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April 6, 2018

Addressee (see distribution list)

RE: Response to Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report: High Speed Rail Station Area Plan “Making Downtown Bakersfield” by the City of Bakersfield (SCH #2016081071)

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Enclosed is a document titled Chapter 9, Response to Comments, for the above-referenced project. Section 15088 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines requires the Lead Agency to evaluate comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and prepare a written response addressing each comment. This document is Chapter 9 of the Final EIR.

A public hearing has been scheduled with the City of Bakersfield Planning Commission to consider this request on April 19, 2018, at 5:30 p.m., in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 1501 Truxtun Avenue, Bakersfield, California, 93301.

Thank you for your participation in the environmental process for this project. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Cecelia Griego, Principal Planner, at (661) 326-3733.

Sincerely,

Cecelia Griego, Principal Planner
Planning Division
Community Development Department

COMMENTING AGENCIES AND INTERESTED PERSONS: State Clearinghouse; Golden Empire Transit (GET); California Department of Transportation (Caltrans); Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources; San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District; California High Speed Rail Authority; Kern County Public Works Department; Adam Cohen; G. Peters; Francine Simmons; Vanessa Vangel; Darlene Vangel; Stephen Montgomery; John and Susan Karnes; Rhonda Pierce; Mike Ladd; Pamela Dougherty; Julie Riegel; William C. Descary; Kira Gravely; Troy Hightower, and; Jonathan Yates.
This page intentionally left blank.
Chapter 9
Response to Comments

SCH #2016081071

High Speed Rail Station Area Plan
“Making Downtown Bakersfield”
By the City of Bakersfield

City of Bakersfield
Community Development Department
Planning Division
Attn: Cecelia Griego, Principal Planner, or
Jacquelyn Kitchen, Community Development Director
1715 Chester Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301-2370
(661) 326-3733

April 2018
This page intentionally left blank.
Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations ..................................................................................................1
9.1 Introduction .....................................................................................................................2
9.1.1 Purpose .......................................................................................................................2
9.1.2 Environmental Review Process .............................................................................2
9.2 Revisions to the Draft EIR ..........................................................................................4
9.3 Response to Comments ...............................................................................................17

Tables

Table 48 Comments Received on the DEIR...........................................................................3

Attachments

Attachment A: Central District Area Map
Attachment B: City Agreement No. 15-189
Attachment C: Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan Transportation Impact Analysis;
Revised March 16, 2018
# Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAQA</td>
<td>Ambient Air Quality Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPM</td>
<td>diesel particulate matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARP</td>
<td>Hot Spots Analysis and Reporting Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRA</td>
<td>Health Risk Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>Indirect Source Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOP/IS</td>
<td>notice of preparation/initial study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO\textsubscript{x}</td>
<td>nitrogen oxides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project</td>
<td>State Route 99/Hosking Commercial Center Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>Reactive Organic Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTIF</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Impact Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>State Clearinghouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJVAPCD</td>
<td>San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>State Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>toxic air contaminant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERA</td>
<td>Voluntary Emission Reduction Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>volatile organic compound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.1 Introduction

9.1.1 Purpose

As defined by Section 15050 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the City of Bakersfield is serving as Lead Agency for preparation of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Making Downtown Bakersfield Project (project). The Final EIR presents the environmental information and analyses that have been prepared for the project, including comments received addressing the adequacy of the Draft EIR and responses to those comments. In addition to the responses to comments, clarifications, corrections, or minor revisions have been made to the Draft EIR. The Final EIR—which includes the responses to comments, the Draft EIR, and the Mitigation Monitoring Program—will be used by the Planning Commission, and ultimately the City Council, in the decision-making process for the project.

9.1.2 Environmental Review Process

The City of Bakersfield distributed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the EIR for a 30-day agency and public review period starting on August 29, 2016 and ending on September 27, 2016. In addition, the City held an EIR Scoping Meeting on September 22, 2016. The meeting, held from 4:00 PM to 5:00 PM, was aimed at providing information about the Project to members of public agencies, interested stakeholders and residents/community members. The meeting was held in the Bakersfield City Council Chamber at 1501 Truxtun Avenue, Bakersfield, CA. The City received letters from eight agencies and two individuals in response to the NOP during the public review period. The Draft EIR for the project was circulated for a 45-day public review period beginning on January 5, 2018, and ending on February 19, 2018. A total of 29 written comment letters were received on the Draft EIR, and public testimony was taken during the Draft EIR Hearing held by the Planning Commission on January 18, 2018.

Section 15088 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that the lead agency evaluate comments on environmental issues received from persons and agencies that reviewed the Draft EIR and prepare a written response addressing each of the comments received. The response to comments is contained in this Chapter 9 of the Draft EIR. A list of agencies, organizations, and interested parties who have commented on the Draft EIR is provided below. A copy of each numbered comment letter and a lettered response to each comment are provided in Section 9.3, Response to Comments, of this chapter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned Letter No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adam Cohen</td>
<td>1/18/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adam Cohen</td>
<td>2/10/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adam Cohen</td>
<td>2/13/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adam Cohen</td>
<td>2/14/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adam Cohen</td>
<td>2/16/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Adam Cohen</td>
<td>2/19/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>G. Peters</td>
<td>1/16/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Francine Simmons</td>
<td>1/17/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vanessa Vangel</td>
<td>1/18/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Darlene Vangel</td>
<td>1/18/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Stephen A. Montgomery</td>
<td>1/19/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>John and Susan Karnes</td>
<td>1/18/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rhonda Pierce</td>
<td>2/14/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mike Ladd</td>
<td>2/14/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Francine Simmons</td>
<td>2/16/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pamela Dougherty</td>
<td>2/17/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Julie Riegel</td>
<td>2/18/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bill Descary</td>
<td>2/19/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kira Gravely</td>
<td>2/19/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Troy Hightower</td>
<td>2/19/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Jonathan Yates</td>
<td>2/12/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Various at Planning Commission Hearing</td>
<td>1/18/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Emery Rendes</td>
<td>GET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Michael Navarro</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Michael Navarro</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Michael Toland</td>
<td>DOGGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Brian Clements</td>
<td>SJVAPCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Stuart Mori</td>
<td>HSR Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>State Clearinghouse</td>
<td>OPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Paul Candelaria</td>
<td>Kern County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2 Revisions to the Draft EIR

The following revisions were made to the text of the Making Downtown Bakersfield Draft EIR. Amended text is identified by page number. Clarifications and corrections to the Draft EIR text are shown with underlining and text removed from the Draft EIR is shown with strikethrough.

The project revisions fall within the scope of the original project analysis included in the Draft EIR and do not result in an increase in impacts or any new impacts. No new significant environmental impacts would result from the clarifications and corrections shown here. Therefore, no significant revisions have been made that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 (Recirculation of an EIR Prior to Certification).

The Lead Agency is of the opinion that no new significant environmental impacts would result from the clarified and revised proposed mitigation measures shown below.

**DEIR Page x, Acronyms and Abbreviations**

- RWQCB Regional Water Quality Control Board
- SARA Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
- SB Senate Bill
- SCS Sustainable Communities Strategy
- SHMA Seismic Hazards Mapping Act
- SHPO State Historic Preservation Office
- SJVAB San Joaquin Valley Air Basin
- SJVAPCD San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
- SLF Sacred Lands Files
- SO2 Sulfur Dioxide
- SR State Route
- SWPPP Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
- SWRCB State Water Resources Control Board
- TDM Transportation Demand Management
- TNC Transportation Network Company
- UNFCCC United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
- UPRR Union Pacific Railroad
- URBEMIS Urban Emissions Air Quality Model
- USACE United States Army Corps of Engineers
- USC United States Code
- USDA United States Department of Agriculture
DEIR Page 1. 1.2 Project Description

The Project is a Station Area Project that establishes a strategic vision for the future development of the areas surrounding the future HSR Station in Downtown Bakersfield. The Downtown visioning process included developing consensus about what future the community wants to produce an idealistic, seemingly intangible view of the future. In the process a tangible set of goals and strategies are developed which move today’s community toward the community vision. The community vision will have individual components that lend themselves to individual goals, for example, to better accommodate pedestrians and cyclists throughout the downtown. This component of the vision becomes a goal that is then further defined with a set of objectives and implementation strategies. Those strategies, when implemented, take additional steps like zone changes, design guidelines, specific plans, etc., that have land use density requirements with corresponding subsequent and/or tiered environmental analysis per CEQA.

The Project does not change any land use designation as determined by the General Plan or zoning in the project area; nor does the Project require changes to land use and/or zoning. However, it does guide what may be future land use actions to addresses key factors affecting future development within the Project area, including, but not limited to: land use patterns in the context of the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan, architecture and urban design, infrastructure, multi-modal transportation services and circulation, parking, pedestrian and bicycle access, open space and recreation, arts and culture, and other principal factors.

