
Table 2-11 Passenger Boardings for Bakersfield and Palmdale Airports	2-71
Table 2-12 Summary of Design Features	2-77
Table 2-13 Proposed Tunnel Portal Facilities and Infrastructure Elements	2-77
Table 2-14 Proposed Traction Power Locations	2-78
Table 2-15 Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives Proposed Modifications to California Department of Transportation State Highway Facilities	2-87
Table 2-16 Design Features	2-91
Table 2-17 High-Speed Rail System Ridership Forecasts (in millions per year)	2-107
Table 2-18 High-Speed Rail Service Plan Assumptions for Phase 1	2-111
Table 2-19 Temporary Conversion of Existing Land Uses	2-117
Table 2-20 Temporary Conversion of Planned Land Uses	2-117
Table 2-21 Permanent Conversion of Existing Land Uses	2-118
Table 2-22 Permanent Conversion of Planned Land Uses	2-118
Table 2-23 Construction Schedule	2-122



Table 2-24 Construction Staging and Pre-Casting Yards by Area for B-P Build Alternatives	2-126
Table 2-25 Tunnel Excavation	
Table 2-26 Potential Major Environmental Reviews, Permits, and Approvals	
Table 3.2-1 Regional Transportation Plans and Programs	
Table 3.2-2 Local Plans and Applicable Policies	
Table 3.2-3 Level-of-Service, Average Vehicular Delay, and Volume-to-Capacity Definition for Roadway Segments	
Table 3.2-4 Level-of-Service and Average Control Delay for Signalized Intersections	.3.2-20
Table 3.2-5 Level-of-Service and Average Control Delay for Unsignalized Intersections	.3.2-20
Table 3.2-6 Freeway Segment Peak-Hour Capacity	.3.2-21
Table 3.2-7 Level-of-Service and Volume-to-Capacity Ratio Definition for Freeway Segments	.3.2-21
Table 3.2-8 Regionally Significant Roadways within the Resource Study Area	.3.2-25
Table 3.2-9 Regional Truck Routes within the Resource Study Area	.3.2-35
Table 3.2-10 Estimated Conventional Rail Travel Times between Cities (Peak Conditions).	.3.2-37
Table 3.2-11 Golden Empire Transit Bus Routes: Bakersfield	.3.2-39
Table 3.2-12 Palmdale Transportation Center—Connecting Transit Services	.3.2-41
Table 3.2-13 Educational Facilities with School Bus Transportation within the Resource Study Area	.3.2-42
Table 3.2-14 Commercial Air Traffic and Airports	.3.2-43
Table 3.2-15 Passenger Enplanements for Bakersfield and Palmdale Airports	.3.2-44
Table 3.2-16 California Outbound and Inbound Freight Shipments, All Modes	.3.2-45
Table 3.2-17 California Outbound and Inbound Freight Shipments, by Truck and by Rail	.3.2-46
Table 3.2-18 Existing (2014) Intersection Levels-of-Service—City of Bakersfield: Intersection of 34th Street and L Street to Oswell Street	.3.2-48
Table 3.2-19 Future Year (2035) No Project Intersections Operating at Levels-of-Service E or F—City of Bakersfield	.3.2-51
Table 3.2-20 Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled	.3.2-65
Table 3.2-21 Roadway Levels-of-Service, Existing (2016) and Existing (2016) Plus Construction	.3.2-67
Table 3.2-22 Roadway Levels-of-Service, Future Year (2040) No Project and Future Year (2040) Plus Project Conditions	.3.2-71
Table 3.2-23 Intersection and Roadway Segments Mitigation	.3.2-77
Table 3.2-24 Comparison of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives Impacts for Transportation	.3.2-80
Table 3.2-25 Summary of CEQA Significance Conclusions and Mitigation Measures for Transportation	.3.2-82
Table 3.3-1 Ambient Air Quality Standards	3.3-5
Table 3.3-2 Policy Consistency Summary	.3.3-15



Table 3.3-3 Employee Counts	3.3-28
Table 3.3-4 Daily Passenger Trips	3.3-28
Table 3.3-5 Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Alignment Lengths	3.3-36
Table 3.3-6 High-Speed Rail Roadway Project Locations	3.3-38
Table 3.3-7 General Conformity de minimis Thresholds	3.3-42
Table 3.3-8 San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District CEQA Construction and Operational Thresholds of Significance	3.3-44
Table 3.3-9 Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District CEQA Construction Thresholds of Significance	3.3-45
Table 3.3-10 Antelope Valley Air Pollution Control District CEQA Construction and Operational Thresholds of Significance	3.3-45
Table 3.3-11 Ambient Criteria Pollutant Concentration Data at Air Quality Monitoring Stations Closest to the High-Speed Rail Project	3.3-49
Table 3.3-12 Federal and State Attainment Status	3.3-51
Table 3.3-13 Estimated Annual Average Emissions for the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (tons per day)	3.3-55
Table 3.3-14 Estimated Annual Average Emissions for the Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District (tons per day)	3.3-56
Table 3.3-15 Estimated Annual Average Emissions for the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District (tons per day)	3.3-57
Table 3.3-16 2014 California Statewide Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory	3.3-58
Table 3.3-17 Sensitive Receptors within 1,000 Feet of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives	3.3-59
Table 3.3-18 Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Construction Regional Emissions— Total (Tons/Construction Duration)	3.3-73
Table 3.3-19 Estimated Annual Average Emissions for the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District—Alternative 1	3.3-74
Table 3.3-20 Estimated Annual Average Emissions for the Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District—Alternative 1	3.3-77
Table 3.3-21 Estimated Annual Average Emissions for the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District—Alternative 1	3.3-80
Table 3.3-22 Estimated Annual Average Emissions for the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District—Alternative 2	3.3-82
Table 3.3-23 Estimated Annual Average Emissions for the Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District—Alternative 2	3.3-85
Table 3.3-24 Estimated Annual Average Emissions for the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District—Alternative 2	3.3-88
Table 3.3-25 Estimated Annual Average Emissions for the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District—Alternative 3	3.3-90
Table 3.3-26 Estimated Annual Average Emissions for the Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District—Alternative 3	3.3-93
Table 3.3-27 Estimated Annual Average Emissions for the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District—Alternative 3	3.3-96



