

Table of Contents

Fact Sheet	v
Preface	ix
List of Tables	xxiii
List of Figures	xxvii

Summary	1
S.1 Introduction and Background.....	1
S.2 Tiered Environmental Review: Final Statewide Program EIR/EIS and Merced to Fresno Section Project EIR/EIS.....	1
S.3 Issues Raised During the Scoping Process	4
S.4 Purpose of and Need for the HST System and the Merced to Fresno HST Section.....	5
S.4.1 Purpose of the HST System	5
S.4.2 Purpose of the Merced to Fresno Section.....	5
S.4.3 Objectives and Policies for the HST System in California and within the Central Part of the San Joaquin Valley Region	5
S.4.4 Need for the HST System Statewide and within the Central San Joaquin Valley Region	6
S.5 Alternatives	7
S.5.1 No Project Alternative	7
S.5.2 Merced to Fresno Section High-Speed Train Alternatives	7
S.5.3 Station Area Development	8
S.5.4 Heavy Maintenance Facility.....	9
S.6 Measures to Avoid and Minimize Impacts	10
S.7 No Project Alternative Impacts.....	10
S.8 HST Alternatives Evaluation	12
S.8.1 HST Benefits.....	14
S.8.2 Adverse Effects Common to All HST Alternatives.....	14
S.8.3 Comparison of HST Alternatives.....	18
S.8.4 Capital Cost	23
S.8.5 Section 4(f) Resources	25
S.8.6 Section 6(f) Resource	26
S.9 Areas of Controversy.....	26
S.10 Draft EIR/EIS Circulation and Review	26
S.10.1 Public and Agency Comment Summary.....	27
S.10.2 Identification of Preferred Alternative.....	28
S.11 Summary of Changes between the Draft and Final EIR/EIS	28
S.12 Next Steps in the Environmental Process	35
S.12.1 Federal Railroad Administration Decision-making	35
S.12.2 California High-Speed Rail Authority Decision-making.....	35
S.12.3 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Decision-making	36
S.12.4 Project Implementation	36

1.0 Project Purpose, Need, and Objectives	1-1
1.1 Introduction.....	1-1
1.2 Purpose of and Need for the HST System and the Merced to Fresno HST Section.....	1-3
1.2.1 Purpose of HST System	1-3
1.2.2 Purpose of the Merced to Fresno HST Section.....	1-4
1.2.3 CEQA Project Objectives for the HST System in California and in the Central Part of the San Joaquin Valley Region	1-4



1.2.4	Statewide and Regional Need for the HST System within the Merced to Fresno Section	1-5
1.3	Relationship to Other Agency Plans and Policies	1-22
1.4	Relationship to Other Transportation Projects and Plans in the Study Area	1-24
1.5	Tiering of Program EIR/EIS Documents	1-25
1.6	2012 Business Plan	1-28
2.0	Alternatives	2-1
2.1	Background	2-1
2.1.1	California HST Project Background	2-1
2.1.2	Merced to Fresno 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
2.2.4	Infrastructure Components.....	2-8
2.2.5	Grade Separations.....	2-9
2.2.6	Railroad Wye	2-11
2.2.7	Traction Power Distribution.....	2-13
2.2.8	Track Structure.....	2-15
2.2.9	Maintenance Facilities	2-15
2.3	Potential Alternatives Considered during Alternatives Screening Process.....	2-17
2.3.1	HST Project-Level Alternatives Development Process.....	2-18
2.3.2	Range of Potential Alternatives Considered and Findings	2-19
2.3.3	Summary of Design Features for Alternatives Being Carried Forward.....	2-24
2.4	Alignment, Station, and Heavy Maintenance Facility Alternatives Evaluated in this Project EIR/EIS.....	2-27
2.4.1	No Project Alternative—Existing and Planned Improvements.....	2-27
2.4.2	UPRR/SR 99 Alternative.....	2-42
2.4.3	BNSF Alternative	2-62
2.4.4	Hybrid Alternative (Preferred Alternative)	2-72
2.4.5	Modification of Caltrans/State Facilities.....	2-80
2.4.6	Proposed Heavy Maintenance Facility Locations	2-86
2.5	Travel Demand and Ridership Forecasts	2-93
2.5.1	Ridership and HST System Design.....	2-93
2.5.2	Ridership and Environmental Impact Analysis	2-94
2.5.3	Ridership and Station Area Parking	2-94
2.6	Operations and Service Plan	2-95
2.6.1	HST Service.....	2-95
2.6.2	Maintenance Activities	2-97
2.7	Additional High-Speed Train Development Considerations	2-98
2.7.1	High-Speed Train, Land Use Patterns, and Development around High-Speed Train Stations	2-98
2.8	Construction Plan.....	2-100
2.8.1	General Approach	2-101
2.8.2	Preconstruction Activities.....	2-103
2.8.3	Major Construction Activities.....	2-103
2.9	Permits.....	2-106
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 Off-Site Mitigation.....	3.1-8
3.2	Transportation	3.2-1
3.2.1	Introduction.....	3.2-1
3.2.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders.....	3.2-1
3.2.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.2-3
3.2.4	Affected Environment.....	3.2-9
3.2.5	Environmental Consequences	3.2-25
3.2.6	Project Design Features.....	3.2-128
3.2.7	Mitigation Measures	3.2-131
3.2.8	NEPA Impacts Summary	3.2-156
3.2.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.2-157
3.2.10	Potential Future Option for Improved Transportation Connectivity in Merced	3.2-161
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
3.3.3	Pollutants for Analysis	3.3-9
3.3.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.3-12
3.3.5	Affected Environment.....	3.3-29
3.3.6	Environmental Consequences	3.3-35
3.3.7	Compliance with Conformity Rules	3.3-73
3.3.8	Project Design Features.....	3.3-74
3.3.9	Mitigation Measures	3.3-75
3.3.10	NEPA Impacts Summary	3.3-78
3.3.11	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.3-78
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
3.4.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.4-2
3.4.4	Affected Environment.....	3.4-17
3.4.5	Environmental Consequences	3.4-28
3.4.6	Project Design Features.....	3.4-45
3.4.7	Mitigation Measures	3.4-45
3.4.8	NEPA Impacts Summary	3.4-60
3.4.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.4-61
3.5	Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference.....	3.5-1
3.5.1	Introduction.....	3.5-1
3.5.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders.....	3.5-2
3.5.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.5-3
3.5.4	Affected Environment.....	3.5-6
3.5.5	Environmental Consequences	3.5-12
3.5.6	Project Design Features.....	3.5-18
3.5.7	Mitigation Measures	3.5-18
3.5.8	NEPA Impacts Summary	3.5-19
3.5.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.5-20
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
3.6.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.6-6
3.6.4	Affected Environment.....	3.6-10
3.6.5	Environmental Consequences	3.6-22
3.6.6	Project Design Features.....	3.6-49
3.6.7	Mitigation Measures	3.6-49

3.6.8	NEPA Impacts Summary	3.6-49
3.6.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.6-52
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.....	3.7-2
3.7.2.1	Federal.....	3.7-3
3.7.2.2	State	3.7-4
3.7.2.3	Regional and Local	3.7-5
3.7.2.4	Habitat Conservation Plans in the Project Vicinity	3.7-5
3.7.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.7-5
3.7.3.1	Study Areas	3.7-5
3.7.3.2	Literature Review	3.7-6
3.7.3.3	Field Surveys	3.7-8
3.7.3.4	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.7-10
3.7.3.5	Methods for Evaluating Effects Under NEPA	3.7-11
3.7.3.6	CEQA Significance Criteria	3.7-11
3.7.4	Affected Environment.....	3.7-13
3.7.4.1	Regional Setting.....	3.7-13
3.7.4.2	Plant Communities and Land Cover Types	3.7-13
3.7.4.3	Native Fauna Assemblage.....	3.7-17
3.7.4.4	Special-Status Species.....	3.7-17
3.7.4.5	Habitats of Concern	3.7-23
3.7.4.6	Wildlife Movement Corridors	3.7-31
3.7.4.7	Plant Communities and Land Cover Types – By Alternative	3.7-34
3.7.4.8	Special-Status Species – By Alternative.....	3.7-37
3.7.4.9	Habitats of Concern – By Alternative	3.7-40
3.7.4.10	Wildlife Movement Corridors – By Alternative.....	3.7-44
3.7.5	Environmental Consequences	3.7-46
3.7.5.1	Overview	3.7-46
3.7.5.2	No Project Alternative	3.7-47
3.7.5.3	High-Speed Train Alternatives.....	3.7-48
3.7.6	Project Design Features.....	3.7-113
3.7.6.1	Project Design Options for the San Joaquin River	3.7-113
3.7.6.2	Project Design Features for Stormwater Management and Treatment	3.7-114
3.7.6.3	Project Design Features for Flood Protection.....	3.7-115
3.7.6.4	Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan	3.7-115
3.7.6.5	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Board, Order No. 5- 00-175, Waste Discharge Requirements General Order for Dewatering and Other Low Threat Discharges to Surface Waters	3.7-116
3.7.6.6	Maintain Pre-Project Hydrology	3.7-116
3.7.6.7	Industrial Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan	3.7-116
3.7.6.8	Air Quality Fugitive Dust Control	3.7-117
3.7.6.9	Wildlife-dedicated Crossings	3.7-117
3.7.7	Mitigation Measures	3.7-117
3.7.7.1	Mitigation Measures for Biological Resources	3.7-118
3.7.7.2	Construction-Period Mitigation Measures	3.7-123
3.7.7.3	Project Mitigation Measures	3.7-139
3.7.8	NEPA Impacts Summary	3.7-150
3.7.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.7-155
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