DEIR Page 6. Table 1, Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

MM AQ-1 Control Measures for Construction Emissions

Prior to the issuance of grading/building permits for individual projects, project proponents shall demonstrate to the City of Bakersfield that they have obtained all required permits from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD); and that all construction activities will continuously comply with applicable regulatory standards; including, but not limited to SJVAPCD Regulation VIII, Control Measures for Construction Emissions of PM\textsuperscript{10}. If it is determined that air quality impacts are found to be significant even after complying with District Rules 9510 and 9410, project proponents shall be directed to enter into a VERA or other equal and feasible mitigation prior to the start of the first project activity generating emissions.

DEIR Page 17. Table 1, Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Mitigation Measure T-1.3 Transportation Demand Management Plan

d. Work with Employers to develop programs to incentivize reduced parking and use of carpooling/public transit; such as:
   1. “Parking cash-out” program for employees to avoid use of on-site parking.
   2. “Guaranteed ride home” program in which employees who took transit or other alternative modes to work are offered a limited number of fully-subsidized taxi, rideshare, or Transportation Network Company (i.e. Uber or Lyft) rides home after hours.
DEIR Page 18. Table 1, Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

T-5 The Project would not Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bikeways, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. Rather, the focus of the Project in terms of transportation is to create an integrated, multi-modal transportation system to improve transit, walking, and bicycling modes as priorities. Increased infrastructure for transit, pedestrians, and bicycles would result from the Project improving circulation in the Project area, creating a benefit for commuters, bicyclists and pedestrians. Impacts to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure would be less than significant.

DEIR Page 20. Table 1, Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

U-2 The Project would result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project’s demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments. The Project would generate a new source of wastewater that would flow through the existing City of Bakersfield sewer system and Treatment Plant No. 2. Local conveyance infrastructure would be upgraded in accordance with the City of Bakersfield Sewer System Maintenance plan, and would not need to be upgraded as a result of buildout under the Project. However, existing wastewater treatment facilities must be expanded to accommodate the projected growth. The City of Bakersfield, as the wastewater treatment provider, would confirm that the wastewater treatment system has adequate capacity to serve the Project’s demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

U-3 The Project would be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project’s solid waste disposal needs.

DEIR Page 23. 2.1 Environmental Impact Report Background, Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adam Cohen, dated September 25, 2016</th>
<th>Issued raised in this letter include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Failure of the City to incorporate public comments from the Community workshop held on August 23rd, 2016;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Failure of the City to conduct station area and transit oriented development planning around the approved high-speed rail station at approximately Truxtun and U Streets (Hybrid Alternative);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Failure of the City to conduct station area and transit oriented development planning around the existing Amtrak station;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Failure of the City to adequately disclose the route and impact of relocating Amtrak to the vicinity of F Street and Golden State Avenue, as presented in Alternative C at the August 23rd workshop; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Failure to provide an adequate comment period after the public scoping meeting on September 22, 2016.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous, dated September 21, 2016</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.0, Project Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This EIR does not evaluate the specific impacts associated with the LGA scenario. The California High-Speed Rail Authority is addressing the LGA impacts within their Supplemental Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement. See responses below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adam Cohen, dated September 25, 2016</th>
<th>Staff reviewed all comments received during the NOP process and has taken those issues brought forth into consideration in the preparation of the EIR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Failure of the City to incorporate public comments from the Community workshop held on August 23rd, 2016;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Failure of the City to conduct station area and transit oriented development planning around the approved high-speed rail station at approximately Truxtun and U Streets (Hybrid Alternative);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Failure of the City to conduct station area and transit oriented development planning around the existing Amtrak station;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Failure of the City to adequately disclose the route and impact of relocating Amtrak to the vicinity of F Street and Golden State Avenue, as presented in Alternative C at the May 2016, the CHSRA Board approved the LGA as the preliminary preferred alignment. The City’s focus for the development strategy and projected growth pattern then turned toward potential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 23rd workshop; and failure to provide an adequate comment period after the public scoping meeting on September 22, 2016.

However, it is important to note that the Vision Plan was specifically crafted to also have independent utility and can to act as a guide for growth and revitalization of Downtown Bakersfield, regardless of station location or construction of HSR. Amtrak is not being relocated. The City followed CEQA guidelines in providing a 30-day comment period for the NOP as described in Section 2.1 on page 21.

**DEIR Page 31, Table 3. Project Phasing.**

South of 21st St., north of Truxtun Avenue, east of Chester Avenue, and west of Mill Creek Linear Park Q Street.

**DEIR Page 35, Table 3. Project Phasing.**

**Phase 1 (0-10 years)**

The first phase of the Project would be implemented over the first ten years after adoption. Initial activity during this phase would occur towards the southern end of the Project area, primarily south of 21st Street, north of Truxtun Avenue, east of Chester Avenue, and west of Q Street-Mill Creek Linear Park.
Figure 4  Project Phase I

0-10 Year Map:
365,000 SF Office; 1100 Residential Units; 150,233 SF Retail; 360 Hotel Rooms

Existing
| Study Area Boundary
| Rail
| Bike Lane
| Bike/Ped Trail
| Open Space (Park)
| School
| Hospital
| HSR Station Zone
| Transit Center
| Amtrak

Proposed
| Development Node/Cluster
| Reservoir Development Zone
| Complete Street
| Bus Rapid Transit
| Shuttle
| Bike Lane
| Bike Boulevard
| Protected Bike Lane
| Urban Boulevard
| Pedestrian Paseo
| Improved Intersections
Figure 5  Project Phase II
Figure 6  Project Phase III

20-30 Year Map

Δ220,000 SF Offices (2,005,000 SF); Δ4,390 Residential Units (2,837,000 SF); Δ492,970 SF Retail (2903,988 SF); Δ1,141 Hotel Rooms (2,413 Rooms)

Existing
- Study Area Boundary
- Rail
- Bike Lane
- Bike/Ped Trail
- Open Space (Park)
- School
- Hospital
- HSR Station Zone
- Transit Center
- Complete Streets
- Bus Rapid Transit
- Bike Boulevard
- Protected Bike Lane
- Urban Boulevard
- Pedestrian Paseo
- 10 Y- 20 Y Development Zone
- 20 Y Residential Infill
- 20 Y Rehabilitation

Proposed
- Development Node/Abatement
- Reside Development Zone
- Bike/Ped Trail
- Shuttle line
- Improved Intersections
- Stadium
- HSR Mobility Hub
- Amtrak Mobility Hub
DEIR Page 39. 3.4.2 Land Use and Development Standards

No specific land use and development standards are included in the Project. Therefore, the uses and permit requirements for projects that would be developed under the Project would be based on the existing zoning designations and associated standards established by the City of Bakersfield Zoning Ordinance (Municipal Code Title 17). Future changes in land use and/or zoning, that may be completed, such as a specific plan or a development project, may be necessary in order for the City to implement the Project as discussed in the Vision Plan for Downtown Bakersfield. Once certified, any project consistent with the Project and this program EIR can take advantage of more streamlined environmental review.

DEIR Page 54. Strengthen Downtown (0-10 Year Strategy)

The Strengthen Downtown strategy includes development of 365,000 square feet of office space, 1,100 residential units, 150,223 square feet of retail, and 360 hotel rooms south of 21st Street, north of Truxtun Avenue, east of Chester Avenue and west of Mill Creek Linear Park Q Street. Activity in this area would consist of mixed use entertainment infill activity, bisected in an east-west direction by a new pedestrian paseo. This phase would also see the conversion of Chester Avenue into a “complete street”, expansion of the existing bike lane along 21st Street, and bus rapid transit (BRT) along California Avenue. This activity would be concentrated primarily the immediate northwest of the existing Amtrak station and partial buildout of the Mill Creek Entertainment District at California Avenue and P/Q Streets.

DEIR Page 71. MM AQ-1 Control Measures for Construction Emissions

Prior to the issuance of grading/building permits for individual projects, project proponents shall demonstrate to the City of Bakersfield that they have obtained all required permits from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD); and that all construction activities will continuously comply with applicable regulatory standards; including, but not limited to SJVAPCD Regulation VIII, Control Measures for Construction Emissions of PM10. If it is determined that air quality impacts are found to be significant even after complying with District Rules 9510 and 9410, project proponents shall be directed to enter into a VERA or other equal and feasible mitigation prior to the start of the first project activity generating emissions.