Table 3.3-28 Estimated Annual Average Emissions for the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District—Alternative 5	3.3-98
Table 3.3-29 Estimated Annual Average Emissions for the Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District—Alternative 5	.3.3-101
Table 3.3-30 Estimated Annual Average Emissions for the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District—Alternative 5	.3.3-104
Table 3.3-31 Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Carbon Dioxide Equivalent Construction Emissions (Metric Tons per Year)	.3.3-119
Table 3.3-32 Statewide No Project Emissions in Tons per Year (2015)	.3.3-125
Table 3.3-33 Statewide No Project Emissions in Tons per Year (2040)	.3.3-126
Table 3.3-34 Estimated Statewide Emissions Burden Changes Due to the High-Speed Rail Project versus No Project (Medium Ridership Scenario) in Tons per Year (2015).	.3.3-126
Table 3.3-35 Estimated Statewide Emissions Burden Changes Due to the High-Speed Rail Project versus No Project (High Ridership Scenario) in Tons per Year (2015)	.3.3-126
Table 3.3-36 Estimated Statewide Emission Burden Changes Due to the High-Speed Rail Project versus No Project (Medium Ridership Scenario) in Tons per Year (2040)	
Table 3.3-37 Estimated Statewide Emission Burden Changes Due to the High-Speed Rail Project versus No Project (High Ridership Scenario) in Tons per Year (2040)	
Table 3.3-38 Summary of Regional Emissions Changes Existing Year—2015 with Project (Under the Medium Ridership Scenario)	
Table 3.3-39 Summary of Regional Emissions Changes Existing Year—2015 with Project (Under the High Ridership Scenario)	
Table 3.3-40 Summary of Regional Emissions Changes in Horizon Year—2040 with Project (under the Medium Ridership Scenario)	.3.3-130
Table 3.3-41 Summary of Regional Emissions in Horizon Year—2040 with Project (under the High Ridership Scenario)	.3.3-131
Table 3.3-42 Estimated Statewide Greenhouse Gas Emissions for the No Project Alternative	.3.3-132
Table 3.3-43 Estimated Statewide Greenhouse Gas Emission for the High-Speed Rail Project	.3.3-133
Table 3.3-44 Maximum Modeled Carbon Monoxide Concentrations at Intersections near the Palmdale Station	
Table 3.3-45 Comparison of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Impacts for Air Quality and Global Climate Change	.3.3-146
Table 3.3-46 Summary of CEQA Significance Conclusions for Air Quality and Global Climate Change	.3.3-149
Table 3.4-1 Summary of Severe Noise Operations Impacts	3.4-3
Table 3.4-2 Regional and Local Plans, Policies, and Ordinances	3.4-8
Table 3.4-3 Regional and Local Plans and Policies Inconsistencies	3.4-10
Table 3.4-4 Noise Screening Distances for Noise Assessments	3.4-13
Table 3.4-5 FRA Screening Distances for Vibration Assessment	3.4-14
Table 3.4-6 Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Operational and Geometric Assumptions	3.4-17



Table 3.4-7 Detailed Assessment Criteria for Construction Noise	3.4-18
Table 3.4-8 Construction Vibration Damage Criteria	3.4-18
Table 3.4-9 Vibration Impact Screening Distances	3.4-22
Table 3.4-10 Distances to Federal Railroad Administration Noise Impact Contours from Construction Activities for the High-Speed Rail Corridor	3.4-24
Table 3.4-11 Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels	3.4-25
Table 3.4-12 Distances to Federal Railroad Administration Noise Impact from Construction Activities for the High-Speed Rail Corridor	3.4-27
Table 3.4-13 Typical Noise Levels from Construction Activities for Public Works Projects	3.4-28
Table 3.4-14 Construction Noise Impact Summary	3.4-32
Table 3.4-15 Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment	3.4-33
Table 3.4-16 Distances of Construction Vibration Annoyance Criteria	3.4-34
Table 3.4-17 Distances Within the Construction Vibration Damage Criteria	3.4-35
Table 3.4-18 Noise Impact Summary without Mitigation—Fresno to Bakersfield (Locally Generated Alternative)	3.4-39
Table 3.4-19 Impact on Schools—Fresno to Bakersfield (Locally Generated Alternative)	3.4-39
Table 3.4-20 Noise Impact Summary without Mitigation—Alternative 1—Bakersfield to Palmdale (between Station Areas)	3.4-41
Table 3.4-21 Noise Impact Summary without Mitigation—Alternative 2—Bakersfield to Palmdale (between Station Areas)	3.4-41
Table 3.4-22 Noise Impact Summary without Mitigation—Alternative 3—Bakersfield to Palmdale (between Station Areas)	3.4-41
Table 3.4-23 Noise Impact Summary without Mitigation—Alternative 5—Bakersfield to Palmdale (between Station Areas)	3.4-41
Table 3.4-24 Impact on Schools—Bakersfield to Palmdale (between Station Areas)	3.4-42
Table 3.4-25 Noise Impact Summary—Palmdale Station Area	3.4-43
Table 3.4-26 Vibration Impacts—Fresno to Bakersfield (Locally Generated Alternative)	3.4-45
Table 3.4-27 Distances to Vibration Criterion Level Contours—Bakersfield to Palmdale (between Station Areas)	3.4-45
Table 3.4-28 Sound Barrier Analysis: Bakersfield Station—Fresno to Bakersfield (Locally Generated Alternative) Alignment	3.4-59
Table 3.4-29 Sound Barrier Analysis: Bakersfield to Palmdale (between Station Areas) Alignment—Alternative 1	3.4-60
Table 3.4-30 Sound Barrier Analysis: Bakersfield to Palmdale (between Station Areas) Alignment—Alternative 2	3.4-62
Table 3.4-31 Sound Barrier Analysis: Bakersfield to Palmdale (between Station Areas) Alignment—Alternative 3	3.4-64
Table 3.4-32 Sound Barrier Analysis: Bakersfield to Palmdale (between Station Areas) Alignment—Alternative 5	3.4-66
Table 3.4-33 Sound Barrier Analysis: Palmdale Station Area	3.4-68
Table 3.4-34 Bakersfield Station—Fresno to Bakersfield (Locally Generated Alternative) Alignment—Severe Residual Impacts: Mitigation Not Considered	3 4-69