3.8.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.8-7
3.8.4	Affected Environment.....	3.8-9
3.8.5	Environmental Consequences	3.8-25
3.8.6	Project Design Features.....	3.8-38
3.8.7	NEPA Impacts Summary.....	3.8-41
3.8.8	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.8-41
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
3.9.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.9-6
3.9.4	Affected Environment.....	3.9-8
3.9.5	Environmental Consequences	3.9-22
3.9.6	Project Design Features.....	3.9-31
3.9.7	NEPA Impacts Summary.....	3.9-33
3.9.8	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.9-34
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
3.10.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.10-5
3.10.4	Affected Environment.....	3.10-7
3.10.5	Environmental Consequences	3.10-18
3.10.6	Project Design Features.....	3.10-27
3.10.7	Mitigation Measures	3.10-28
3.10.8	NEPA Impacts Summary.....	3.10-28
3.10.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.10-29
3.11	Safety and Security	3.11-1
3.11.1	Introduction.....	3.11-1
3.11.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders.....	3.11-3
3.11.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.11-6
3.11.4	Affected Environment.....	3.11-7
3.11.5	Environmental Consequences	3.11-20
3.11.6	Project Design Features.....	3.11-32
3.11.7	Mitigation Measures	3.11-33
3.11.8	NEPA Impacts Summary.....	3.11-36
3.11.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.11-38
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
3.12.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.12-3
3.12.4	Affected Environment.....	3.12-10
3.12.5	Environmental Consequences	3.12-32
3.12.6	Project Design Features.....	3.12-66
3.12.7	Mitigation Measures	3.12-67
3.12.8	NEPA Impacts Summary.....	3.12-69
3.12.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.12-72
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.....	3.13-1
3.13.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.13-7
3.13.4	Affected Environment.....	3.13-8
3.13.5	Environmental Consequences	3.13-15
3.13.6	Project Design Features.....	3.13-31
3.13.7	NEPA Impacts Summary.....	3.13-31
3.13.8	CEQA Significance Conclusion	3.13-32
3.14	Agricultural Lands	3.14-1

3.14.1	Introduction.....	3.14-1
3.14.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders.....	3.14-1
3.14.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.14-7
3.14.4	Affected Environment.....	3.14-9
3.14.5	Environmental Consequences	3.14-24
3.14.6	Project Design Features.....	3.14-40
3.14.7	Mitigation Measures	3.14-40
3.14.8	NEPA Impacts Summary	3.14-41
3.14.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.14-42
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
3.15.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.15-6
3.15.4	Affected Environment.....	3.15-7
3.15.5	Environmental Consequences	3.15-18
3.15.6	Mitigation Measures	3.15-46
3.15.7	NEPA Impacts Summary	3.15-48
3.15.8	CEQA Significance Conclusion	3.15-49
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
3.16.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.16-4
3.16.4	Affected Environment.....	3.16-8
3.16.5	Environmental Consequences	3.16-23
3.16.6	Project Design Features.....	3.16-58
3.16.7	Mitigation Measures	3.16-58
3.16.8	NEPA Impacts Summary	3.16-62
3.16.9	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.16-63
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
3.17.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.17-9
3.17.4	Affected Environment.....	3.17-28
3.17.5	Environmental Consequences	3.17-67
3.17.6	Section 106 Commitments and Mitigation Measures	3.17-84
3.17.7	NEPA Impact Summary	3.17-92
3.17.8	CEQA Significance Conclusions.....	3.17-93
3.18	Regional Growth	3.18-1
3.18.1	Introduction.....	3.18-1
3.18.2	Laws, Regulations, and Orders.....	3.18-1
3.18.3	Methods for Evaluating Impacts.....	3.18-7
3.18.4	Affected Environment.....	3.18-8
3.18.5	Environmental Consequences	3.18-15
3.18.6	Summary.....	3.18-26
3.19	Cumulative Impacts	3.19-1
3.19.1	Introduction.....	3.19-1
3.19.2	Cumulative Projects and Growth Forecasts	3.19-2
3.19.3	Analysis of Cumulative Impacts.....	3.19-5
4.0	Final Section 4(f)/6(f) Evaluation	4-1
4.1	Introduction.....	4-1
4.1.1	Section 4(f) Use Definition.....	4-3
4.2	Coordination	4-5
4.3	Purpose and Need.....	4-7
4.4	Alternatives	4-8

4.4.1	No Project Alternative	4-8
4.4.2	UPRR/SR 99 Alternative.....	4-8
4.4.3	BNSF Alternative	4-11
4.4.4	Hybrid Alternative	4-12
4.4.5	Heavy Maintenance Facility Alternatives	4-13
4.5	Section 4(f) Applicability Analysis	4-14
4.5.1	Parks, Recreation, and Open Space.....	4-14
4.5.2	Cultural Resources	4-30
4.6	Section 4(f) Use Assessment and Determination	4-35
4.6.1	Park/Recreation Resources	4-35
4.6.2	Cultural Resources	4-39
4.7	Section 4(f) de minimis Findings	4-42
4.8	Avoidance Alternatives	4-48
4.8.1	Individual Resource Avoidance Assessments.....	4-50
4.9	Measures to Minimize Harm.....	4-53
4.10	Section 4(f) Least Harm Analysis.....	4-53
4.11	Section 6(f)	4-58
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 Facilities	5-4
5.3	Operation and Maintenance Costs	5-5
5.3.1	Operating Speeds	5-6
5.3.2	Travel Times.....	5-8
5.3.3	Development of Operation and Maintenance Costs.....	5-8
5.3.4	Development of Operation and Maintenance Costs.....	5-8
6.0	CEQA/NEPA Decision Process and Other Considerations.....	6-1
6.1	Preferred Alternative	6-1
6.2	Environmentally Superior Alternative and Environmentally Preferable 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 Uses 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	6-4
7.0	Preferred Alternative and Stations.....	7-1
7.1	Introduction.....	7-1
7.2	Summary of Comments	7-2
7.2.1	California Legislators	7-3
7.2.2	Project Area Local Governments	7-3
7.2.3	Federal Agencies and Tribes	7-3
7.2.4	State Agencies.....	7-3
7.2.5	Regional and Other Public Agencies	7-4
7.2.6	Businesses.....	7-4
7.2.7	Organizations	7-4
7.3	Alternatives Considered	7-5
7.4	Alternatives Evaluation – North-South Alignment	7-7
7.4.1	Environmental Impacts.....	7-7
7.4.2	Capital Costs.....	7-13
7.4.3	Constructability Issues.....	7-13

7.4.4	Ridership and Revenue/Travel Times/Travel Conditions	7-14
7.5	Station Locations	7-14
7.6	Regulatory Considerations	7-17
7.7	Preferred Alternative	7-18
7.7.1	Preferred Alignment	7-20
7.7.2	Wye Option	7-20
7.7.3	Stations.....	7-20
7.7.4	Heavy Maintenance Facility.....	7-21
8.0	Public and Agency Involvement	8-1
8.1	Environmental Justice Outreach	8-1
8.2	Public and Agency Scoping	8-2
8.2.1	Notices of Preparation, Notices of Intent, and Public Information Materials	8-2
8.2.2	Scoping Meetings.....	8-2
8.2.3	Scoping Comments	8-3
8.3	Alternatives Analysis Process	8-3
8.3.1	Public Information Meetings and Materials during the Alternatives Analysis Process.....	8-5
8.3.2	Technical Working Group Meetings during the Alternatives Analysis Process	8-5
8.3.3	Environmental Resource Agency Meetings during the Alternatives Analysis Process.....	8-6
8.4	Development of the EIR/EIS	8-6
8.4.1	Public Information Materials and Meetings.....	8-6
8.4.2	Technical Working Group Meetings	8-6
8.4.3	Agency Meetings and Consultation	8-6
8.5	Notification and Circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS	8-8
8.6	Publication and Review of the Draft EIR/EIS	8-8
8.6.1	Public and Agency Information Meetings and Hearings.....	8-9
8.6.2	Comments on the Draft EIR/EIS.....	8-9
8.6.3	Responses to Common Comments	8-34
9.0	EIR/EIS Distribution.....	9-1
9.1	Repository Locations	9-1
9.2	Federal Agencies.....	9-2
9.3	State Agencies	9-3
9.4	Elected Officials	9-4
9.4.1	Federal Elected Officials	9-4
9.4.2	State Elected Officials.....	9-4
9.5	Regional/Local Agencies	9-6
9.6	Organizations and Businesses	9-7
9.7	Native American Contacts.....	9-8
10.0	List of Preparers	10-1
10.1	California High-Speed Rail Authority	10-1
10.2	List of Consultants	10-1
11.0	References/Sources Used in Document Preparation	11-1
	Summary.....	11-1
	Chapter 1.0 Project Purpose, Need, and Objectives	11-2
	Chapter 2.0 Alternatives	11-6
	Chapter 3.0 Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measure	11-9