DEIR Page 184. b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Phase I development would occur within 10 years of Project implementation. Development would occur primarily in the southern portion of downtown south of 21st St., north of Truxtun Avenue, east of Chester Avenue, and west of Mill Creek Linear Park Q Street. Development would include mixed use entertainment/infill areas, improvements to the existing bicycle network, and a complete street concept on Chester Avenue.
DEIR Page 244. Figure 24 Future Lane Configurations and traffic Control Devices (2035 with Project scenario and later)
Correct mitigation measures were listed within the text of the DEIR analysis within the noted section; however, the correct mitigation measures were listed in Table 1, Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures. Therefore, the edits shown below simply reflect the correction within the text of the DEIR and make no actual changes to the mitigation measures.

**MM T-1.1 Project-Level Analysis and Mitigation - Transportation Demand Management Plan**

Prior to the approval of Site Plan Review for projects that would generate more than 50 peak hour trips, the project proponent shall submit a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for review and approval by the City of Bakersfield Public Works Department. The TIS shall be prepared pursuant to the City's requirements and shall identify project-specific mitigation measures to reduce project-related impacts to a level that is consistent with City's adopted performance criteria and contained in the City of Bakersfield's General Plan (or other adopted mechanism).

Prior to completion of construction activities for the High Speed Rail Station Facility, the City of Bakersfield shall develop a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan for the Project area. The Plan may include a variety of strategies to ensure development of a cohesive and efficient multi-modal transportation network, both in and around the Station area. The Plan may include strategies such as:

A. Develop a comprehensive list of specific improvements to ensure connectivity of the “first/last-mile” access to the station. These may include, but are not limited to: bus bays, pick-up/drop-off areas, taxi/e-hailing stands, secured bicycle parking, dedicated parking for carshare/vanpools/electric vehicles near building entrances, EV charging stations, transit pass sales outlets, interactive travel kiosks, etc.

B. Introduction of carshare and bikeshare programs; including reserved parking spaces outside of the station for carshare/bikeshare vehicles, and subsidized membership in carshare programs

C. Identification of necessary improvements to area bus stops (e.g., seating and shelters) and pedestrian pathways (e.g., new or improved crosswalks)

D. Programs to incentivize reduced parking and use of carpooling/public transit; such as:

1. Public Transportation Operators
   a. Offer Federally authorized pre-tax deductions for transit passes, vanpools, and bicycle commuting costs
   b. Subsidized transit passes for employees in the Project area (note: Golden Empire Transit does not currently have an employer-based transit pass program, so the City would need to work with GET to create one)
   c. Implement an “Employer Pass Program” where operators offer bulk passes to employers at a discounted rate for employee use

2. Employers
   a. “Parking cash-out” program for employees to avoid use of on-site parking
b. “Guaranteed ride home” program in which employees who took transit or other alternative modes to work are offered a limited number of fully-subsidized taxi rides home after hours

c. Telecommuting program

d. Employer-sponsored vanpool or rideshare-matching program

e. On-site childcare programs, cafeterias and other measures to reduce driving trips

f. Shuttle service to the GET Transit Center and future high-speed rail station hub

**MM T-1.2 CIRCULATION CHANGES AND ADJUSTMENTS**

All construction activity within the project area shall continuously comply with the following: Construction activities within the public right-of-way shall require approval from the City of Bakersfield Public Works Department. Specific street improvements identified in this Vision Plan shall be subject to individual review and approval by the City, and shall be required to adhere to the City’s adopted performance criteria. Prior to completion of construction activities for the High Speed Rail Station Facility, the City of Bakersfield shall implement key improvement recommendations of the 2013 City of Bakersfield Bicycle Transportation Plan including but not limited to, Project level pro-rata contributions of funds toward bicycle transportation improvements identified in the City of Bakersfield Capital Improvement Program and/or Regional Transportation Facilities List.

**MM T-1.3 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT PLAN CIRCULATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS**

Prior to “Opening Day” of the High Speed Rail Station Facility, the City of Bakersfield shall develop a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan for the Project Area. The Plan may include a variety of strategies to ensure development of a cohesive and efficient multi-modal transportation network, both in and around the Station area. The Plan may include, but is not limited to, strategies to:

a. Incorporate improvements into future Capital Improvement Programs (CIPs), which facilitate transit-oriented development at and near the High-speed rail station. The improvements will enhance connectivity of the “first/last mile” access to the station; and may include, but are not limited to: bus bays, pick-up/drop-off areas, taxi/e-hailing stands, secured bicycle parking, dedicated parking for carshare/vanpools/electric vehicles near building entrances, EV charging stations, transit pass sales outlets, interactive travel kiosks, etc.

b. Introduce car-share and bike-share programs to the Project Area; including reserved parking spaces outside of the station for car-share and bike-share vehicles, and subsidized membership in car-share programs.

c. Work with Public Transportation Operators to develop programs to incentivize reduced parking and use of carpooling/public transit; such as:
   1. Identify necessary improvements to area bus stops (e.g., seating and shelters) and pedestrian pathways (e.g. new or improved crosswalks).
   2. Offer subsidized transit passes for employees in the Project area.
   3. Implement an “Employer Pass Program” where operators offer bulk passes to employers at a discounted rate for employee use.

d. Work with Employers to develop programs to incentivize reduced parking and use of carpooling/public transit; such as:
   1. “Parking cash-out” program for employees to avoid use of on-site parking.
2. “Guaranteed ride home” program in which employees who took transit or other alternative modes to work are offered a limited number of fully-subsidized rideshare, taxi rides, or Transportation Network Company (i.e. Uber, or Lyft) home after hours.

3. Telecommuting program.

4. Employer-sponsored vanpool or rideshare-matching program.

5. On-site childcare programs, cafeterias and other measures to reduce driving trips.

6. Shuttle service to the GET Transit Center and future high-speed rail station hub.

Individual projects proposed within the Project area shall complete project-specific traffic impact assessments utilizing the applicable traffic impact significance thresholds and procedures in place at the time of application. Individual projects shall implement the warranted transportation mitigation measures as prescribed from those assessment results as directed by the City of Bakersfield.

**T-1.4 Bicycle Transportation Plan Implementation**

Prior to “Opening Day” of the High Speed Rail Station Facility, the City of Bakersfield shall implement key improvement recommendations of the 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan; including but not limited to, project level pro-rata contributions of funds toward bicycle transportation improvements identified in the City of Bakersfield Capital Improvement Program.

**DEIR Page 262.**

**Impact T-5** THE PROJECT WOULD NOT CONFLICT WITH ADOPTED POLICIES, PLANS, OR PROGRAMS REGARDING PUBLIC TRANSIT, BIKEWAYS, OR PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES, OR OTHERWISE SUBSTANTIALLY DECREASE THE PERFORMANCE OR SAFETY OF SUCH FACILITIES. INCREASED INFRASTRUCTURE FOR TRANSIT, PEDESTRIAN, AND BICYCLE WOULD RESULT FROM THE PROJECT IMPROVING CIRCULATION IN THE PROJECT AREA, CREATING A BENEFIT FOR COMMUTERS, BICYCLISTS AND PEDESTRIANS. IMPACTS TO TRANSIT, BICYCLE, AND PEDESTRIAN INFRASTRUCTURE WOULD LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT.

**DEIR Page 281.**

**Impact U-2** THE PROJECT WOULD RESULT IN A DETERMINATION BY THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PROVIDER WHICH SERVES THE PROJECT THAT IT HAS ADEQUATE CAPACITY TO SERVE THE PROJECT’S DEMAND IN ADDITION TO THE PROVIDER’S EXISTING COMMITMENTS. THE PROJECT WOULD GENERATE A NEW SOURCE OF WASTEWATER THAT WOULD FLOW THROUGH THE EXISTING CITY OF BAKERSFIELD SEWER SYSTEM AND TREATMENT PLANT NO. 2. LOCAL CONVEYANCE INFRASTRUCTURE WOULD BE UPGRADED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF BAKERSFIELD SEWER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PLAN, AND WOULD NOT NEED TO BE UPGRADED AS A RESULT OF BUILDOUT UNDER THE PROJECT. HOWEVER, EXISTING WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES MUST BE EXPANDED TO ACCOMMODATE THE PROJECTED GROWTH. THE CITY OF BAKERSFIELD, AS THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PROVIDER, WOULD CONFIRM THAT THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEM HAS ADEQUATE CAPACITY TO SERVE THE PROJECT’S DEMAND IN ADDITION TO THE PROVIDER’S EXISTING COMMITMENTS. IMPACTS WOULD BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION.
DEIR Page 282.

Impact U-3 the project would be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. The Bena landfill has adequate capacity to serve the project; therefore, impacts related to solid waste facilities would be less than significant.

DEIR Page 314 - 315.