Table 3.4-35 Bakersfield to Palmdale (Between Station Areas) Alignment—Severe Residual Impacts: Mitigation Not Considered	3.4-69
Table 3.4-36 Palmdale Station Alignment—Severe Residual Impacts Without Mitigation	3.4-69
Table 3.4-37 Potential Vibration Mitigation Procedures and Descriptions	3.4-71
Table 3.4-38 Comparison of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Impacts for Noise and Vibration	3.4-75
Table 3.4-39 Summary of CEQA Significance Conclusions for Noise and Vibration	3.4-78
Table 3.5-1 Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers C95.6 Magnetic Field Maximum Permissible Exposure Levels for the General Public	3.5-4
Table 3.5-2 Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers C95.6 Electric Field Maximum Permissible Exposure Levels for the General Public	3.5-5
Table 3.5-3 Radio Frequency Emissions Safety Levels Expressed as Maximum Permissible Exposure	3.5-6
Table 3.5-4 Comparison of Measured and Project Calculated 60-Hertz Magnetic Fields	3.5-13
Table 3.5-5 Summary of High-Speed Rail EMF Modeling Results	3.5-18
Table 3.5-6 Potentially Sensitive Facilities	3.5-20
Table 3.5-7 Comparison of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Impacts for EMI/EMF	3.5-29
Table 3.5-8 Summary of CEQA Significance Conclusions and Mitigation Measures for EMI/EMF	3.5-32
Table 3.6-1 General Plan Policy Consistency Analysis Results	3.6-7
Table 3.6-2 Construction Energy Consumption Assumptions for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	3.6-16
Table 3.6-3 Resource Study Area Utility and Energy Providers	3.6-18
Table 3.6-4 Water Suppliers in the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	3.6-20
Table 3.6-5 Water Treatment Plant Existing Capacity Summary for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	3.6-22
Table 3.6-6 Wastewater Treatment Plant Existing Average Flow and Capacity Summary for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	3.6-22
Table 3.6-7 Landfill Facility Summary for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	3.6-24
Table 3.6-8 2015 Electricity Consumption in Kern and Los Angeles Counties	3.6-25
Table 3.6-9 Fuel Sources for Electric Power in California in 2015	3.6-25
Table 3.6-10 Construction Water Demand Summary for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	3.6-39
Table 3.6-11 Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Impacts to High-Risk and Major Utilities.	3.6-41
Table 3.6-12 Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Impacts to Other Significant Utility Facilities	3.6-42
Table 3.6-13 Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Impacts to Low-Risk Utilities	3.6-43
Table 3.6-14 Estimated Existing Water Use and Anticipated Water Demand for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	3.6-49