3.1 Introduction to Chapter 3	11-9
3.2 Transportation	11-9
3.3 Air Quality and Global Climate Change.....	11-11
3.4 Noise and Vibration	11-15
3.5 Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference.....	11-16
3.6 Public Utilities and Energy	11-17
3.7 Biological Resources and Wetlands.....	11-22
3.8 Hydrology and Water Resources.....	11-27
3.9 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	11-30
3.10 Hazardous Materials/Wastes.....	11-32
3.11 Safety and Security.....	11-34
3.12 Socioeconomics, Communities, and Environmental Justice	11-39
3.13 Local Growth, Station Planning, and Land Use.....	11-42
3.14 Agricultural Lands.....	11-45
3.15 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space	11-47
3.16 Aesthetics and Visual Quality.....	11-48
3.17 Cultural and Paleontological Resources	11-50
3.18 Regional Growth.....	11-54
3.19 Cumulative Impacts.....	11-56
Chapter 4.0 Section 4(f)/6(f) Evaluation	11-59
Chapter 5.0 Project Costs and Operations.....	11-61
Chapter 6.0 CEQA/NEPA Decision Process and Other Considerations	11-61
Chapter 7.0 Preferred Alternative	11-61
Chapter 8.0 Public and Agency Involvement	11-61
12.0 Glossary of Terms	12-1
13.0 Index	13-1
14.0 Acronyms and Abbreviations	14-1

LIST OF TABLES

S-1	Design Features of Alternatives Carried Forward	S-13
S-2	Capital Cost of the HST Alternatives	S-24
S-3	Potential Uses of Section 4(f) Resources Differentiating Among HST Alternatives	S-25
S-4	Impacts That Differentiate Among North-South HST Alternatives and Design Options	S-37
S-5	Comparison of Potential Adverse Effects of HST Alternatives.....	S-49
S-6	HMF Alternative Differentiating Environmental Impacts	S-74
1-1	Jobs-to-Housing Ratio in the Merced to Fresno HST Section Region, 2010 and 2035.....	1-11
1-2	Increase in Total Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled	1-12
1-3	Travel Growth for Intercity Highways	1-13
1-4	2009 Intercity Air Travel	1-14
1-5	Commercial Air Traffic and Central Valley Airports.....	1-15
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
2-1	HST Performance Criteria	2-4
2-2	Design Features of Alternatives Carried Forward	2-26
2-3	Regional Projected Population and Employment.....	2-29
2-4	Planned Residential Development Plans within the Merced to Fresno Area as of October 2010.....	2-30
2-5	Increase in Total Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled	2-32
2-6	No Project Alternative – Planned Highway Improvements in Merced.....	2-35
2-7	No Project Alternative – Planned Highway Improvements in Madera	2-36
2-8	No Project Alternative – Planned Highway Improvements in Fresno	2-37
2-9	Passenger Boardings for Fresno and Merced Airports	2-39
2-10	Programmed Improvements in 2008 California State Rail Plan	2-40
2-11	Planning and Design Assumptions	2-55
2-12	Impact of HST Alternatives on Caltrans State Facilities	2-82
2-13	Merced to Fresno Section HMF Site Descriptions	2-86
2-14	HST System Ridership Forecasts	2-93
2-15	Construction Sequence.....	2-102

2-16	Potential Major Environmental Permits and Approvals	2-106
3.2-1	Regional and Local Plans and Policies	3.2-2
3.2-2	Roadway Segment Level of Service	3.2-4
3.2-3	Level of Service and Average Vehicular Delay Definitions for Signalized Intersections.....	3.2-4
3.2-4	Level of Service and Average Vehicular Delay Definitions for Unsignalized Intersections	3.2-5
3.2-5	Year 2035 Forecast Vehicle Trip Generation at HST Stations	3.2-7
3.2-6	Year 2035 Forecast Vehicle Trip Generation at Heavy Maintenance Facility Sites	3.2-7
3.2-7	Intersections Operating at LOS E or F near the Proposed Downtown Merced Station	3.2-17
3.2-8	Merced Bus Routes and Weekday Service Frequency.....	3.2-19
3.2-9	Intersections Operating at LOS E or F near the Proposed Downtown Fresno Station	3.2-24
3.2-10	Fresno Bus Routes and Weekday Service Frequency	3.2-24
3.2-11	Intersections Operating at LOS E or F around the Proposed HMF Locations under Existing Conditions	3.2-25
3.2-12	Vehicle Trip Reductions by SR 99 Screenline.....	3.2-37
3.2-13	Vehicle Miles Traveled	3.2-37
3.2-14	Existing Plus Project Roadway Segment Analysis – Between Herndon Avenue and Shaw Avenue	3.2-39
3.2-15	Future (2035) Plus Project Roadway Segment Analysis – Between Herndon Avenue and Shaw Avenue	3.2-39
3.2-16	Existing Plus Project Intersection Analysis – Between Herndon Avenue and Shaw Avenue.....	3.2-40
3.2-17	Future (2035) Plus Project Intersection Analysis – Between Herndon Avenue and Shaw Avenue	3.2-41
3.2-18	Existing Plus Project Roadway Segment Analysis – Between McKinley Avenue and SR 180.....	3.2-42
3.2-19	Future (2035) Plus Project Roadway Segment Analysis – Between McKinley Avenue and SR 180.....	3.2-43
3.2-20	Existing Plus Project Intersection Analysis – Between McKinley Avenue and SR 180	3.2-44
3.2-21	Future (2035) Plus Project Intersection Analysis – Between McKinley Avenue and SR 180.....	3.2-44
3.2-22	Existing Plus Project Intersection Analysis – SR 99 Relocation.....	3.2-52

3.2-23	Future Year (2035) plus Project Intersection Analysis - SR 99 Relocation.....	3.2-53
3.2-24	Existing Plus Project Roadway Segment Analysis – Downtown Merced Station – Parking Option A.....	3.2-55
3.2-25	Existing Plus Project Roadway Segment Analysis – Downtown Merced Station – Parking Option B.....	3.2-57
3.2-26	Future (2035) Plus Project Roadway Segment Analysis – Downtown Merced Station – Parking Option A.....	3.2-59
3.2-27	Future (2035) Plus Project Roadway Segment Analysis – Downtown Merced Station – Parking Option B.....	3.2-61
3.2-28	Existing Plus Project Intersection Operating Conditions Downtown Merced Station – Parking Option A	3.2-63
3.2-29	Existing Plus Project Intersection Operating Conditions Downtown Merced Station – Parking Option B	3.2-65
3.2-30	Future (2035) Plus Project Intersection Operating Conditions around Proposed Downtown Merced Station – Parking Option A.....	3.2-67
3.2-31	Future (2035) Plus Project Intersection Operating Conditions around Proposed Merced HST Station – Parking Option B	3.2-69
3.2-32	Existing Plus Project Roadway Segment Analysis around Downtown Fresno Station – Tulare Street Underpass Option	3.2-75
3.2-33	Existing Plus Project Roadway Segment Analysis around Downtown Fresno Station – Tulare Street Overpass Option	3.2-78
3.2-34	Future (2035) Plus Project Roadway Segment Analysis around Downtown Fresno Station – Tulare Street Underpass Option	3.2-81
3.2-35	Future (2035) Plus Project Roadway Segment Analysis around Downtown Fresno Station – Tulare Street Overpass Option	3.2-84
3.2-36	Existing Plus Project Intersection Operating Conditions around Proposed Fresno HST Station – Tulare Street Underpass Option	3.2-87
3.2-37	Existing Plus Project Intersection Operating Conditions around Proposed Fresno HST Station – Tulare Street Overpass Option	3.2-92
3.2-38	Future (2035) plus Project Intersection Operating Conditions around Proposed Fresno HST Station – Tulare Street Underpass Option	3.2-96
3.2-39	Future (2035) plus Project Intersection Operating Conditions around Proposed Fresno HST Station – Tulare Street Overpass Option	3.2-103
3.2-40	Existing plus Project Intersection Level of Service Summary near Proposed Castle Commerce HMF Site – Parking Option A.....	3.2-111
3.2-41	Existing plus Project Intersection Level of Service Summary near Proposed Castle Commerce HMF Site – Parking Option B.....	3.2-114
3.2-42	Future (2035) Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Summary near Proposed Castle Commerce HMF Site – Parking Option A.....	3.2-117



3.2-43	Future (2035) Intersection Level of Service Summary near Proposed Castle Commerce HMF Site – Parking Option B	3.2-120
3.2-44	Existing Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Summary near Proposed Harris-DeJager HMF Site.....	3.2-123
3.2-45	Future (2035) Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Summary near Proposed Harris-DeJager HMF Site.....	3.2-123
3.2-46	Existing Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Summary near Proposed Fagundes HMF Site	3.2-124
3.2-47	Future (2035) Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Summary near Proposed Fagundes HMF Site	3.2-124
3.2-48	Existing Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Summary near Proposed Gordon-Shaw HMF Site	3.2-125
3.2-49	Future (2035) Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Summary near Proposed Gordon-Shaw HMF Site	3.2-126
3.2-50	Existing Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Summary near Proposed Kojima Development HMF Site	3.2-127
3.2-51	Future (2035) Plus Project Intersection Level of Service Summary near Proposed Kojima Development HMF Site	3.2-127
3.2-52	Existing Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Between Herndon Avenue and Shaw Avenue.....	3.2-132
3.2-53	Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Between Herndon Avenue and Shaw Avenue.....	3.2-133
3.2-54	Existing Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Between McKinley Avenue and SR 180	3.2-134
3.2-55	Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Between McKinley Avenue and SR 180	3.2-135
3.2-56	Existing Plus Project Mitigation Measures – SR 99 Realignment.....	3.2-136
3.2-57	Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures – SR 99 Realignment.....	3.2-136
3.2-58	Existing Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Merced Station.....	3.2-138
3.2-59	Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Merced Station.....	3.2-139
3.2-60	Existing Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Fresno Station.....	3.2-141
3.2-61	Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Fresno Station.....	3.2-142
3.2-62	Existing Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Castle Commerce Center HMF	3.2-149
3.2-63	Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Castle Commerce Center HMF...	3.2-150
3.2-64	Existing Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Harris-DeJager HMF	3.2-153
3.2-65	Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Harris-DeJager HMF	3.2-153