Alternatives 2 and 3 could be considered environmentally superior, as they would reduce impacts related to air quality, greenhouse gas, noise, and traffic due primarily to the reduction in housing units. However, this alternative would not eliminate the significant and unavoidable impacts. No mitigation measures are available to reduce the significant unavoidable impacts. These alternatives would generally meet most of the Project objectives, but to a lesser degree than the Project. Of the development alternatives being considered, the Low Intensity/Density Design Alternative (Alternative 2) could be considered environmentally superior, as it would reduce impacts in many issue areas, due primarily to the reduction in future commercial housing unit construction as well as less of a strain on both transportation and utilities infrastructure.
9.3 Response to Comments

Global Responses to Comments

This section provides “Global Responses” to comments raised in multiple comment letters on the DEIR. The Global Responses address comments related to general issues that are common throughout several comment letters. The intent of a Global Response is to provide a comprehensive response to an issue so that all aspects of the issue are addressed in a coordinated, organized manner in one location. This reduces repetition of responses. When an individual comment raises an issue discussed in a global response, the response to the individual comment includes a cross reference to the appropriate global response. For example, if a comment identifies a question concerning project documents that were included in the processing of the DEIR, the response will include a statement such as, “Please see Global Response 1.” Individual responses to each comment are included in Section 9 of the FEIR.

Global Response No. 1

Project EIR versus Program EIR

Background

Comments were received regarding the level of analysis provided by the EIR. Therefore, the Lead Agency offers information noted below, related to the differences between a Project-level EIR, and a Program-level EIR.

Response

As discussed in Article 11 of the CEQA Guidelines, there are several types of EIRs that can be prepared to assess the environmental impacts of a project, based on specific situations and intended uses.

- **Project EIR.** The most common type of EIR is a Project EIR, which examines the environmental impacts of a specific development project. This type of EIR should focus primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from the development project. The EIR shall examine all phases of the project including planning, construction, and operation.

- **Program EIR.** Section 15165 of the CEQA Guidelines states that, “Where individual projects are, or a phased project is, to be undertaken and where the total undertaking comprises a project with significant environmental effect, the Lead Agency shall prepare a single program EIR for the ultimate project...”

The Project (i.e., the Vision Plan) is a policy document that will provide guidance on how a specific area will grow and how projected growth will be guided or implemented in the future. Therefore, a Program EIR was the relevant CEQA analysis for the Vision Plan consistent with Section 15165.

In accordance with Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines, this Program EIR has been prepared to achieve the following purposes:

1. Provide an occasion for a more exhaustive consideration of effects and alternatives than would be practical in an EIR on an individual action
2. Ensure consideration of cumulative impacts that might be slighted in a case-by-case analysis
(3) Avoid duplicative reconsideration of basic policy considerations
(4) Allow the Lead Agency to consider broad policy alternatives and program wide mitigation measures at an early time when the Agency has greater flexibility to deal with basic problems or cumulative impacts
(5) Allow reduction in paperwork

Subsequent activities within the project area will be thoroughly analyzed as required by CEQA, and, if the Agency finds that pursuant to Section 15162, no new effects could occur or no new mitigation measures would be required, the subsequent activities could be found to be within the scope of the project described in the program EIR, and no further environmental documents would be required.

A program EIR can be used to simplify the task of preparing environmental documents on later parts of the program. The program EIR can:

1. Provide the basis in an initial study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects.
2. Be incorporated by reference to deal with regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.
3. Focus an EIR on a subsequent project to permit discussion solely of new effects which had not been considered before.

The Vision Plan EIR is a program document which provides assurances for adequate future analysis, and an opportunity for future development projects to tier off of this document, provided they address any identified project specific CEQA impacts from that proposed project. In this, the Program EIR does not exclude future CEQA review; rather, it facilitates a more comprehensive review.

**Global Response No. 2**

**The Project Boundary**

**Background**

Comments were received regarding the development of the Project Boundary; including, but not limited to comments related to the level of public input used, use of a ¼ and ½ mile study area radius and the relations of the project studies to the project boundary. Therefore, the Lead Agency offers the information noted below.

**Response**

In general, development of a Project boundary or “footprint” is one of the basic components of any Project, and is typically defined during the initial stages of the planning process. In the case of the project, the HSR offered guidance to all Station Cities regarding Station Area Plan project areas.

During the initial grant application process for the project, the HSR Authority stated that the purpose of the project was for the Lead Agency to undertake a station area planning effort in the area of the planned HSR station in “Downtown Bakersfield.” City staff recognized that “Downtown Bakersfield” does not have a universally-defined boundary, because there is no Specific Plan or other codified boundary. Therefore, the project boundary was developed during the initial scoping process, and was prepared in accordance with the following parameters:
(1) Recognizing the need to define a Planning area for the Project, Staff used the City’s “Central District” map as the foundation and starting point for the project boundaries (See Attachment A, Central District Area Map). The “Central District” is a long-established planning area that is legally defined by Section 10.08.020 of the Municipal Code, and illustrated by a map contained in the Zoning Ordinance (Title 17). The area is used to define reduced impact fees and parking reduction opportunities within the Downtown area, and was established in approximately 1980.

(2) To ensure that the project planning area aligned with the objectives of the project, which specifically requires that the project area cover the HSR Station located in the general area of F Street and Golden State Avenue Central District (See Attachment : Agreement 15-189, Exhibit A, Section 2.4) the “Central District” boundary was then expanded to account for the State’s future construction of a High Speed Rail Station, as follows:

a. Northern Boundary: Adjusted from Golden State Avenue to account for the potential location of the Station at F Street and likely connections to the 34th Street Corridor.

b. Western Boundary: Adjusted from F Street to account for commercial areas south of Golden State Avenue.

c. Southern Boundary: Adjusted to incorporate the Amtrak Station and adjacent commercial development.

d. Eastern Boundary: Adjusted to incorporate commercial/industrial area to Union Avenue.

(3) On July 23, 2015, the City released an RFP which reflected this boundary; and received proposals consistent with this project scope.

It is important to note that the project boundary is only necessary to define the CEQA study area. One of the fundamental purposes of the Vision Plan was to engage the public and explore the identity of Downtown Bakersfield with and without HSR. While the recommendations and outcomes of the Vision Plan have an initial focus within the Planning area, they are Programmatic and broad in nature, and are intended to benefit the entire Community.

For example, Page 32 of the Vision Plan includes a conceptual illustration of Downtown that shows the Wall Street Pedestrian Paseo linking Mill Creek to the historic core, the future Station, Chester Avenue, and beyond. Figure 20 on page 35 also depicts a conceptual “Green Loop” as a framework concept that forms an open space corridor around the project area, and Downtown Bakersfield, leveraging the existing Kern River and canal system. These and other Vision Plan concepts are intended to capitalize on existing infrastructure and development within the Plan boundary area, and leverage those improvements in a way that can be expanded throughout the community. The project boundary does not prohibit vision plan concepts or improvements from expanding to areas outside the Downtown area; and it is noted that any projects proposed outside the boundary will require additional environmental analysis.

It is also important to note that this is a Vision Plan, not a regulatory document; as the Vision Plan will not force specific changes in zoning or other regulatory changes. Rather, the Vision Plan is intended to provide a framework for future implementing actions, and act as a basis for future decision-making as the City prepares for the arrival of High-Speed Rail to Bakersfield.

Finally, it is important to note that development of the Vision Plan included a significant amount of community outreach to stakeholders, residents, businesses, non-profit organizations, development and real estate community both within and outside the project boundary. This process is described in detail in Chapter 2 of the Vision Plan, and in Appendix VII: Engagement Summary.
Global Response No. 3

F Street Station vs Truxtun Station – HSR Alignment

Background

Comments were received regarding the two alignments under consideration in Bakersfield: (1) the Hybrid alignment with a Station location on Truxtun Avenue; and (2) the Locally Generated Alternative alignment with a Station location on F Street. Therefore, the Lead Agency offers the information noted below, related to the two alignments and station locations.

Response

It is important to note that the final decision regarding selection of a High Speed Rail alignment through the City of Bakersfield will ultimately be made by the State High Speed Rail Authority. However, the Lead Agency notes that the following facts are relevant to this topic:

(1) In 2014, the HSR Authority certified the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIR/EIS) for the Fresno to Bakersfield section of the HSR project, which included a Truxtun Avenue station location and the "Hybrid Alignment." The alignment impacted several community assets, facilities and homes; including, but not limited to, the City corporation yard, senior housing, Rabobank Arena parking facilities, a hospital, and a major commercial project. The City sued the CHSRA arguing the alignment was unacceptable and the Final EIR/EIS inadequately analyzed the impacts under CEQA.

(2) In December of 2014, the City reached a Settlement Agreement with the HSR Authority. As a part of that agreement, the HSR agreed to study an alternative alignment, known as the Locally Generated Alignment (LGA). The LGA follows an alternative route generally paralleling the Union Pacific Railroad line which travels through the intersection of F Street and Golden State in downtown Bakersfield. The LGA identifies the F Street location as the site for a High Speed Rail Station in Downtown Bakersfield.