Table 3.6-15 Wastewater Capacity and Estimated Wastewater (Sewage) Generation for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	3.6-50
Table 3.6-16 Construction Energy Payback Period	3.6-54
Table 3.6-17 2015 & 2040 Estimated Regional (Bakersfield to Palmdale) Change in Energy Consumption from the High-Speed Rail Build Alternatives	3.6-55
Table 3.6-18 2040 Estimated Statewide Change in Energy Consumption from the High-Speed Rail Build Alternatives	3.6-55
Table 3.6-19 Comparison of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Impacts for Public Utilities	3.6-59
Table 3.6-20 Comparison of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Impacts for Energy Resources	3.6-62
Table 3.6-21 Summary of CEQA Significance Conclusions and Mitigation Measures for Public Utilities and Energy	3.6-63
Table 3.7-1 Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis Summary	3.7-12
Table 3.7-2 Survey Results: Aquatic Resources in the Aquatic Resource Study Area	3.7-47
Table 3.7-3 Biological Resources Impacts in the Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated Alternative Area	3.7-52
Table 3.7-4 Potential Areas of Section 1600 Jurisdiction in the Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated Alternative Area of the Aquatic Resource Study Area	3.7-52
Table 3.7-5 Comparison of Estimated Potential Effects on Suitable Habitats for Special-Status Plant Species within the Resource Study Area	3.7-55
Table 3.7-6 Comparison of Estimated Potential Effects on Suitable Habitat for Special-Status Wildlife Species within the Resource Study Area	3.7-61
Table 3.7-7 Intersection of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives (Station to Station) and Modeled Federal and State Threatened/Endangered Species Habitat	3.7-62
Table 3.7-8 Comparison of Potential Estimated Effects on Aquatic Resources—Ordinary High Water Mark or Edge of Wetland	3.7-75
Table 3.7-9 Comparison of Potential Estimated Effects on Aquatic Resources—Top of Bank or Edge of Riparian	3.7-76
Table 3.7-10 Potential Areas of Section 1600 Jurisdiction in the Aquatic Resource Study Area	3.7-77
Table 3.7-11 Comparison of Impacts on Special-Status Plant Communities	3.7-90
Table 3.7-12 Modeled Unshielded Distance to L _{max} Noise Contour for a Train Moving at 220 mph	3.7-96
Table 3.7-13 Potential Nonbiological Impacts of Off-Site Mitigation Activities	3.7-141
Table 3.7-14 Summary of Effects for Federally Listed Species and Their Critical Habitat	3.7-164
Table 3.7-15 Summary of CEQA Significance Conclusions, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation	3.7-173
Table 3.8-1 Local Plans, Policies, and Ordinances	
Table 3.8-2 Quantitative and Qualitative Analyses for Hydrology and Water Resources	3.8-17
Table 3.8-3 High-Speed Rail Documents Reviewed	3.8-17
Table 3.8-4 Evaluation Method by Topic Area	3.8-18



Table 3.8-5 Named Surface Waters within the Resource Study Area	3.8-26
Table 3.8-6 Surface Water Beneficial Uses in the Tulare Lake Basin and Lahontan Region	3.8-29
Table 3.8-7 Surface Water Quality Objectives for All Surface Waters in the Tulare Lake Basin	3.8-31
Table 3.8-8 Surface Water Quality Objectives for All Surface Waters in the Lahontan Region	3.8-33
Table 3.8-9 Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Hazard Zone Designations in the Resource Study Area	3.8-35
Table 3.8-10 Groundwater Beneficial Uses for the Tulare Lake Basin and the Lahontan Region	3.8-44
Table 3.8-11 General Groundwater Objectives for the Tulare Lake Basin	3.8-44
Table 3.8-12 General Groundwater Objectives for the Lahontan Region	3.8-45
Table 3.8-13 Floodplains Crossed by the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives	3.8-49
Table 3.8-14 Acres Disturbed during Construction of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives	3.8-54
Table 3.8-15 Groundwater Basins Crossed by the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives	3.8-61
Table 3.8-16 Acres of Impervious Surface Area	3.8-67
Table 3.8-17 Proposed Drainage System	3.8-68
Table 3.8-18 Named Waterbodies Crossed by the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives	3.8-70
Table 3.8-19 Comparison of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Impacts for Hydrology and Water Resources	3.8-98
Table 3.8-20 Summary of CEQA Significant Conclusions and Mitigation Measures for Hydrology and Water Resources	3.8-103
Table 3.9-1 Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis Summary	3.9-7
Table 3.9-2 California Department of Transportation Paleontological Sensitivity Rating Criteria	3.9-19
Table 3.9-3 Summary of Geologic Units Along the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	3.9-24
Table 3.9-4 Soil Types in the Resource Study Area	3.9-34
Table 3.9-5 Paleontological Sensitivity Evaluation of Geologic Units in the Resource Study Area	3.9-58
Table 3.9-6 Soils with Moderate and High Erosion Potential Disturbed during Construction (acres)	3.9-65
Table 3.9-7 Acreage of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Construction on Oil Fields	3.9-67
Table 3.9-8 Number of Oil Wells within the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Construction Footprint	3.9-67
Table 3.9-9 Soils with Moderate and High Expansive Potential Crossed by the B-P Build Alternatives (acres)	3.9-73



Table 3.9-10 Soils with Moderate and High Corrosive Potential Crossed by the B-P Build Alternatives (acres)	3.9-74
Table 3.9-11 Number of Fault Crossings Within the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	3.9-78
Table 3.9-12 Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Mileage within Fault Zones	3.9-78
Table 3.9-13 Liquefaction Risk Areas Crossed by the B-P Build Alternatives (acres)	3.9-80
Table 3.9-14 Dam Inundation Zones Crossed by the B-P Build Alternatives (acres)	3.9-81
Table 3.9-15 Comparison of B-P Build Alternative Impacts for Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	3.9-83
Table 3.9-16 Comparison of B-P Build Alternative Impacts for Paleontological Resources	3.9-91
Table 3.9-17 Summary of CEQA Significance Conclusions and Mitigation Measures for Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	3.9-92
Table 3.9-18 Summary of CEQA Significance Conclusions and Mitigation Measures for Paleontological Resources	3.9-94
Table 3.10-1 Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis Summary	3.10-6
Table 3.10-2 Ranking Applied to Potential Environmental Concern Sites in the Resource Study Area	3.10-8
Table 3.10-3 Summary of Potential Environmental Concern Sites by Ranking and Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative	3.10-14
Table 3.10-4 Summary of Potentially High Potential Environmental Concern Sites Requiring Abatement of Building Materials	3.10-14
Table 3.10-5 Oil and Gas Wells in the Resource Study Area by Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative	3.10-15
Table 3.10-6 Educational Facilities in Study Area (Project Footprint + 0.25 mile)	3.10-17
Table 3.10-7 Comparison of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Impacts for Hazardous Material and Wastes	3.10-32
Table 3.10-8 Summary of CEQA Significance Conclusions and Mitigation Measures for Hazardous Materials and Wastes	3.10-33
Table 3.11-1 Regional and Local Plans and Policies Analysis Summary	3.11-11
Table 3.11-2 Airport Land Use Plans	3.11-13
Table 3.11-3 Definition of Safety and Security Resource Study Area	3.11-14
Table 3.11-4 Emergency Services within the Resource Study Area for the Light Maintenance Facility/Maintenance of Infrastructure Siding Facilities/Maintenance-of-Way Facility	3.11-31
Table 3.11-5 Regional Law Enforcement	
Table 3.11-6 Crime Rates in the Region	3.11-34
Table 3.11-7 Regional Fire Departments and Equipment	3.11-35
Table 3.11-8 Wildfire Activity within the Two-County Region	3.11-37
Table 3.11-9 B-P Build Alternatives and LMF/MOIS/MOWF in LRA/SRA Fire Severity Zones	3.11-37
Table 3.11-10 Pedestrian and Bicyclist Victims Killed or Injured Within Resource Study Area Jurisdictions (2016)	3.11-39