3.2-66	Existing Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Fagundes HMF	3.2-154
3.2-67	Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Fagundes HMF	3.2-154
3.2-68	Existing Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Gordon-Shaw HMF	3.2-154
3.2-69	Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Gordon-Shaw HMF	3.2-155
3.2-70	Existing Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Kojima Development HMF	3.2-155
3.2-71	Future (2035) Plus Project Mitigation Measures – Kojima Development HMF.....	3.2-156
3.2-72	Summary of Significant Transportation Resource Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	3.2-158
3.3-1	State and Federal Ambient Air Quality Standards	3.3-3
3.3-2	General Conformity Thresholds	3.3-27
3.3-3	SJVAPCD CEQA Construction and Operational Thresholds of Significance.....	3.3-28
3.3-4	Ambient Criteria Pollutant Concentrations at Air Quality Monitoring Stations Closest to the Project.....	3.3-31
3.3-5	Federal and State Attainment Status	3.3-33
3.3-6	Planning Documents Relevant to Project’s Study Area	3.3-34
3.3-7	UPRR/SR 99 Alternative Programmatic Construction Emissions for Years 2013–2022 (tons/year).....	3.3-37
3.3-8	BNSF Alternative Programmatic Construction Emissions for Years 2013–2022 (tons/year)	3.3-39
3.3-9	Hybrid Alternative Programmatic Construction Emissions for Years 2013–2022 (tons/year)	3.3-40
3.3-10	HST Alternatives CO ₂ e Construction Emissions (metric tons per year).....	3.3-43
3.3-11	Summary of Estimated 2035 Statewide Emission Burden Changes Project vs. No Project 2035	3.3-46
3.3-12	Summary of Estimated 2009 Statewide Emission Burden Changes Existing plus Project Vs Existing Condition.....	3.3-46
3.3-13	Summary of Regional Changes in Operational Emissions Project vs. No Project 2035	3.3-47
3.3-14	Summary of Regional Changes in Operational Emissions Existing Plus Project vs. Existing Condition 2009	3.3-48
3.3-15	2035 Estimated Statewide GHG Emission Changes (Project vs. No Project) (MMT/year)	3.3-53
3.3-16	2009 Estimated Statewide GHG Emission Changes (Existing Plus Project vs. Existing Condition) (MMT/year).....	3.3-53
3.3-17	2035 On-Road Vehicles Regional GHG Emissions (Project vs. No Project)	3.3-54

3.3-18	2009 On-Road Vehicles Regional GHG Emissions (Existing Plus Project vs. Existing Condition)	3.3-54
3.3-19	2035 Project Alternatives Regional GHG Emissions (Project vs. No Project) (MMT/year)	3.3-55
3.3-20	2009 Project Alternatives Regional GHG Emissions (Existing Plus Project vs. Existing Condition) (MMT/year).....	3.3-56
3.3-21	Maximum Modeled CO Concentrations at Intersections near the Merced HST Stations and Castle Commerce Center HMF Site.....	3.3-59
3.3-22	Maximum Modeled CO Concentrations at Intersections near the Fresno HST Station and Herndon Avenue and Shaw Avenue.....	3.3-60
3.3-23	Maximum Modeled CO Concentrations at Intersections along SR 99 and Roeding Park Area	3.3-62
3.3-24	Maximum Modeled 2035 CO Concentrations at Merced HST Station Parking Structures.....	3.3-64
3.3-25	Maximum Modeled 2035 CO Concentrations at Fresno Station Parking Facilities.....	3.3-64
3.3-26	Maximum Modeled 2009 CO Concentrations at Intersections near the Merced HST Station and Castle Commerce Center HMF Site	3.3-67
3.3-27	Maximum Modeled 2009 CO Concentrations at Intersections near the Fresno HST Station and Herndon Ave and Shaw Ave.....	3.3-68
3.3-28	Maximum 2009 Modeled CO Concentrations at Intersections along SR 99.....	3.3-70
3.3-29	Summary of Significant Air Quality and Global Climate Change Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.3-79
3.4-1	FTA Construction Noise Assessment Criteria	3.4-5
3.4-2	Construction Vibration Damage Criteria	3.4-6
3.4-3	FRA Noise-Sensitive Land Uses	3.4-6
3.4-4	FHWA Traffic Noise Abatement Criteria	3.4-8
3.4-5	Interim Criteria for High-Speed Train Noise Effects on Animals	3.4-9
3.4-6	FRA Ground-Borne Vibration and Ground-Borne Noise Impact Criteria.....	3.4-10
3.4-7	FRA Ground-Borne Vibration and Ground-Borne Noise Impact Criteria for Special Buildings	3.4-10
3.4-8	Screening Distances for High-Speed Rail Speed Regime III.....	3.4-16
3.4-9	FRA Screening Distances for Vibration Assessment.....	3.4-17
3.4-10	Long-Term Existing Noise Measurement Locations	3.4-22
3.4-11	Short-Term Existing Noise Measurement Locations.....	3.4-24
3.4-12	Summary of Noise Impacts by Alternative from HST Operations and HMFs.....	3.4-29

3.4-13	Typical Equipment Noise for Rail Construction	3.4-31
3.4-14	Approximate Distances to Vibration Criterion-Level Contours	3.4-31
3.4-15	Potential Noise Impacts under the UPRR/SR 99 Alternative without Mitigation for Design Year 2035	3.4-37
3.4-16	Potential Noise Impacts under the BNSF Alternative without Mitigation for Design Year 2035.....	3.4-38
3.4-17	Potential Noise Impacts under the Hybrid Alternative without Mitigation for Design Year 2035.....	3.4-39
3.4-18	Potential Noise Impacts at the HMFs without Mitigation for Full Operations Year 2035.....	3.4-41
3.4-19	Screening Distances for Effects on Wildlife and Domestic Animals	3.4-42
3.4-20	Potential Vibration Impacts under the BNSF Alternative without Mitigation for Design Year 2035.....	3.4-43
3.4-21	Potential Noise Impacts at SR 99 Relocation without Mitigation for Full Operations Year 2035.....	3.4-45
3.4-22	Proposed UPRR/SR 99 Alternative Sound Barriers	3.4-53
3.4-23	Proposed BNSF Alternative Sound Barriers.....	3.4-53
3.4-24	Proposed Hybrid Alternative Sound Barriers	3.4-53
3.4-25	Proposed Castle Commerce Center Sound Barriers	3.4-53
3.4-26	Proposed SR 99 Relocation Sound Barriers	3.4-54
3.4-27	Total Severe Effects Remaining at Locations with and without Sound Barriers.....	3.4-54
3.4-28	Potential Vibration Mitigation Procedures and Descriptions	3.4-59
3.4-29	Summary of Significant Noise and Vibration Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.4-62
3.5-1	Summary Comparison of Measured and Calculated 60-Hz Magnetic Fields	3.5-11
3.5-2	Summary of HST EMF Modeling Results.....	3.5-14
3.5-3	Length Adjacent to Existing Rail Lines – HST Alternatives	3.5-17
3.5-4	Length Adjacent to Existing Rail Lines – HMF Alternatives.....	3.5-17
3.6-1	Local Plans and Policies	3.6-3
3.6-2	Construction-Related Energy Consumption Assumptions for the Merced to Fresno Section	3.6-8
3.6-3	Local Utility and Energy Providers	3.6-10
3.6-4	Existing and Projected Urban Water Demand Summary for the Merced to Fresno Section	3.6-12

3.6-5	Wastewater Treatment Plant Capacity Summary for Proposed HST Station and Maintenance Facility Locations in the Merced to Fresno Section	3.6-14
3.6-6	Landfill Facility Summary for the Merced to Fresno Section	3.6-17
3.6-7	Solid Waste Volumes and Diversion Summary for the Merced to Fresno Section.....	3.6-18
3.6-8	2009 Electricity Consumption in Merced, Madera, and Fresno Counties	3.6-20
3.6-9	Fuel Sources for Electric Power in California in 2005.....	3.6-20
3.6-10	2035 Estimated Change in Energy Consumption due to the HST System (50% to 83% Fare Scenario)	3.6-29
3.6-11	Construction Phase Water Consumption	3.6-30
3.6-12	UPRR/SR 99 Alternative Impacts – High-Risk Utilities	3.6-33
3.6-13	UPRR/SR 99 Alternative Impacts – Low-Risk Utilities	3.6-33
3.6-14	Utilities Potentially Affected by the BNSF Alternative – High-Risk Utilities	3.6-34
3.6-15	Utilities Potentially Affected by the BNSF Alternative – Low-Risk Utilities.....	3.6-35
3.6-16	Utilities Potentially Affected by Hybrid Alternative – High-Risk Utilities	3.6-37
3.6-17	Utilities Potentially Affected by Hybrid Alternative – Low-Risk Utilities.....	3.6-37
3.6-18	Utilities Potentially Affected by the HMF Alternatives – High-Risk Utilities.....	3.6-38
3.6-19	Utilities Potentially Affected by the HMF Alternatives – Low-Risk Utilities	3.6-39
3.6-20	Existing and Project-Related Water Consumption	3.6-40
3.6-21	Project-Related Wastewater Generated for the HST Stations.....	3.6-42
3.6-22	Project-Related Solid Waste Generated for the HST Stations.....	3.6-43
3.6-23	HST Energy Usage Calculations.....	3.6-45
3.6-24	On-Road Vehicle Energy Changes in the Merced to Fresno Region (50% to 83% Fare Scenario)	3.6-47
3.6-25	Aircraft Energy Changes Due to HST System (50% to 83% Fare Scenario)	3.6-47
3.6-26	Summary of Potentially Significant Utility Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.6-52
3.7-1	Federal Laws and Regulations.....	3.7-3
3.7-2	State Laws and Regulations	3.7-4
3.7-3	Special-Status Plant Species Reported to Occur in the Region	3.7-18
3.7-4	Special-Status Wildlife Species Reported to Occur in the Region.....	3.7-20
3.7-5	Terrestrial Communities Potentially Affected during the Construction Period of the UPRR/SR 99 Alternative (acres).....	3.7-51
3.7-6	Aquatic Communities Potentially Affected during the Construction Period of the UPRR/SR 99 Alternative (acres).....	3.7-52