(3) On November 9, 2017, the Authority released the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, assessing the LGA. The report declared the LGA as the environmentally superior alternative. According to the discussion in Chapter 8: Comparison of Alternatives and Identification of the Preferred Alternative of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS prepared by the Authority, the LGA is the Preferred Alternative because it is supported by the City and would result in lesser impacts associated with agricultural lands, residential displacements, special-status plant species, riparian areas, and permanent impacts to jurisdictional waters; would cost less to construct; would improve traffic, pedestrian, and bicycle safety and circulation in the City of Shafter; and would reduce overall system-wide travel time. See Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement Fresno to Bakersfield Section; VOLUME I: REPORT; Chapter 8 Comparison of Alternatives and Identification of the Preferred Alternative. Also see “Table S-2 Impact Comparison between May 2014 Project and F-B LGA" Pg. S-26 - 31, California High Speed Rail Authority - Fresno to Bakersfield Section Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS (November 2017).

(4) On December 13, 2017, the Bakersfield City Council voted unanimously to adopt a resolution for the continued cooperation with the California High-Speed Rail Authority in development of the Locally Generated Alternative (LGA) Alignment of the Fresno to Bakersfield project section.
The Project is not intended to select a site for the HSR station; rather it creates a vision for the development of Downtown Bakersfield in coordination with a future station. In addition, the EIR prepared for the Project assesses the impacts of the phased development strategy and related implementation strategies; it does not assess the impacts of the HSR LGA project.

Global Response No. 4

F Street Station vs Truxtun Station – Station Area Plan

Background

Comments were received regarding the two HSR station locations under consideration in Bakersfield and how the Station Area Plan vision shows possible development in the areas around each station: (1) the Station location on Truxtun Avenue in line with the Hybrid alignment; and (2) the Station location on F Street in line with the Locally Generated Alternative (LGA) alignment. Therefore, the Lead Agency offers the information noted below, related to the areas around each station location.

Response

At the start of the City’s station area plan process, there were two possible station locations that depended on the ultimate HSR alignment selected by the HSR Authority: at the Amtrak Station on Truxtun Avenue for the Hybrid Alignment, or at F Street and Golden State Avenue for the LGA.

In May 2016, the California HSR Authority Board of Directors approved the LGA as the preliminary preferred alignment. At this point during the City’s development of the project, focus for the development strategy and projected growth pattern turned toward potential development around the F Street station. However, it is important to note that the Vision Plan was specifically crafted to also have independent utility and to act as a guide for growth and revitalization of Downtown Bakersfield, regardless of station location or construction of HSR. The principles of the Vision Plan relate to several factors; including consistently focusing reinvestment in the historic core, connecting the many Downtown assets to the core, and focusing development around the future HSR station. These principles remain applicable regardless of the Station location.

The Project includes a phased development strategy broken into three 10-year segments with the first phase focused on the historic core of Downtown Bakersfield. These are described as follows (Chapter 4, page 66 of the Vision Plan):

- The first 10 years (2015-2025) focuses on strengthening the historic core of Downtown and connecting it to the Mill Creek Entertainment District;
- The second 10 years (2025-2035) focuses on preparing Downtown to connect to and develop a new node of activity around the future HSR station; and,
- The third 10 years (2035-2045) focuses on responding to continued growth around the HSR station and spreading its benefits equitably across Downtown and adjacent neighborhoods.

As demonstrated by the Phased Development Strategy, the Project focuses on creating connectivity in the Downtown core and building on current investments and infrastructure to connect Downtown to the rest of Bakersfield. The Project proposes various pedestrian and bike infrastructure improvement and recommends policies, design guidelines, specific plans and various strategies for making downtown more walkable and accessible to the rest of the community, including shuttle service between the LGA, HSR and Amtrak stations. See Appendix I: Implementation Matrix.
Global Response No. 5

Vision Plan versus Land Use Plan

Background

Comments were received regarding the specificity of the Vision Plan. Therefore, the Lead Agency offers the information noted below, related to the differences between a vision plan and a land use plan.

Response

VISION PLAN

Community visioning is the process of developing consensus about what future the community wants, and then deciding what is necessary to achieve it. A vision captures what community members most value about their community, and the shared image of what they want their community to become. It inspires community members to work together to achieve the vision. A thoughtful vision process is one of the elements needed to form a forward looking strategic framework that gives councils or boards the long-term-comprehensive perspective necessary to make rational and disciplined tactical/incremental decisions on community issues as they arise. Community visions are typically crafted through a collaborative process that involves a wide variety of community residents, stakeholders and elected officials.

The community vision comprises peoples’ values, wishes, fears and desires and the process has a tendency to produce an idealistic, seemingly intangible view of the future. In the process a tangible set of goals, objectives and strategies are developed which move today’s community toward the consensus community vision. The community vision will have individual components that lend themselves to individual goals, for example, to better accommodate pedestrians and cyclists throughout the downtown. This component of the vision becomes a goal that is then further defined with a set of objectives and implementation strategies. Those strategies, when implemented, take additional steps like zone changes, design guidelines, specific plans, etc., that have land use density requirements with corresponding subsequent environmental analysis per CEQA.

LAND USE PLAN/SPECIFIC PLAN

A Land Use plan is to guide future land use decisions such as zoning, subdivisions, capital improvements, development agreements, and many other land use actions. An adopted land use plan identifies the community’s land use, circulation, environmental, economic, and social goals and policies as they relate to future growth and development. Land use designations determine type, intensity, and general distribution of uses of land for housing, business, industry, open space, education, public buildings and grounds, waste disposal facilities, and other categories of public and private uses.

California state law requires each city and county to adopt a general plan “for the physical development of the county or city, and any land outside its boundaries which in the planning agency’s judgment bears relation to its planning” (Gov. Code § 65300). The general plan expresses the community’s development goals and embodies public policy relative to the distribution of future land uses, both public and private. The Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (MBGP) includes the project area; and no Specific Plan for the project area is being proposed.
City zoning districts are established to implement the goals and policies of the MBGP. Zoning regulates the types of activities that can be accommodated on a given piece of land, as well as the amount of space devoted to those activities, and the ways that buildings may be situated and shaped. This Project does not change any existing land use or zoning entitlements but serves as a guide for development within current zoning parameters.

The Project does not change any land use designation as determined by the General Plan or zoning in the project area; nor does the Project require changes to land use and/or zoning.

**Global Response No. 6**

**San Joaquin Hospital**

**Background**

Comments were received stating that the Project proposes removal and significant impacts to the existing San Joaquin Hospital, located on Chester Avenue. Therefore, the Lead Agency offers the information noted below, related to these comments.

**Response**

The Project does not propose to re-zone, relocate or demolish Adventist Health Bakersfield (a.k.a. San Joaquin Community Hospital). The project does not change the land use or zoning or prevent the hospital from expanding.

As stated in the forward for the plan, “The purpose of this Vision Plan is to illustrate the Community’s vision for revitalization of Downtown Bakersfield and provide a blueprint for future decisions. Most importantly, this Vision Plan is intended to spark interest, inspire deeper conversations, and to show the City’s support for progress and investment in Downtown Bakersfield.” The recent expansion of Adventist Health Bakersfield is a perfect example of the redevelopment and revitalization that is envisioned by the Project.

Chapter 4, Phased Development Strategy, lays out a specific framework to achieve this purpose:

1. **Phase 1: Strengthen (Now-2025).** As illustrated in the Phase 1 Map on Page 70 of the Project, the goal is to focus on infrastructure improvements throughout Downtown, and focus redevelopment on the Downtown “core area,” south of Adventist Health Bakersfield.

2. **Phase 2: Prepare (2025-2035).** As illustrated in the Phase 2 Map on Page 76 of the Project, the goal is to focus on continued infrastructure improvements throughout Downtown, and build upon previous development by encouraging residential infill east of Adventist Health Bakersfield, encouraging rehabilitation of underutilized parcels north of Golden State Highway/Hwy 178, and responding to new development along the Chester Avenue corridor, where Adventist Health Bakersfield has already began redevelopment efforts.

3. **Phase 3: Respond (2035-2045).** As illustrated in the Phase 3 Map on Page 82 of the Project, the goal is to continue to build upon previous development and encourage development in proximity to the future HSR Station at F Street, and the surrounding area. These areas are located west of Adventist Health Bakersfield.
Responses to Public Comments

The comment letters received on the Draft EIR are addressed in their entirety in this section. Each comment contained in the letter has been assigned a reference code. The responses to reference code comments correlate to each letter.
Dear Cecelia,

I would like to submit the attached letter for the record as a comment. I will also be submitting additional comments.

Also, can you please explain why an anonymous letter is listed under my name for public comments in the draft EIR/EIS? Can this be corrected as it is very odd to attribute anonymous comments from someone else and mix them in with separate comments that I submitted.