Table 3.11-11 Adopted Bicycle Master Plans within Resource Study Area Jurisdictions	3.11-39
Table 3.11-12 Airports and Heliports within the Resource Study Area	.3.11-41
Table 3.11-13 Educational Facilities (Schools) within 0.25 Mile of Project Footprint	.3.11-42
Table 3.11-14 Landfills within the Resource Study Area	.3.11-45
Table 3.11-15 Government Buildings within the Resource Study Area	.3.11-46
Table 3.11-16 Designed Bed Space and Count for the California State Prison (Los Angeles)	3.11-46
Table 3.11-17 Comparison of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Impacts for Safety and Security	3.11-75
Table 3.11-18 Summary of CEQA Significance Conclusions and Mitigation Measures for Safety and Security	3.11-78
Table 3.12-1 Local and Regional Plan Policy Consistency Analysis Summary	3.12-9
Table 3.12-2 Definition of Resource Study Areas	.3.12-13
Table 3.12-3 Population Growth (2000–2040)	.3.12-28
Table 3.12-4 Number of Households and Average Household Size (2000)	.3.12-37
Table 3.12-5 Number of Households and Average Household Size (2009–2013 American Community Survey)	3.12-37
Table 3.12-6 Household Composition (2010)	.3.12-38
Table 3.12-7 Community Cohesion Indicators	.3.12-44
Table 3.12-8 Housing Characteristics (2009–2013 American Community Survey)	.3.12-46
Table 3.12-9 Housing Unit Tenure (2009–2013 American Community Survey)	.3.12-47
Table 3.12-10 Foreclosure Rate (April 2018)	.3.12-48
Table 3.12-11 Unemployment (April 2016)	.3.12-53
Table 3.12-12 City Employment by Industry (2009–2013 American Community Survey)	.3.12-54
Table 3.12-13 Local Government Revenues in the Indirect Impacts Resource Study Area for Population and Community Impacts	
Table 3.12-14 School Districts in the Indirect Impacts Resource Study Area for Population and Community Impacts	3.12-59
Table 3.12-15 Residential Displacements in the Palmdale Station Area	.3.12-85
Table 3.12-16 Gap Analysis of Residential Displacements in the Palmdale Station Area	.3.12-85
Table 3.12-17 Business Displacements in the Palmdale Station Area	.3.12-86
Table 3.12-18 Gap Analysis of Business Displacements in the Palmdale Station Area	.3.12-86
Table 3.12-19 Residential and Student Displacements in School Districts in the Palmdale Station Area	
Table 3.12-20 School District Revenue Losses in the Palmdale Station Area	.3.12-90
Table 3.12-21 Estimated Property Tax Loss Associated with the Palmdale Station Site	.3.12-91
Table 3.12-22 Estimated Changes in Property Tax Revenue Related to the Palmdale Station Site	3.12-91
Table 3.12-23 Estimated Changes in Sales Tax Revenue Associated with the Palmdale Station Site	3.12-92