3.7-7	Terrestrial Communities Potentially Affected during the Construction Period of the BNSF Alternative (acres)	3.7-53
3.7-8	Aquatic Communities Potentially Affected during the Construction Period of the BNSF Alternative (acres)	3.7-54
3.7-9	Terrestrial Communities Potentially Affected during the Construction Period of the Hybrid Alternative (acres)	3.7-56
3.7-10	Aquatic Communities Potentially Affected during the Construction Period of the Hybrid Alternative (acres)	3.7-57
3.7-11	Terrestrial Communities Potentially Affected during the Construction Period of the HMF Alternatives (acres)	3.7-58
3.7-12	Aquatic Communities Potentially Affected during the Construction Period of the HMF Alternatives (acres)	3.7-58
3.7-13	Special-Status Wildlife Species Potentially Affected during the Construction Period of the HMF Alternatives	3.7-70
3.7-14	Critical Habitat Potentially Affected during the Construction Period of the BNSF Alternative (acres)	3.7-73
3.7-15	Habitats of Concern Potentially Affected during the Construction Period of the HMF Alternatives	3.7-76
3.7-16	Wildlife Movement Corridors Potentially Affected during the Construction Period of the HMF Alternatives	3.7-78
3.7-17	Terrestrial Communities Potentially Affected (Direct/Indirect) during the Project Period of the UPRR/SR 99 Alternative (acres)	3.7-81
3.7-18	Aquatic Communities Potentially Affected (Direct/Indirect) during the Project Period of the UPRR/SR 99 Alternative (acres)	3.7-82
3.7-19	Terrestrial Communities Potentially Affected (Direct/Indirect) during the Project Period of the BNSF Alternative (acres)	3.7-83
3.7-20	Aquatic Communities Potentially Affected (Direct/Indirect) during the Project Period of the BNSF Alternative (acres)	3.7-84
3.7-21	Terrestrial Communities Potentially Affected (Direct/Indirect) during the Project Period of the Hybrid Alternative (acres)	3.7-86
3.7-22	Aquatic Communities Potentially Affected (Direct/Indirect) during the Project Period of the Hybrid Alternative (acres)	3.7-87
3.7-23	Terrestrial Communities Potentially Affected during the Project Period of the HMF Alternatives (acres)	3.7-88
3.7-24	Aquatic Communities Potentially Affected during the Project Period of the HMF Alternatives (acres)	3.7-89
3.7-25	Special-Status Wildlife Species Potentially Affected during the Project Period of the HMF Alternatives	3.7-100

3.7-26	Critical Habitat Potentially Affected during the Project Period of the BNSF Alternative (acres).....	3.7-104
3.7-27	Habitats of Concern Potentially Affected during the Project Period of the HMF Alternatives.....	3.7-106
3.7-28	Summary of Hydraulic Wildlife Crossings within ECA and Modeled Wildlife Corridors by Alternative.....	3.7-111
3.7-29	Wildlife Movement Corridors Potentially Affected during the Project Period of the HMF Alternatives.....	3.7-113
3.7-30	Summary of Significant Biological Resource Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	3.7-156
3.8-1	Local Policies and Plans.....	3.8-5
3.8-2	Beneficial Uses of Surface Water in the Project Vicinity.....	3.8-12
3.8-3	Section 303(d) List of Impaired Waters in the Project Vicinity	3.8-12
3.8-4	Natural Water Body Crossings.....	3.8-19
3.8-5	FEMA Special Flood Hazard Zone Designations in the Study Area	3.8-23
3.8-6	HST Alternatives Water Body Crossings	3.8-27
3.8-7	Acres Disturbed During Construction by HST Alternatives	3.8-29
3.8-8	HST Alternatives Area in the Special Flood Hazard Area (acres)	3.8-37
3.9-1	Local Plans and Policies	3.9-4
3.9-2	Summary of Mapped Surficial Geologic Units	3.9-11
3.9-3	Predominant Geologic Formation Subunits between City of Merced and the City of Fresno	3.9-12
3.9-4	Summary of General Groundwater Locations	3.9-13
3.9-5	Summary of Soil Associations.....	3.9-15
3.9-6	Predominant Soil Associations between City of Merced and the City of Fresno	3.9-16
3.10-1	Local Plans and Policies	3.10-4
3.10-2	Landfills with 0.25 Mile of the Study Area	3.10-9
3.10-3	Range of Potentially Affected PEC Sites and Nearby Schools	3.10-19
3.10-4	PEC Sites Potentially Affected by UPRR/SR 99 Alternative and Nearby Schools.....	3.10-22
3.10-5	PEC Sites Potentially Affected by BNSF Alternative and Nearby Schools	3.10-23
3.10-6	PEC Sites Potentially Affected by the Hybrid Alternative and Nearby Schools.....	3.10-24
3.10-7	Summary of Significant Hazardous Materials and Wastes Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.10-30
3.11-1	General Plans and Other Plans Considered.....	3.11-5

3.11-2	Airport Plans Considered	3.11-6
3.11-3	Fire Departments and Equipment.....	3.11-8
3.11-4	Fire, Law Enforcement, and Emergency Medical Service Locations, by HMF Site....	3.11-15
3.11-5	Airports, Airstrips, and Heliports within 2 Miles of Alternative Alignment Construction Footprints	3.11-17
3.11-6	Schools within Approximately 0.25 Mile of Alternative Alignment Construction Footprints.....	3.11-18
3.11-7	Summary of Significant Safety and Security Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.11-37
3.12-1	Public Involvement Activities and Outreach to Minority and Low-Income Populations.....	3.12-8
3.12-2	Regional Existing and Projected Populations	3.12-10
3.12-3	Household Income and Poverty Status	3.12-11
3.12-4	County Housing Characteristics	3.12-14
3.12-5	Facilities within Study Area	3.12-17
3.12-6	Communities Affected, by Alternative	3.12-18
3.12-7	Minority and Low-income Population	3.12-27
3.12-8	Elementary Schools – Percent of Minority Students and Percent of Students Receiving Free or Reduced-Price Lunch in 2008–2009	3.12-28
3.12-9	Annual Local Project Expenditures and Sales Tax Revenues during Construction ...	3.12-39
3.12-10	Contribution of Sales Tax Revenues during Construction	3.12-40
3.12-11	Resource Impacts Potentially Affecting Community Character and Cohesion– Impacts Common to All Alternatives.....	3.12-43
3.12-12	Potential Impacts on Community Cohesion, Neighborhoods, and Community Resources during Operation – Proposed HMF Sites.....	3.12-48
3.12-13	Range of Residential and Business Displacements	3.12-50
3.12-14	Annual Sales Tax Revenues during Operation	3.12-54
3.12-15	Contribution of Sales Tax Revenues during Operation	3.12-54
3.12-16	Property Tax Revenues during Operation.....	3.12-55
3.12-17	Impacts Common to All Alternatives on Communities of Concern	3.12-60
3.12-18	Summary of Significant Physical Changes to Communities and Mitigation Measures.....	3.12-72
3.13-1	Permanent Land Use Impacts by Alternative (acres).....	3.13-18
3.13-2	Permanent Land Impacts by Potential HMF Site (acres).....	3.13-20