Thank you,

Adam Cohen
661-912-2986
To the Stakeholder’s Committee & General Public;

The Golden Empire Chapter of the American Institute of Architects (AIA) wishes to express appreciation for being included in the conversation as Stakeholders for Making Downtown Bakersfield. Regardless of how long High Speed Rail takes to develop, or whether it comes to fruition, we believe it is important to plan wisely for Downtown Bakersfield either way.

Many of the items in the 0-10 year strategy would be helpful toward the growth of downtown and ensuring its viability into the future. Formation and expansion of a Downtown Business Improvement District, establishing Downtown Design Guidelines and ordinances that encourage development, both Infill and in proven developing districts like Mill Creek, will be critical to the success of this effort. In the 10-20 and 20-30 year strategies the steps to encourage development, especially mixed-use development, and establish funding mechanisms will be necessary to continue growth, as will expanding infrastructure for this development. We believe that studies such as this can aid us in planning for those infrastructure needs.

As with every group endeavor there are some concerns. The emphasis on the Golden State & “F” Street site and the development proposed around it could serve to draw away from the traditional core of downtown rather than compliment it. We realize that this site may be easier for the HSR authority but, in turn, may throw greater expense on the City in developing connecting transportation corridors along Chester Avenue and “F” Street. We do recommend that a similar effort made looking at the Truxtun Avenue/Amtrak location originally proposed so the stakeholders and public can make a true comparison.

The earlier massing concept shows 25 story towers and numerous 10 stories adjacent to the “F” Street Station Site. These may need to be reduced in height, and future taller towers directed back toward the downtown core in order to integrate with the existing downtown.

In many ways Bakersfield is not like other cities. We are very independent and not inclined to be squeezed into molds for other cities. This is a big vision for big projects, but we need to keep a place for the modest endeavors by architects, developers, and end users alike.

All in all this was a good effort by the stakeholders. Gunnar Hand & SOM, and the City staff who assisted them, are to be commended for trying to make some sense of our many viewpoints. This is not set in stone, but it is a start. Many decisions lie ahead if we are to chip out a well sculpted future for our city.

Respectfully,

Timothy R. Stomont, AIA
Mandy Freeland, AIA
Rob Trost, AIA
John Cohrs, AIA
HST STATION AREA DEVELOPMENT:
GENERAL PRINCIPALS AND GUIDELINES

There would be great benefits to enhancing development patterns and increasing development densities near proposed high-speed train (HST) stations. To provide maximum opportunity for station area development in accordance with the purpose, need, and objectives for the HST system, the preferred HST station locations would be multi-modal transportation hubs and would typically be in traditional city centers. The State of California is leading the nation with legislation such as AB 32 to adapt state policy to global climate change and SB 375 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through coordinated land-use and transportation planning. HST Station area development should promote the implementation of SB 375 and sustainability principles with smart growth development. To further these objectives, when making decisions regarding both the final selection of station locations and the timing of station development, the Authority would consider the extent to which appropriate station area planning and development principles are supported by local authorities.

In addition to potential benefits from minimizing land consumption needs for new growth, dense development near HST stations would concentrate activity conveniently located to stations. This would increase the use of the HST system, generating additional HST ridership and revenue to benefit the entire state. It also would accommodate new growth on a smaller footprint. Reducing the land needed for new growth should reduce pressure for new development on nearby habitat areas, in environmentally fragile or hazardous areas, and on agricultural lands. Denser development allowances also would enhance joint development opportunities at and near stations, which in turn could increase the likelihood of private financial participation in construction and operations related to the HST system. A dense development pattern can better support a comprehensive and extensive local transit and shuttle system, bicycle1 and pedestrian paths, and related amenities that can serve the local communities as well as provide access to and egress from HST stations. The Authority’s adopted policies would ensure that implementation of the HST in California would maximize station area development that serves the local community and economy while increasing HST ridership. The Authority is committed to cooperating with local communities to develop HST stations appropriate to the scale and needs of each community.

General Principles for HST Station Area Development

HST station area development principles draw on transit-oriented development (TOD) strategies that have been successfully applied to focus compact growth within walking distance of rail stations and other transportation facilities. Applying TOD measures around HST stations is a strategy that works for large, dense urban areas, as well as smaller central cities and suburban areas. TOD can produce a variety of other local and regional benefits by encouraging walkable, bikeable compact and infill development. Local governments would play a significant role in implementing station area development by adopting plans, policies, zoning provisions, and incentives for higher densities, and by approving a mix of urban land uses. Almost all TOD measures adopted by public agencies involve some form of overlay zoning that designates a station area for development intensification, mixed land uses, and improvements to the pedestrian/bicycle environment. TOD measures for major facilities are generally applied to areas within one-half mile of stations, and this principal would be followed for HST stations.

1HST will include facilities to accommodate bicycles.
Station area development principles that would be applied at the project level for each HST station and the areas around the stations would include the following features:

- Higher density development in relation to the existing pattern of development in the surrounding area, along with minimum requirements for density.
- A mix of land uses (e.g., retail, office, hotels, entertainment, residential) and a mix of housing types to meet the needs of the local community. Different styles of TOD may be appropriate for different HST station areas.
- A grid street pattern and compact pedestrian-oriented design that promotes walking, bicycle, and transit access with streetscapes that include landscaping, small parks, pedestrian spaces, bus shelters, lighting, wayfinding signs, bike lanes, and bike racks. New buildings should incorporate high energy efficiency and building performance standards.
- Context-sensitive building design that considers the continuity of the building sizes and that coordinates the street-level and upper-level architectural detailing, roof forms, and the rhythm of windows and doors should be provided. New buildings should be designed to complement and mutually support public spaces, such as streets, plazas, other open space areas, and public parking structures. The Authority will work cooperatively with each local community to assure the design process accommodates both the operating requirements of the HST system and local conditions and character.
- Limits on the amount of parking for new development and a preference that parking be placed in structures. TOD areas typically have reduced parking requirements for retail, office, and residential uses due to their transit access and walkability. Sufficient train passenger parking would be essential to the system viability, but this should, as appropriate, be offered at market rates (not free) to encourage the use of access by transit and other modes, where available. Shared parking would be planned when the mix of uses would support it.

**Implementation of HST Station Area Development Guidelines**

The statewide HST system is likely to have more than 20 stations. The Authority has the powers necessary to oversee the construction and operation of a statewide high-speed rail system and to purchase the land required for the infrastructure and operations of the system. The responsibility and powers needed to focus growth and station area development guidelines in the areas around high-speed stations are likely to reside primarily with local government.

The primary ways in which the Authority can help ensure that the HST system becomes an instrument for encouraging maximizing implementation of station area development principles include:

- Select station locations that are multi-modal transportation hubs with a preference for traditional city centers.
- Adopt HST station area development policies and principles that require TOC, and promote value-capture at and around station areas as a condition for selecting a HST station site.
- Provide incentives for local governments where potential HST stations may be located to prepare and adopt Station Area Plans and to amend City and County General Plans that incorporate station area development principles in the vicinity of HST stations.
1. Select Station Locations that Are Multi-Modal Transportation Hubs, Preferably in Traditional City Centers.

HST stations in California would be multi-modal transportation hubs. To meet the Authority's adopted objectives, the locations that were selected as potential HST stations would provide linkage with local and regional transit, airports, and highways. In particular, convenient links to other rail services (urban rapid transit, heavy rail, commuter rail, light rail, and conventional intercity) would promote TOD at stations by increasing ridership and pedestrian activity at these hub stations. A high level of accessibility and activity at the stations can make the nearby area more attractive for additional economic activity.

Most of the potential stations identified for further evaluation are located in the heart of the downtown/central city area of California's major cities. By eliminating potential greenfield sites, the Authority has described a proposed HST system that meets the objectives of minimizing potential impacts on the environment and maximizing connectivity with other modes of transportation. These locations also would have the most potential to support infill development and TOD.

2. Adopt HST Station Area Development Policies that Require TOD, and Promote Value-Capture at and around Stations as a Condition for Selecting a HST Station Site

Through subsequent CEQA and NEPA processes, the Authority would determine where stations would be located and how many HST stations there would be. The Authority has identified TOD and value-capture at and around stations sites as essential for promoting HST ridership. The Authority would work with local governments to ensure these policies are adopted and implemented.

Local government would be expected to promote TOD and to use value-capture techniques to help finance and maintain station amenities and the public spaces needed to create an attractive pedestrian environment. Because the HST stations would be public gathering places, value-capture techniques should be used to enhance station designs with additional transportation or public facilities. It is the Authority's policy that parking for HST services at HST stations should, as appropriate, be provided at market rates (no free parking) to encourage access by alternative means. The Authority would maximize application of TOD principles during the site-specific review of proposed station locations. In addition, for HST stations in the Central Valley, the Authority will undertake a comprehensive economic study of the kinds of businesses that would uniquely benefit from being located near HST station areas, including a thorough estimate of the kinds and numbers of jobs that such businesses would create.