Table 3.12-24 Construction Sales Tax Revenue per Year for the Palmdale Station S	ite3.12-94
Table 3.12-25 Employment Impacts during Construction (in annual job years)	3.12-109
Table 3.12-26 Residential Displacements Under Alternative 1	3.12-111
Table 3.12-27 Gap Analysis of Residential Displacements Under Alternative 1	3.12-112
Table 3.12-28 Residential Displacements Under Alternative 2/Preferred Alternative	3.12-114
Table 3.12-29 Gap Analysis of Residential Displacements Under Alternative 2/Preference Alternative	
Table 3.12-30 Residential Displacements Under Alternative 3	3.12-115
Table 3.12-31 Gap Analysis of Residential Displacements Under Alternative 3	3.12-116
Table 3.12-32 Residential Displacements Under Alternative 5	3.12-117
Table 3.12-33 Gap Analysis of Residential Displacements Under Alternative 5	3.12-118
Table 3.12-34 Business Displacements Under Alternative 1	3.12-118
Table 3.12-35 Gap Analysis of Business Displacements Under Alternative 1	3.12-120
Table 3.12-36 Vacant Commercial/Industrial Land in Lancaster and Palmdale	3.12-121
Table 3.12-37 Business Displacements Under Alternative 2/Preferred Alternative	3.12-121
Table 3.12-38 Gap Analysis of Business Displacements Under Alternative 2/Preferre	
Table 3.12-39 Business Displacements Under Alternative 3	3.12-124
Table 3.12-40 Gap Analysis of Business Displacements Under Alternative 3	3.12-125
Table 3.12-41 Business Displacements Under Alternative 5	3.12-126
Table 3.12-42 Gap Analysis of Business Displacements Under Alternative 5	3.12-127
Table 3.12-43 Agricultural Displacements Under Alternative 1	3.12-129
Table 3.12-44 Agricultural Displacements Under Alternative 2	3.12-130
Table 3.12-45 Agricultural Displacements Under Alternative 3	3.12-131
Table 3.12-46 Agricultural Displacements under Alternative 5	3.12-132
Table 3.12-47 Community Facility Displacements by Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative	
Table 3.12-48 Alternatives 1, 2 and 3: Temporary Effects to Community Facilities Wi 500 Feet of the Temporary and Permanent Effect Limits During Construction	
Table 3.12-49 Alternative 5: Temporary Effects on Community Facilities Within 500 For the Temporary and Permanent Effect Limits during Construction	
Table 3.12-50 Residential and Student Displacements in School Districts for Alternat 139	tive 13.12-
Table 3.12-51 School District Revenue Losses under Alternative 1	3.12-141
Table 3.12-52 Residential and Student Displacements in School Districts for Alternative	
Table 3.12-53 School District Revenue Losses under Alternative 2/Preferred Alterna	tive .3.12-143
Table 3.12-54 Residential and Student Displacements in School Districts for Alternat 145	tive 33.12-
Table 3.12-55 School District Revenue Losses under Alternative 3	3.12-146



Table 3.12-56 Residential and Student Displacements in School Districts for Alternative 5 147	53.12-
Table 3.12-57 School District Revenue Losses Under Alternative 5	3.12-149
Table 3.12-58 Existing Roads That Would Be Temporarily Closed at the High-Speed Rai Alignment During Construction of Alternatives 1, 3, and 5	
Table 3.12-59 Locations of Temporary Detours during Construction of Alternative 2	3.12-151
Table 3.12-60 Crop Revenue and Job Losses in Kern County Related to Agricultural Production Affected by the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section	3.12-152
Table 3.12-61 Estimated Changes in Property Tax Revenue Under Alternative 1	3.12-154
Table 3.12-62 Estimated Changes in Sales Tax Revenue Under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.	3.12-155
Table 3.12-63 Estimated Changes in Property Tax Revenue Under Alternative 2/Preferred Alternative	3.12-156
Table 3.12-64 Estimated Changes in Property Tax Revenue Under Alternative 3	3.12-156
Table 3.12-65 Estimated Changes in Property Tax Revenue under Alternative 5	3.12-158
Table 3.12-66 Estimated Changes in Sales Tax Revenue Under Alternative 5	3.12-159
Table 3.12-67 Construction Sales Tax Revenue per Year under the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives	3.12-161
Table 3.12-68 Construction Sales Tax Revenue per Year for the Maintenance Facilities	3.12-162
Table 3.12-69 Regional Projected and Induced Population and Employment Growth	3.12-166
Table 3.12-70 Direct, Indirect, and Induced Jobs by 2040	3.12-167
Table 3.12-71 Alternatives 1, 2, and 3: Permanent Effects on Community Facilities Within 500 Feet of the Temporary and Permanent Effect Limits	
Table 3.12-72 Alternative 5: Permanent Effects on Community Facilities Within 500 Feet of the Temporary and Permanent Effect Limits	
Table 3.12-73 Summary of Findings on Effect of Rail Transit on Residential Real Estate Values	3.12-177
Table 3.12-74 Summary of Findings on Effect of Rail Transit on Commercial Real Estate Values	3.12-178
Table 3.12-75 Comparison of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Impacts for Socioeconomics and Communities	3.12-187
Table 3.12-76 Summary of CEQA Significance Conclusions and Mitigation Measures for Socioeconomics and Communities	
Table 3.13-1 Local and Regional Plan Policy Consistency Analysis Summary	3.13-5
Table 3.13-2 Permanent Conversion of Existing Land Uses in the Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated Alternative	3.13-19
Table 3.13-3 Permanent Conversion of Planned Land Uses in the Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated Alternative	3.13-20
Table 3.13-4 Temporary Conversion of Existing Land Uses	3.13-26
Table 3.13-5 Permanent Conversion of Existing Land Uses	3.13-29
Table 3.13-6 Permanent Conversion of Planned Land Uses	3.13-30
Table 3.13-7 Temporary Conversion of Planned Land Uses	3.13-32