3.13-3	Percentage of Existing Land Uses and Current Zoning Opportunities within the HST Station Study Areas.....	3.13-23
3.14-1	Regional and Local Plans and Policies.....	3.14-3
3.14-2	Important Farmland and Grazing Land in Merced, Madera, and Fresno Counties...	3.14-11
3.14-3	Farmland Conversions in Merced, Madera, and Fresno Counties 2000–2008	3.14-20
3.14-4	Protected Farmland in Merced, Madera, and Fresno Counties	3.14-21
3.14-5	Important Farmland Potentially Affected by Each HST Alternative	3.14-25
3.14-6	Protected Farmland Potentially Affected by HST Alternatives.....	3.14-25
3.14-7	Important Farmland Temporarily Used for Project Construction	3.14-27
3.14-8	Farmland Types Potentially Affected by the UPRR/SR 99 Alternative	3.14-30
3.14-9	Farmland Types Potentially Affected by the BNSF Alternative.....	3.14-31
3.14-10	Farmland Types Potentially Affected by the Hybrid Alternative	3.14-32
3.14-11	Farmland Types Potentially Affected by the HMF Alternatives.....	3.14-33
3.14-12	Protected Farmland Potentially Affected under the UPRR/SR 99 Alternative	3.14-35
3.14-13	Protected Farmland Potentially Affected by the BNSF Alternative.....	3.14-36
3.14-14	Protected Farmland Potentially Affected by the Hybrid Alternative.....	3.14-36
3.14-15	Protected Farmland Potentially Affected by the Heavy Maintenance Facility	3.14-37
3.14-16	Summary of Significant Agricultural Land Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.14-43
3.15-1	Local Jurisdiction Plans and Policies.....	3.15-5
3.15-2	Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Resources within the HST Alternatives Study Area	3.15-12
3.15-3	Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Resources within Castle Commerce Center HMF Study Area	3.15-15
3.15-4	Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Resources in the Downtown Merced Station Study Area – Common to all HST Alternatives	3.15-16
3.15-5	Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Resources in the Downtown Fresno Station Study Area – Common to all HST Alternatives	3.15-17
3.15-6	Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Resources Permanent Acquisition Acreage	3.15-38
3.15-7	Examples of Adverse Effects Provided in 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)	3.15-43
3.15-8	Summary of Significant Parks, Recreation and Open Space Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.15-49
3.16-1	Local Plans and Policies	3.16-2
3.16-2	Characteristics of Typical HST Components	3.16-25

3.16-3	Generalized Summary of Aesthetics and Visual Resources Impacts on KVPs under NEPA and CEQA by HST Alternative	3.16-27
3.16-4	Summary of Visual Quality Changes and Impacts at Key Viewpoints.....	3.16-31
3.16-5	Summary of Significant Aesthetics and Visual Resources Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	3.16-64
3.17-1	Regional and Local Cultural Resource Plans and Ordinances	3.17-6
3.17-2	Coordination with SHPO and ACHP	3.17-16
3.17-3	Native American Tribes Invited to Participate.....	3.17-18
3.17-4	Tribal Contacts and Consultation	3.17-19
3.17-5	Prehistoric Cultural Periods	3.17-29
3.17-6	Archaeological Resources and Sensitive Areas within or Adjacent to the APE	3.17-32
3.17-7	Significant Historic Architectural Resources by Alternative.....	3.17-43
3.17-8	Paleontological Sensitivity Ratings Employed for This Analysis	3.17-62
3.17-9	Relative Paleontological Sensitivity of Geologic Units Potentially Affected by the Merced to Fresno Section HST Alternatives and Components	3.17-64
3.17-10	Section 106 Effects and CEQA Changes on Historic Architectural Resources by Component of the HST Project.....	3.17-70
3.17-10	Summary of Significant Cultural and Paleontological Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	3.17-93
3.18-1	Population Growth, 2000 – 2010	3.18-10
3.18-2	Population Projections, 2010 - 2035	3.18-10
3.18-3	Merced, Madera, and Fresno County Employment by Industry	3.18-12
3.18-4	Employment Projections, 2010 and 2035	3.18-13
3.18-5	Labor Force Characteristics – Merced, Madera, Fresno Counties.....	3.18-13
3.18-6	Labor Force Characteristics – Cities of Merced, Chowchilla, Madera, and Fresno ...	3.18-14
3.18-7	Existing Housing Units and Projected Housing Unit Demand	3.18-14
3.18-8	HST Alternative Costs (2010 \$M)	3.18-17
3.18-9	UPRR/SR 99 Alternative Employment Impacts during Construction.....	3.18-17
3.18-10	BNSF Alternative Employment Impacts during Construction	3.18-18
3.18-11	Hybrid Alternative Employment Impacts during Construction	3.18-18
3.18-12	Merced-Fresno Section Stations and HMF Costs (2010\$).....	3.18-19
3.18-13	Employment Impacts during Construction of the Merced and Fresno Stations	3.18-19
3.18-14	Employment Impacts during Construction of the HMF – Castle Commerce Center .	3.18-20

3.18-15	Employment Impacts during Construction of the HMF – Generic	3.18-20
3.18-16	Regional Projected and Induced Population and Employment	3.18-21
4-1	Section 4(f) and 6(f) Evaluation Consultation Summary	4-6
4-2	Park and Recreation Areas Evaluated for Section 4(f) Use	4-19
4-3	Properties Listed in, or Determined Eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places	4-30
4-4	Summary of Section 4(f) Uses of NRHP-Listed or Eligible Properties	4-42
4-5	Measures to Minimize Harm	4-43
4-6	Least Harm Analysis	4-54
5-1	Capital Cost of the HST Alternatives (2010 \$Thousands)	5-3
5-2	Costs for Heavy Maintenance Facility Alternatives (2010 \$Thousands)	5-4
5-3	Optimal Express Travel Times from Merced to Fresno and Other Cities (hours:minutes)	5-7
5-4	Annual Phase Full System O&M Cost, Year 2035 (2010 \$Millions)	5-8
5-5	Annual 2035 O&M Costs Apportioned to the Merced to Fresno Section (2010 \$Millions)	5-9
7-1	Natural Resources Impacts in the Merced to Fresno Section	7-8
7-2	Community Resource Impacts in the Merced to Fresno Section	7-10
8-1	Public and Agency Meetings	8-35

LIST OF FIGURES

S-1	California HST System Initial Study Corridors	S-2
S-2	Merced to Fresno Section Alternatives and Design Options	S-3
S-3	Overview of SR 152 Wye	S-8
S-4	Overview of UPRR/SR 99 Alternative and Design Options	S-19
S-5	Overview of BNSF Alternative and Design Options.....	S-20
S-6	Overview of the Hybrid Alternative.....	S-21
1-1	HST System in California	1-2
1-2	Merced to Fresno HST Project Corridor.....	1-6
1-3	Existing and Future California Population (in millions).....	1-7
1-4	Intercity Trips (in millions).....	1-9
1-5	Major Intercity Travel Routes and Airports.....	1-10
1-6	Preferred Alignments and Stations – State of California	1-27
1-7	Preferred Alignments and Stations – Northern California.....	1-28
1-8	Preferred Alignments and Stations – Southern California	1-29
2-1	California HST System Initial Study Corridors	2-2
2-2	Examples of Japanese Shinkansen High-Speed Trains	2-5
2-3	Example of an At-grade Profile Showing Catenary Wire System and Vertical Arms of the Pantograph Power Pickups.....	2-5
2-4	Examples of Existing Stations	2-7
2-5a and b	Simulated and Plan Views of a Functional Station and Its Various Components	2-7
2-6	At-grade Typical Cross Section.....	2-8
2-7a	Retained Fill Typical Cross Section	2-9
2-7b	Retained Cut Typical Cross Section.....	2-9
2-8	Elevated Structure Typical Cross Sections	2-9
2-9	Straddle Bent Typical Cross Section.....	2-10
2-10a	Replacing Local At-Grade Crossings with New Overcrossings above HST Guideway and Existing Railroad Trackway.....	2-10
2-10b	Adding Local Roadway Overcrossings above HST Guideway.....	2-10
2-11	Typical Cross Section of Roadway Grade-Separated Beneath HST Guideway.....	2-11
2-12	Diagram of a Wye Formation	2-12

2-13	Photograph Showing Leg of Wye Crossing over Another HST Track.....	2-12
2-14	Elevated Four-track Segment at Wye Turnouts	2-13
2-15	Traction Power Substation	2-14
2-16	Switching Station	2-14
2-17	Paralleling Station	2-14
2-18	Typical HMF Layout.....	2-16
2-19	Potential Alternatives Considered During Screening	2-20
2-20	SR 152 Wye Connection	2-23
2-21	HST Alternatives and HMF Sites Carried Forward for Further Study	2-25
2-22	HST Alternatives and Project Vicinities.....	2-28
2-23	Existing Intercity Transportation Network	2-33
2-24	No Project Alternative Planned Improvements in Merced	2-34
2-25	No Project Alternative Planned Improvements in Madera	2-34
2-26	No Project Alternative Planned Improvements in Fresno	2-35
2-27a	UPRR/SR 99 Alternative with West Chowchilla Design Option and Ave 24 Wye.....	2-42
2-27b	UPRR/SR 99 Alternative with East Chowchilla Design Option and Ave 24 Wye.....	2-43
2-27c	UPRR/SR 99 Alternative with East Chowchilla Design Option and Ave 21 Wye.....	2-43
2-28	UPRR/SR 99 Alternative Requirements	2-44
2-29	UPRR/SR 99 Alternative – UPRR Right-of-way Cross Section Configurations.....	2-45
2-30	UPRR/SR 99 Alternative in the Merced Project Vicinity	2-47
2-31	UPRR/SR 99 Alternative in the Chowchilla Vicinity	2-48
2-32	UPRR/SR 99 Alternative in the Madera Vicinity	2-50
2-33	UPRR/SR 99 Alternative in the Fresno Project Vicinity.....	2-51
2-34a	Golden State Boulevard Realignment.....	2-52
2-34b	SR 99 Realignment.....	2-52
2-35	Typical Cross Section of SR 99 Realignment.....	2-53
2-36a and b	Ave 24 Wye and Chowchilla Design Options.....	2-54
2-37	Ave 21 Wye	2-54