The Authority has prescribed the following criteria for HST station locations:

- To be considered for a station, the proposed site must have the potential to promote higher density, mixed-use, pedestrian accessible development around the station. Transit accessibility and proximity to transit corridors are also important considerations.
- As the HST project proceeds to more detailed study, and before a final station location decision is made, the responsible local government(s) are expected to provide (through planning and zoning) for TOD around HST station locations.

---

2See the final statewide program EIR/EIS (California High-Speed Rail Authority and Federal Railroad Administration 2005), Section 1.2.1, Purpose of High-Speed Train System.
3Sites in rural areas with very limited or no existing infrastructure.
4The Government Accounting Office defines value capture strategies as: "...joint development, special assessment districts, tax increment financing, and development impact fees [that] are designed to dedicate to transit either a portion of increased tax revenue or additional revenue through assessments, fees, or rents based on value expected to accrue as a result of transit investments."
5As part of the “Staff Recommendations” adopted at the January 26, 2005, Authority Board Meeting in Sacramento.
Give priority to stations for which the city and/or county has adopted station area TOD plans and general plans that focus and prioritize development on the TOD areas rather than on auto-oriented outlying areas, and adopted trip-reduction and greenhouse gas-reduction strategies.

As the project proceeds to more detailed study, local governments are expected to help finance (e.g., through value-capture or other financing techniques) the public spaces needed to support the pedestrian/bicycle traffic generated by hub stations, as well as identifying long-term maintenance of the spaces.

The imperative to link transportation investments with supportive land use was made clear in a study by the MTC. The study showed that people who both live and work within a half mile of a rail stop use transit for 42% of their work trips, more than 10 times as much as others in the region.6 While HST service offers a different scale of travel, the fundamental principles of compact access and high mobility apply.

In California, regional agencies and transit providers are adopting policies that link funding for transit expansion with land use. These include:

- MTC – which has adopted a TOD policy for regional expansion projects to help improve the cost effectiveness of regional investments.

- BART – its Strategic Plan mandates that BART partner with communities to make investment choices that encourage and support TOD and increased transit use.

- SACOG – the Sacramento Blueprint process built a strong foundation of political and community support for the compact, mixed-use growth scenario adopted in the region's long-range transportation plan, and as a result, SACOG dedicated $500 million for smart growth construction and $250 million for smart growth planning, bike/pedestrian activities, public involvement, and support services.

- SCAG – SCAG manages the Compass Blueprint Demonstration Project program that funds local agencies to carry out innovative planning efforts that align with the Compass Blueprint principles. These efforts include TOD planning, parking systems management, and smart growth planning efforts.

- LA Metro – its Joint Development Program encourages comprehensive planning and development around station sites and along transit corridors.

- SANDAG – promotes smart growth and TOD to its member jurisdictions through funding and technical assistance.

The Authority will analyze these policies and others like it throughout the state and country in developing specific TOD guidelines.

---

6Charteristics of Rail and Ferry Station Area Residents in the San Francisco Bay Area: Evidence from the 2000 Bay Area Travel Survey. Volume 1. MTC, September 2006.
3. Provide Incentives for Local Governments in which Potential HST Stations Would Be Located to Prepare and Adopt Station Area Plans, Amend City and County General Plans, and Encourage TOD in the Vicinity of HST Stations

Throughout future environmental processes and the implementation of the HST, the Authority would continue to work cooperatively with the communities being considered for HST stations. It is important to understand HST as a system that will have regional as well as statewide ridership. It will provide an opportunity to improve and expand local and regional transit systems leading to the HST stations and to have additional job and housing growth along those transit corridors. The Authority is committed to working with host cities and other local agencies throughout the process, in a cooperative manner, sharing data and information to enable each station area to benefit from the efforts and successes at other stations.

Local governments can use a number of mechanisms to encourage higher density HST-oriented development in and around potential HST station locations and to minimize undesirable growth effects. These include developing plans (such as specific plans, transit village plans, regional plans, and greenbelts), development agreements, zoning overlays, and, in some cases, use of redevelopment authority.

Increased density of development in and around HST stations would provide public benefits beyond the benefits of access to the HST system itself. Such benefits could include relief from traffic congestion, improved air quality, promotion of infill development, preservation of natural resources, more affordable housing, promotion of job opportunities, reduction in energy consumption, and better use of public infrastructure. The Authority and local government working together would determine which mechanisms best suit each community and could be implemented to enhance the benefits possible from potential HST station development.

Most successful contemporary examples of urban development are the product of long-term strategic planning. For example, in France and Japan, where there has been considerable success guiding new development around HST stations, local governments typically prepare long-term plans that focus growth at each HST station area. Regional plans are also typically used to coordinate station area development with existing urban areas and reserves for parks, agriculture, and natural habitat.

Over the last 5 years, four of the major regions of California—Los Angeles, San Diego, Sacramento, and the Bay Area—have developed regional blueprints. Eight counties in the Central Valley are now conducting their own blueprint process. All of these blueprints focus on supporting the existing downtowns and increasing transit ridership as critical ways for future growth to be environmentally and economically sustainable. The HST could provide a major boost to these blueprints by greatly increasing access to the downtowns, directly supporting local and regional rail systems, and indirectly supporting bus and light rail systems with an infusion of additional riders. The importance of local and regional transit service to provide feeder and distributor functions for the HST service should be emphasized.

A useful starting point for station area development is to work with members of the community to identify needs and missing assets they would like to see as part of any new development, such as parks, libraries, and food stores, and to assess the market sizes needed to attract and retain such uses. Early, regular, and ongoing public involvement in the planning process will assure local character and preferences are incorporated into the project, and enable the local community to influence its interface with the statewide project. Local government also can review the availability of land around potential station sites to achieve development that is of sufficient size to be economically viable. Then an illustrative site and phasing plan for a station area that is realistic from a market perspective can be developed and shared with the community. Finally, a station area plan can be prepared, which would ensure the community and potential developers of a public commitment to promote compact, efficient, TOD around station areas. Infrastructure improvements for station area development should be included in the station area plan.
Significant growth is expected in large areas of California with or without an HST system. The proposed HST system, however, would be consistent with and promote the state’s adopted smart growth principles\(^7\) and could be a catalyst for wider adoption of smart growth principles in communities near HST stations. Well sited stations that are integrated into their communities and connected by local and regional transit will help the state realize some of the principles of AB 32 and SB 375. With strong companion policies and good planning, HST stations should encourage infill development, help protect environmental and agricultural resources by encouraging more efficient land use, and minimize ongoing cost to taxpayers by making better use of our existing infrastructure.

The Authority’s selection of station locations and the timing of station development would consider adherence to the principles in the section, as well as the findings of the associated environmental documentation. In pursuing its objective of providing a profitable and successful HST, the Authority will use its resources, both financial and otherwise, to encourage the local government authority with development jurisdiction at and around potential HST stations to take the following steps:

- In partnership with the Authority, develop a station area plan\(^8\) for all land within a half mile of the HST pedestrian entrance that adheres to the station area development principles (described above).
- Use a community planning process to plan the street, pedestrian, bicycle environment, transit facilities, parks and open spaces, and other amenities.
- Incorporate the station area plan through amendment of the city or county general plan and zoning.
- Use community planning processes to develop regional plans and draft conformance amendments to general plans, which would focus development in existing communities and would provide for long-term protection of farmland, habitat, and open space.
- Identify opportunities to preserve local culture, character, and sense-of-place while still meeting other policy principles.

---

\(^7\) As expressed in the Wiggins Bill (AB857, 2003), and in government code 65041.l.

\(^8\) Such a plan could take the form of a specific plan pursuant to California Government Code sections 65450–65457 or a Transit Village Development Plan pursuant to California Government Code sections 65460–65460.10, which specify the content for such a plan, or another form as determined appropriate by local government.
**Letter No. 1: Adam Cohen, January 18, 2018**

1-A The Lead Agency has accepted these comments as part of the public record.

The Lead Agency also notes that the comment letter prepared by the American Institute of Architects Golden Empire is addressed to the Stakeholder Committee and the General Public and describes general support for the phased development strategies, and expresses concern regarding the Station location at F Street. Please see Global Response No. 4. The letter also recommends that the conceptual buildings shown throughout the plan may need to be reduced in height and integrated closer to the core area. These comments do not relate to the CEQA component of this project; however, the City thanks the AIA for these comments and notes that the imagery shown in the Vision Plan are conceptual, and that specific project design will be determined on an individual project basis.