Table 3.13-8 Comparison of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Impacts for Station Planning, Land Use, and Development	3.13-40
Table 3.13-9 Summary of CEQA Significance Conclusions and Mitigation Measures for Station Planning, Land Use, and Development	3.13-41
Table 3.14-1 Permanent Conversion of Important Farmland (acres)	3.14-2
Table 3.14-2 Regional and Local Plans and Policies	3.14-7
Table 3.14-3 Policy Consistency Analysis Summary	3.14-8
Table 3.14-4 Summary of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Stakeholder Outreach Meetings—Farmland	
Table 3.14-5 Important Farmland and Grazing Land Acreage in Kern and Los Angeles Counties (2014) (acres)	3.14-21
Table 3.14-6 Farmland Acres by Category within the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Farmland Resource Study Area	3.14-22
Table 3.14-7 Farmland Conversions in Kern and Los Angeles Counties (2004–2016)	3.14-22
Table 3.14-8 Protected Farmland Acreage in Kern and Los Angeles Counties (2015)	3.14-23
Table 3.14-9 Williamson Act Contract Land Acres by Category within the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Farmland Resource Study Area	3.14-23
Table 3.14-10 Affected Environment Summary by Region	3.14-31
Table 3.14-11 Important Farmland Temporarily Used for Construction of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives (Acres)	3.14-36
Table 3.14-12 Williamson Act Contract Land Temporarily Used for Construction of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives (Acres)	3.14-38
Table 3.14-13 Important Farmland Directly and Permanently Converted to Nonagricultural Use by Each Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Footprint (acres)	3.14-42
Table 3.14-14 Farmland Conversion Impact Rating (points)	3.14-43
Table 3.14-15 Permanent Impacts to Important Farmland from Direct Impacts and Parcel Severance for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives (Acres).	
Table 3.14-16 Important Farmland to Remain in Agricultural Use after Parcel Severance—Step 2	3.14-46
Table 3.14-17 Permanent Impacts to Williamson Act Contract Land and Important Farmland under a Williamson Act Contract for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives (Acres)	3.14-47
Table 3.14-18 Williamson Act Contract Land and Important Farmland under a Williamson Act Contract Reduced below the Minimum Parcel Size (Acres)	
Table 3.14-19 Permanent Impacts to Land Zoned for Agricultural Use and Important Farmland Zoned for Agricultural Use for the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives (Acres)	3.14-48
Table 3.14-20 Important Farmland Mitigation Calculations (Acres)	3.14-54
Table 3.14-21 Comparison of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Impacts for Important Farmland	3.14-56
Table 3.14-22 Summary of CEQA Significance Conclusions and Mitigation Measures for Agricultural Lands	3.14-63



Table 3.15-2 Parks and Recreation Resources within the Resource Study Areas for Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5	.3.15-5
Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5	3.15-14
Recreation Facilities in the Resource Study Area for the Bakersfield Station—Fresno to Bakersfield (Locally Generated Alternative)	3.15-18
Play Area Resources before and after Mitigation under Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5	3.15-21
Impacts for Parks and Recreation Resources	3.15-31
Parks and Recreation Resources	3.15-55
	3.15-61
	.3.16-4
Table 3.16-2 Key Visual Components and Affected Populations in the East Bakersfield Landscape Unit	3.16-13
Table 3.16-3 Key Visual Components and Affected Populations in the Edison/Rural Valley Landscape Unit	3.16-16
Table 3.16-4 Key Visual Components and Affected Populations in the Tehachapi Mountains West Landscape Unit	3.16-18
Table 3.16-5 Key Visual Components and Affected Populations in the Tehachapi Valley Landscape Unit	3.16-23
Table 3.16-6 Key Visual Components and Affected Populations in the Tehachapi Mountains East Landscape Unit	3.16-24
Table 3.16-7 Key Visual Components and Affected Populations in the West Mojave Landscape Unit	3.16-30
Table 3.16-8 Key Visual Components and Affected Populations in the Rosamond Rural Landscape Unit	3.16-32
Table 3.16-9 Key Visual Components and Affected Populations in the Lancaster-Palmdale Landscape Unit	3.16-34
Table 3.16-10 Summary of Visual Quality Changes and Impacts at Key Viewpoints	3.16-45
Table 3.16-11 Comparison of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Impacts for Aesthetics and Visual Quality	16-150
Table 3.16-12 Summary of CEQA Significance Conclusions and Mitigation Measures for Aesthetics and Visual Quality	16-153
Table 3.17-1 Regional and Local Plans and Policies	3.17-11
Table 3.17-2 Regional and Local Policy Consistency Analysis Summary	3.17-13
Table 3.17-3 Section 106 Technical Reports and Concurrence	3.17-15
Table 3.17-4 Potentially Interested Parties Contacted Via Letter as of September 11, 2015	3.17-17
Table 3.17-5 Public and Agency Meetings (January 2012–September 2017)	3.17-19
Table 3.17-6 Section 106 Consulting Party Meetings	3 17 25



Table 3.17-7 Summary of Outreach Efforts to Identify Native American Consulting/ Concurring Parties	3.17-27
Table 3.17-8 Consulting Parties in the Preparation of the Memorandum of Agreement	.3.17-30
Table 3.17-9 Previously Recorded Archaeological Resources within the Area of Potential Effects	3.17-51
Table 3.17-10 Newly Identified Archaeological Resources within the Area of Potential Effects and Vicinity	.3.17-53
Table 3.17-11 National Register of Historic Places-Listed and Eligible Built Resources Within the Area of Potential Effects	.3.17-57
Table 3.17-12 Previously Identified Historic Properties (National Register of Historic Places) Bakersfield Station—F Street (Locally Generated Alternative)	.3.17-69
Table 3.17-13 Previously Identified "CEQA-Only" Cultural Resources, Bakersfield Station—F Street (Locally Generated Alternative)	.3.17-70
Table 3.17-14 Summary of Project Ground-Disturbing Actions with the Potential to Cause Adverse Effects to Archaeological Historic Properties	
Table 3.17-15 Summary of Section 106 Effects Findings for Built Environment Historic Properties Within the Oswell Street to Palmdale Station Area of Potential Effects Segment	3.17-78
Table 3.17-16 Comparison of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Effects on Historic Properties	
Table 3.17-17 Summary of CEQA Significance Conclusions and Mitigation Measures for Cultural Resources	3.17-105
Table 3.18-1 Summary of Project Consistency with Regional and Local Plans and Policies	3.18-7
Table 3.18-2 Kern and Los Angeles Counties and Regional Employment by Industry 2000–2022	.3.18-14
Table 3.18-3 Regional Long-Range Employment Projections, 2015 and 2040	.3.18-15
Table 3.18-4 Labor Force Characteristics	.3.18-15
Table 3.18-5 Population Increase in the Resource Study Area, 2000–2015	.3.18-17
Table 3.18-6 Population Projections in the Resource Study Area, 2015–2040	.3.18-17
Table 3.18-7 Existing and Projected Housing Units	.3.18-18
Table 3.18-8 Employment Effects from B-P Build Alternatives during Construction (in annual job years)	.3.18-22
Table 3.18-9 Employment Effects from Design Options (in annual job years)	.3.18-22
Table 3.18-10 Direct, Indirect, and Induced Jobs by 2040	.3.18-25
Table 3.18-11 Projected and Induced Employment Growth	.3.18-25
Table 3.18-12 Regional Projected and Induced Population Growth	.3.18-27
Table 3.18-13 Regional Projected and Induced Housing Growth	.3.18-28
Table 3.19-1 Resource Study Areas for Cumulative Impact Analysis	3.19-7
Table 3.19-2 Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District Air Quality Attainment Status	.3.19-15
Table 3.19-3 San Joaquin Valley Air Basin Air Quality Attainment Status	.3.19-16