2-38a and b	Artist's Rendering and Cross Section of Functional Station Structure in Merced	2-56
2-39	Downtown Merced Station Location	2-57
2-40	Conceptual Design of Mariposa Street Station (left) and Kern Street Station (right) Alternatives for Downtown Fresno.....	2-58
2-41	Downtown Fresno Station – Mariposa Street Station Alternative.....	2-59
2-42a	South Facing Aerial View of Existing Southern Pacific Railroad Depot Property	2-61
2-42b	South Facing Aerial View of Existing Southern Pacific Railroad Depot Property and Proposed Mariposa Street Station Alternative Area	2-61
2-43	Downtown Fresno Station – Kern Street Station Alternative	2-62
2-44a	BNSF Alternative with Mission Ave and Le Grand Design Option and Ave 24 Wye.....	2-63
2-44b	BNSF Alternative with Mission Ave and East of Le Grand Design Option and Ave 24 Wye	2-63
2-44c	BNSF Alternative with Mariposa Way and Le Grand Design Option and Ave 24.....	2-63
2-44d	BNSF Alternative with Mariposa Way and East of Le Grand Design Option and Ave 24 Wye	2-63
2-44e	BNSF Alternative with Mission Ave and Le Grand Design Option and Ave 21 Wye.....	2-64
2-44f	BNSF Alternative with Mission Ave and East of Le Grand Design Option and Ave 21 Wye	2-64
2-44g	BNSF Alternative with Mariposa Way and Le Grand Design Option and Ave 21 Wye ...	2-64
2-44h	BNSF Alternative with Mariposa Way and East of Le Grand Design Option and Ave 21 Wye	2-64
2-45	BNSF Alternative without Shared Right-of-Way	2-65
2-46	BNSF Alternative Showing Opportunity for Shared Right-of-Way	2-66
2-47	BNSF Alternative in the Merced Project Vicinity	2-68
2-48	Mission Ave and Mariposa Way Design Options in the Merced Project Vicinity	2-69
2-49	BNSF Alternative in the Merced Project Vicinity	2-70
2-50	BNSF Alternative in the Madera Vicinity	2-71
2-51	BNSF Alternative in the Fresno Project Vicinity	2-73
2-52a	Hybrid Alternative with Ave 24 Wye	2-74
2-52b	Hybrid Alternative with Ave 21 Wye	2-74
2-53	Hybrid Alternative in the Merced Project Vicinity	2-75
2-54	Hybrid Alternative in the Chowchilla Vicinity.....	2-77

2-55	Hybrid Alternative in the Madera Vicinity	2-78
2-56	Hybrid Alternative in the Fresno Project Vicinity	2-79
2-57	Location of State Facilities Affected by HST Alternatives	2-81
2-58	Example of Lengthening an Overcrossing on a Divided Highway	2-84
2-59	Overcrossing Replacement.....	2-84
2-60	Interchange and Road System Replacement.....	2-85
2-61	Frontage Road and Highway Access Modification	2-85
2-62	Locations of Proposed Heavy Maintenance Facility Sites	2-88
2-63	Proposed Castle Commerce Center HMF Site	2-89
2-64	Proposed Harris-DeJager HMF Site	2-91
2-65	Proposed Fagundes HMF Site.....	2-91
2-66	Proposed Gordon-Shaw HMF Site.....	2-92
2-67	Proposed Kojima Development HMF Site	2-92
2-68	Revenue Service and Ridership Build-Up.....	2-96
3.1-1	Shifts of Roadways and Other Infrastructure	3.1-5
3.1-2	Parcel Affected Beyond Project Right-of-Way	3.1-5
3.2-1	Regionally Significant Roadways in the Merced Project Vicinity.....	3.2-11
3.2-2	Regionally Significant Roadways in the Chowchilla Project Vicinity.....	3.2-12
3.2-3	Regionally Significant Roadways in the Madera Project Vicinity	3.2-13
3.2-4	Regionally Significant Roadways in the Fresno Project Vicinity	3.2-14
3.2-5	Roadway Classifications in Downtown Merced.....	3.2-16
3.2-6	Study Intersections in Downtown Merced	3.2-18
3.2-7	Roadway Classifications in Downtown Fresno	3.2-22
3.2-8	Study Intersections in Northern Portion of Downtown Fresno.....	3.2-22
3.2-9	Study Intersections in Southern Portion of Downtown Fresno	3.2-23
3.2-10	Proposed SR 99 Realignment.....	3.2-50
3.2-11	Future (2035) Project Intersection LOS with Proposed Downtown Merced Station – Parking Option A.....	3.2-71
3.2-12	Future (2035) Project Intersection LOS with Proposed Downtown Merced Station – Parking Option B	3.2-72
3.2-13	Future (2035) Project Intersection LOS with Proposed Fresno Station – North Portion of Downtown (Tulare Street Underpass Option)	3.2-101

3.2-14	Future (2035) Project Intersection LOS with Proposed Fresno Station – South Portion of Downtown (Tulare Street Underpass Option)	3.2-101
3.2-15	Future (2035) Project Intersection LOS with Proposed Fresno Station – North Portion of Downtown (Tulare Street Overpass Option)	3.2-108
3.2-16	Future (2035) Project Intersection LOS with Proposed Fresno Station – South Portion of Downtown (Tulare Street Overpass Option)	3.2-109
3.3-1	San Joaquin Valley Air Basin	3.3-13
3.3-2	National MSAT Emission Trends (1999–2050) for Vehicles Operating on Roadways Using EPA’s Mobile6.2 Model	3.3-18
3.3-3	Air Quality Ambient Air Monitors	3.3-30
3.3-4	CO Hot-Spot Evaluation Intersections (Project vs. No Project 2035)	3.3-58
3.3-5	CO Hot-Spot Evaluation Intersections (Existing plus Project vs. Existing Conditions 2009)	3.3-66
3.4-1	Typical Maximum A-weighted Sound Pressure Levels	3.4-4
3.4-2	Typical Levels of Ground-Borne Vibration Source: FRA (2005)	3.4-4
3.4-3	FRA Noise Impact Criteria Source: FRA (2005)	3.4-7
3.4-4	FTA Detailed Ground-Borne Vibration Impact Criteria Source: FTA (2006)	3.4-11
3.4-5	Noise and Vibration Measurement Locations in the Merced Project Vicinity	3.4-18
3.4-6	Noise and Vibration Measurement Locations in the Chowchilla Project Vicinity	3.4-19
3.4-7	Noise and Vibration Measurement Locations in the Madera Project Vicinity	3.4-20
3.4-8	Noise and Vibration Measurement Locations in the Fresno Project Vicinity	3.4-21
3.4-9	Noise Impacts in the Merced Project Vicinity	3.4-33
3.4-10	Noise Impacts in the Chowchilla Project Vicinity	3.4-34
3.4-11	Noise Impacts in the Madera Project Vicinity	3.4-35
3.4-12	Noise Impacts in the Fresno Project Vicinity	3.4-36
3.4-13	Vibration Impacts in the Le Grand Project Vicinity	3.4-44
3.4-14	Potential Noise Mitigation Locations in the Merced Project Vicinity	3.4-48
3.4-15	Potential Noise Mitigation Locations in the Chowchilla Project Vicinity	3.4-49
3.4-16	Potential Noise Mitigation Locations in the Madera Project Vicinity	3.4-50
3.4-17	Potential Noise Mitigation Locations in the Fresno Project Vicinity	3.4-51
3.4-18	Examples of Sound Barriers for Rail Corridors (Photographs courtesy of Harris Miller Miller & Hanson Inc.)	3.4-52
3.4-19	Proposed Sound Barrier Locations in the Merced Project Vicinity	3.4-55

3.4-20	Proposed Sound Barrier Locations in the Chowchilla Project Vicinity	3.4-56
3.4-21	Proposed Sound Barrier Locations in the Madera Project Vicinity	3.4-57
3.4-22	Proposed Sound Barrier Locations in the Fresno Project Vicinity	3.4-58
3.5-1	EMF/EMI Measurement Locations in the Merced Project Vicinity	3.5-7
3.5-2	EMF/EMI Measurement Locations in the Chowchilla Project Vicinity	3.5-8
3.5-3	EMF/EMI Measurement Locations in the Madera Project Vicinity	3.5-9
3.5-4	EMF/EMI Measurement Locations in the Fresno Project Vicinity	3.5-10
3.6-1	California Energy Consumption by Sector, 2008	3.6-19
3.6-2	California Transportation Energy Consumption by Source, 2008	3.6-19
3.6-3	High-Risk Utilities Overview Map	3.6-23
3.6-4	High-Risk Utilities in the Merced Project Vicinity	3.6-24
3.6-5	High-Risk Utilities in the Chowchilla Project Vicinity	3.6-25
3.6-6	High-Risk Utilities in the Madera Project Vicinity	3.6-26
3.6-7	High-Risk Utilities in the Fresno Project Vicinity	3.6-27
3.6-8	Alternatives for Relocating an Existing Substation Affected by the Ave 21 Wye	3.6-50
3.7-1	Habitats of Concern	3.7-24
3.7-2	Habitats of Concern (Merced Area)	3.7-25
3.7-3	Habitats of Concern (Chowchilla Area)	3.7-26
3.7-4	Habitats of Concern (Madera Area)	3.7-27
3.7-5	Habitats of Concern (Fresno Area)	3.7-28
3.7-6	Wildlife Corridors	3.7-32
3.7-7	Threatened and Endangered Species Observed and Reported	3.7-38
3.8-1	Regional Hydrology	3.8-10
3.8-2	Water Resources in the Merced Project Vicinity	3.8-14
3.8-3	Water Resources in the Chowchilla Project Vicinity	3.8-15
3.8-4	Water Resources in the Madera Project Vicinity	3.8-16
3.8-5	Water Resources in the Fresno Project Vicinity	3.8-17
3.8-6	Groundwater Subbasins in the Project Vicinity	3.8-18
3.8-7	Flood Zones in the Project Vicinity	3.8-24
3.9-1	Location of Rock Quarries	3.9-3

3.9-2	Surficial Geology within the Study Area	3.9-10
3.9-3	Soil Associations within the Study Area.....	3.9-14
3.9-4	Active and Potentially Active Faults within about 65 miles of the HST Alternatives...	3.9-18
3.9-5	Historical Earthquakes and Magnitudes within 100 Miles of Project Area	3.9-20
3.10-1	Locations of Conceivable and Current PECs in the Merced Project Vicinity.....	3.10-12
3.10-2	Locations of Conceivable and Current PECs in the Chowchilla Project Vicinity.....	3.10-13
3.10-3	Locations of Conceivable and Current PECs in the Madera Project Vicinity	3.10-14
3.10-4	Locations of Conceivable and Current PECs in the Fresno Project Vicinity	3.10-15
3.11-1	Fatalities per 100 Million Passenger Miles in 2008	3.11-2
3.11-2	Total Passenger Fatalities in 2008	3.11-2
3.11-3	Safety and Security Existing Conditions in the Merced Project Vicinity	3.11-9
3.11-4	Safety and Security Existing Conditions in the Chowchilla Project Vicinity.....	3.11-10
3.11-5	Safety and Security Existing Conditions in the Madera Project Vicinity.....	3.11-11
3.11-6	Safety and Security Existing Conditions in the Fresno Project Vicinity	3.11-12
3.11-7	Derailment Wall and Parapet	3.11-26
3.11-8	HST Derailment	3.11-26
3.11-9	Alternate Mitigation Alignment to Avoid Safety Risk to Correctional Facilities.....	3.11-34
3.12-1	Communities in the Study Area	3.12-20
3.12-2	City of Fresno – Community and Specific Plan Areas	3.12-23
3.12-3	Merced Downtown Station – Areas with Zero Population	3.12-30
3.12-4	Fresno Downtown Station – Areas with Zero Population	3.12-31
3.13-1	Existing Land Uses in the Downtown Merced Station Study Area.....	3.13-10
3.13-2	Current Zoning in the Downtown Merced Station Study Area	3.13-11
3.13-3	Existing Land Uses in the Downtown Fresno Station Study Area.....	3.13-12
3.13-4	Current Zoning in the Downtown Fresno Station Study Area	3.13-13
3.14-1	Important Farmland and Grazing Land in the Merced Project Vicinity	3.14-12
3.14-2	Important Farmland and Grazing Land in the Chowchilla Project Vicinity	3.14-13
3.14-3	Important Farmland and Grazing Land in the Madera Project Vicinity	3.14-14
3.14-4	Important Farmland and Grazing Land in the Fresno Project Vicinity	3.14-15
3.14-5	Distribution of Crop Cover in the Merced Project Vicinity.....	3.14-16

3.14-6	Distribution of Crop Cover in the Chowchilla Project Vicinity.....	3.14-17
3.14-7	Distribution of Crop Cover in the Madera Project Vicinity	3.14-18
3.14-8	Distribution of Crop Cover in the Fresno Project Vicinity	3.14-19
3.14-9	Protected Lands in the Project Vicinity	3.14-22
3.15-1	Parks, Recreation, and Open Space in the Merced Project Vicinity	3.15-8
3.15-2	Parks, Recreation, and Open Space in the Chowchilla Project Vicinity	3.15-9
3.15-3	Parks, Recreation, and Open Space in the Madera Project Vicinity.....	3.15-10
3.15-4	Parks, Recreation, and Open Space in the Fresno Project Vicinity.....	3.15-11
3.15-5	Rotary Park, Sharon Avenue Linear Park, Riverside Park, and Vern McCullough Fresno River Trail, City of Madera	3.15-22
3.15-6	Fairmead Toddler Park, Madera County	3.15-23
3.15-7	Courthouse Park, City of Madera	3.15-24
3.15-8	County Road 27¾ Linear Park, City of Madera.....	3.15-25
3.15-9	Camp Pashayan and San Joaquin River Parkway, City of Fresno.....	3.15-26
3.15-10	Roeding Park, City of Fresno.....	3.15-27
3.15-11	Highway City Neighborhood Community Center, City of Fresno.....	3.15-28
3.15-12	Basin AH1 Dog Park, City of Fresno.....	3.15-29
3.15-13	Bob Hart Square and Courthouse Square Park, City of Merced	3.15-30
3.15-14	Chukchansi Park Stadium and Fresno County Plaza, City of Fresno.....	3.15-31
3.15-15	Stephen Gray Park, City of Merced	3.15-32
3.15-16	Le Grand Park, Merced County.....	3.15-33
3.15-17	Veterans Park, City of Atwater	3.15-34
3.15-18	Joe Stefani Elementary School, Merced County	3.15-35
3.15-19	KVP 16 Existing and Simulated Views	3.15-48
3.16-1	Landscape Units.....	3.16-12
3.16-2	Key Viewpoints in the Merced Station Area	3.16-13
3.16-3	Key Viewpoints in the Merced Project Vicinity	3.16-14
3.16-4	Key Viewpoints in the Chowchilla Project Vicinity	3.16-15
3.16-5	Key Viewpoints in the Madera Project Vicinity	3.16-16
3.16-6	Key Viewpoints in the Fresno Project Vicinity	3.16-17
3.16-7	KVP 4 Existing and Simulated View and Rendering	3.16-35

3.16-8 KVP 5 Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-35
3.16-9 KVP 6 Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-36
3.16-10 KVP 8 Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-37
3.16-11 KVP 9 Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-38
3.16-12 KVP 10 Existing View.....	3.16-39
3.16-13 KVP 11 Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-40
3.16-14 KVP 13 Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-41
3.16-15 KVP 15 Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-42
3.16-16A KVP 16 Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-43
3.16-16B KVP 16B Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-43
3.16-17 KVPs 18 and 19, Existing and Simulated Views	3.16-44
3.16-18 KVP 20 Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-46
3.16-19 KVP 24 Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-47
3.16-20 KVP 25 Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-48
3.16-21 KVP 26 Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-49
3.16-22 KVP 27 Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-50
3.16-23 KVP 28 Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-51
3.16-24 KVP 30 Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-52
3.16-25 Typical HMF Layout.....	3.16-53
3.16-26 KVP 2 Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-55
3.16-27 KVP 3 Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-56
3.16-28 KVP 4A Existing and Simulated Views.....	3.16-57
3.16-29 Example of Power Substation in Urban Setting, with Landscape Screening and Fence.....	3.16-62
3.17-1 Cultural Resources in the Merced Project Vicinity	3.17-39
3.17-2 Cultural Resources in the Chowchilla Project Vicinity	3.17-40
3.17-3 Cultural Resources in the Madera Project Vicinity	3.17-41
3.17-4 Cultural Resources in the Fresno Project Vicinity	3.17-42
3.17-5 Cultural Resources in the Western Portion of the Downtown Merced Station APE..	3.17-48
3.17-6 Cultural Resources in the Eastern Portion of the Downtown Merced HST Station APE.....	3.17-49

3.17-7	Cultural Resources in the APE – South of Merced	3.17-51
3.17-8	Cultural Resources in the APE – Chowchilla Vicinity	3.17-52
3.17-9	Cultural Resources in the APE – North of Fresno	3.17-53
3.17-10	Cultural Resources in APE – North of Downtown Fresno	3.17-55
3.17-11	Cultural Resources along the Downtown Fresno Station Alternatives and Alignment.....	3.17-57
3.17-12	Cultural Resources in the APE – Downtown Madera.....	3.17-61
4-1	Project Location Map.....	4-2
4-2	Park Properties in the Merced Project Vicinity	4-15
4-3	Park Properties in the Chowchilla Project Vicinity	4-16
4-4	Park Properties in the Madera Project Vicinity	4-17
4-5	Park Properties in the Fresno Project Vicinity	4-18
4-6	Rotary Park, Sharon Avenue Linear Park, Riverside Park, and Vern McCullough Fresno River Trail City of Madera	4-21
4-7	County Road 27¾ Linear Park, City of Madera.....	4-25
4-8	Camp Pashayan and San Joaquin River Parkway, City of Fresno.....	4-26
4-9	Roeding Park, City of Fresno.....	4-28
4-10	Joe Stefani Elementary School, Merced County	4-29
4-11	Camp Pashayan Avoidance Alternatives, City of Fresno	4-51
5-1	HST Speeds along the UPRR/SR 99, BNSF, and Hybrid Alternatives.....	5-6
7-1	HST Alternatives and HMF Sites Carried Forward for Further Study	7-6
7-2	SR 152 Wye Connection	7-7
7-3	Downtown Merced Station Location	7-15
7-4	Downtown Fresno Station – Preferred Mariposa Street Alternative	7-16
7-5	Downtown Fresno Station – Kern Street Alternative	7-17
7-6	Preferred Alternative – Hybrid.....	7-19