Table 3.19-4 Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District Air Quality Attainment Status	.3.19-16
Table 3.19-5 Parkland Standards by Jurisdiction	.3.19-23
Table 3.19-6 Population Projections for Counties and Cities Traversed by the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section, 2010–2040	.3.19-27
Table 3.19-7 Summary of Mitigation Measures	.3.19-71
Table 3.19-8 Summary of Cumulative Construction Impacts	.3.19-72
Table 3.19-9 Summary of Cumulative Operations Impacts	.3.19-78
Table 4-1 Summary of the Section 4(f) Outreach Meetings, January 2012–March 2021	4-12
Table 4-2 Summary Section 4(f) Consultation with Officials with Jurisdiction	4-14
Table 4-3 Public Parks and Recreation Resources Evaluated under Section 4(f)	4-34
Table 4-4 Bakersfield Station Alternatives—Public Parks and Recreation Resources Evaluated under Section 4(f)	4-45
Table 4-5 Properties Listed in, or Determined Eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places Evaluated under Section 4(f)	
Table 4-6 Bakersfield Station Alternatives-Properties Listed in, or Determined or Recommended Eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places Evaluated under Section 4(f)	4-52
Table 4-7 Park and Recreation Resources Not Subject to Section 4(f) Requirements	4-53
Table 4-8 Summary of Authority Determinations under Section 4(f) at Park and Recreation Resources	4-65
Table 4-9 Summary of Section 4(f) Uses of National Register of Historic Places Listed or Eligible Properties	4-73
Table 4-10 Summary of Critical Differentiators Analysis from the Supplemental Alternatives Analysis Report	4-94
Table 4-11 Measures to Minimize Harm for Public Parks and Recreation Resources Evaluated under Section 4(f)	4-99
Table 4-12 Measures to Minimize Harm for Built Environment Historic Properties Evaluated under Section 4(f)	4-104
Table 4-13 Measures to Minimize Harm for Archaeological Historic Properties	4-112
Table 4-14 Least-Harm Analysis	4-119
Table 5-1 Local and Regional Plan Policy Compatibility Analysis Summary	5-8
Table 5-2 Population Within 0.5 Mile of the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives	5-11
Table 5-3 Environmental Justice Reference Community and Resource Study Area Demographic Characteristics	5-14
Table 5-4 Summary of Areas of Concern during the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Public Outreach Events	5-20
Table 5-5 Summary of Adverse Effects during Construction—Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives (including the CCNM Design Option and the Refined CCNM Design Option)	5-26
Table 5-6 Facilities of Concern for Low-Income Populations in Lancaster	



Table 5-7 Summary of Visual Quality Changes and Impacts at Key Viewpoints	5-42
Table 5-8 Summary of Adverse Effects during Operation	5-48
Table 5-9 Noise Receptor Impacts by Alternative at Sensitive Noise Receptors—Low-Income and/or Minority Populations	5-51
Table 5-10 Mitigated Noise Receptor Impacts by Alternative at Sensitive Noise Receptors—Low-income and/or Minority Populations	5-52
Table 5-11 Comparison of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Impacts (including the CCNM Design Option and the Refined CCNM Design Option) During Construction	5-89
Table 5-12 Comparison of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternative Impacts (including the CCNM Design Option and the Refined CCNM Design Option) during Operation	5-93
Table 5-13 Summary of Palmdale Station Impacts during Construction	5-96
Table 5-14 Summary of Palmdale Station Impacts during Operation	5-98
Table 5-15 Summary of Environmental Justice Determinations	5-111
Table 6-1 Capital Costs of the B-P Build Alternatives from Bakersfield Station to Palmdale Station (2020\$ in millions)	6-3
Table 6-2 Annual Operations and Maintenance Costs for Phase 1 (2015\$ in millions)	6-6
Table 6-3 Annual Operations and Maintenance Costs Apportioned to the Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section (2015\$ in millions)	6-7
Table 8-1 Comparison of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Build Alternatives	8-12
Table 8-2 Bakersfield to Palmdale Alignment Alternatives Differentiators	8-20
Table 9-1 Summary of Bakersfield to Palmdale Project Section Key Stakeholder Outreach Meetings	9-24