1-B The Lead Agency notes that any attribution of the anonymous letter to you will be removed from the EIR. See Section 9.2 Revisions to the Draft EIR.
Dear Ms. Griego,

I am writing to provide a formal public comment regarding the "Green Loop" as part of Bakersfield's Station Area Vision Plan draft EIR/EIS. The Green Loop is contained on Page 35 of Appendix F. I have attached a copy of the referenced page to this email.

I have read through the materials provide by the City of Bakersfield, and provide you the following facts, circumstances, and observations for your consideration. I must say that, although disheartened, I am not surprised by the critical deficiencies and lack of consideration for disadvantaged and minority communities. All attempts to get the city to include these communities have been met with resistance.

My concerns related to the Green Loop are outlined below:

Throughout the entire Station Area Planning Process, minority business and community leaders (including the Kern County Black Chamber of Commerce Executive Director), repeatedly met with Mr. Andrew Heglund, Ms. Jacqui Kitchen, Gunnar Hand, and other project staff and consultants expressing concerns regarding the project boundary. During these meetings, including but not limited to our meeting on or about March 2016, Mr. Hightower, Mr. Bush, and myself expressed concerns about the station area boundary excluding large portions of the African American community South of California Avenue and East of Union Avenue (emails from Mr. Bush and Mr. Dmohowski highlighting these concerns are attached).

During our in-person meeting at the Department of Community Development with Mr. Heglund, Ms. Kitchen, and Mr. Hand (who joined telephonically), Mr. Hightower and I were told that the study area boundaries would not be changed and that the entire Vision Plan would encompass only the area within the redline boundary. In pertinent part, the northern boundary of the study is West Columbus St (between Chester Avenue and Union Avenue). A copy of the Notice of Preparation Study Area Map is attached.

During the station area planning process, I also met with the City Manager's office (Chris and Caleb) regarding the Strategic Growth Council's (SGC) Transformative Climate Communities (TCC) Program. I informed them that SGC was looking to fund up to $35 million of active transportation improvements in disadvantaged communities within the City of Bakersfield and that we had preliminary discussions about a South Mill Creek extension to Brundage Avenue that SGC expressed interest in potentially funding. I was told by the City Manager's office that their office was not interested in applying for the grant money if the money had to be spent in a
disadvantaged community (a requirement of the funding program). This information was also relayed to Councilmember Gonzales who neither followed-up with myself or the Executive Director of the Kern County Black Chamber of Commerce. The $35 million in grant funding has since been awarded to Ontario ($70 million had previously been awarded to Fresno). I am astonished that city leadership would rather give up this grant funding than apply for projects that can create ladders of economic opportunity in some of our city's poorest neighborhoods.

Imagine our surprise, in spite of being told in no uncertain terms by Mr. Heglund and Ms. Kitchen that the boundaries were immovable and that the vision document would only include areas within the redline, when we viewed the "Green Loop" on Page 35. The Green Loop depicts transportation and greenbelt/active transportation improvements along the Kern Island Canal outside of the project study area to the north (from West Columbus Street to the Kern River). Interestingly, this greenspace addition outside of the study area happens to be within Census Tract 6, Block Group 1, which according to the U.S. Census Bureau is more than 60% White.

Repeated requests to have this green space improvement extended South along the Kern Island Canal from California Avenue to Brundage Lane have been met with resistance. Interestingly, a southward addition would be within Census Tract 20, Block Groups 1-3, which according to the U.S. Census Bureau is 25-29% White. The double standard to add transportation/quality of life improvements outside of the study area boundary on the northside while simultaneously excluding similar improvements on the southside (whether resulting from incompetence, racial insensitivity, or something far more heinous is unknown) shocks the conscience. It's telling that the study area map is depicted with a redline as "redlining" is the practice of denying municipal services or capital improvements to residents of certain areas based on the racial or ethnic composition of those areas. The differing treatment of two neighborhoods outside of the study area are inherently unequal.

It should also be noted that the neighborhood of Westchester, also outside of the study area, is depicted as "white" on this figure (Pg 35 - attached) while areas within the study boundary south of Truxtun Avenue are depicted as "black." As such, there are concerns about the colors of the shading of the aerial photography on this map and the perception of racial steering.

For equity and environmental justice reasons, the City of Bakersfield (and it's consultants) must correct this injustice by adding greenspace/active transportation corridors along the Kern Island Canal between California Avenue and Brundage Ln and apply a uniform shading across the aerial photography of the map.

Should you require additional information, or need me to clarify any statements made in this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me at your earliest convenience.

Very respectfully,

Adam Cohen
661-912-2986
This page and the following 10 pages are attachments to Letter #1 and addressed in the responses below.

- Green Loop.pdf
- NOP Study Map.pdf
Hi Jacqui, Gunner, and all,

I have some very serious concerns about Bakersfield's Station Area boundary that I think need to be resolved. For station area plans, it is generally professional practice to include a 1/2 to 1 mile radius around the station site. Both the Restoration Village station and the downtown station have significant areas excluded within this radius.

For example, a one mile radius around Restoration Village would include all of Westchester Rivera and Westchester as far south as 20th Street. It is critical that these areas are included because this station site could have significant impacts on parking, congestion, and densification in this area.

Similarly, a one mile radius from the downtown station would include an area south to Vista...
High School, east to Gage Street and encompass both Old Town and MLK Jr. Park.

From a Title VI and environmental justice perspective, I have very serious concerns about basically including low-income Caucasian neighborhoods to the NE of Restoration Village while excluding low-income minority neighborhoods to the SE of the downtown station within the same radius.

As part of the station area planning agreement with the CHSRA, the City of Bakersfield received $750,000 to explore options and seek public input for the design and development of a station. The Kern Council of Governments also provided an additional $150,000 to support the station-area planning effort. As recipients of federal funding, both CHSRA and KernCOG must comply with Title VI and Executive Order 12898 on environmental justice.

I am hoping that we can rectify these boundaries or place a one mile radius around each station location and make those the station area planning boundaries, so that we can both ensure full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities; and avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse environmental effects (including social and economic) on the communities within both station areas.

Thank you for your time and consideration on this matter.

Very respectfully,

Adam Cohen
661-912-2986

On Wed, Mar 16, 2016 at 12:52 PM, StationAreaPlan <StationAreaPlan@bakersfieldcity.us> wrote:

Thank you to everyone for the great feedback, values, dreams,... we learned about during the visioning workshop and I hope everyone enjoyed it and is encouraging others to participate in the future workshops scheduled. Attached is the meeting minutes and a recap of the vision workshop. If you think there is anything we missed that you shared at the workshop please let us know. I have also attached the workshop flyer and postcards. We have all four postcard designs printed here at our office (1715 Chester Avenue, 2nd Floor) if you would like to pick some up and help us spread the word. Please respond to this email and let us know if you would like to pick up some postcards and flyers. Next month’s meeting will be hosted by GET and again we will be sending out agendas and other homework the week before. Thank you.

Cecelia Griego
Associate Planner II
Community Development Department - Planning Division
City of Bakersfield

(661) 326-3788

www.bakersfieldcity.us
Kevin's question on study area boundaries deserves a response.

Re visioning exercise, planners have always struggled to ascertain what community and particularly stakeholders want to see as their community's future. The consultants tried to make this exercise fun as well as interactive and informative. There is no magic solution for this important task.

Dave

Dmohowski Consulting Services
661.510.8311
Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 18, 2016, at 5:29 PM, Kevin Bush <2045994@gmail.com> wrote:

I have serious concerns about the station area map. The map area leaves out a large portion of the African American Community, south of California Avenue and east of Union. I would like to see a map that would include these disadvantaged communities. Moving the lines further south to Brundage and east to Mt Vernon would be more representative.

I have concerns about how the station area funds are being spent. The exercise conducted by the consultant was confusing and I do not know how it relates.

On Wed, Mar 16, 2016 at 12:52 PM, StationAreaPlan <StationAreaPlan@bakersfieldcity.us> wrote:

Thank you to everyone for the great feedback, values, dreams,... we learned about during the visioning workshop and I hope everyone enjoyed it and is encouraging others to participate in the future workshops scheduled. Attached is the meeting minutes and a recap of the vision workshop. If you think there is anything we missed that you shared at the workshop please let us know. I have also attached the workshop flyer and postcards. We have all four postcard designs printed here at our office (1715 Chester Avenue, 2nd Floor) if you would like to pick some up and help us spread the word. Please respond to this email and let us know if you would like to pick up some postcards and flyers. Next month’s meeting will be hosted by GET and again we will be sending out agendas and other homework the week before. Thank you.

Cecelia Griego
Associate Planner II
Community Development Department – Planning Division
City of Bakersfield
(661) 326-3788

www.bakersfieldcity.us
Kevin Bush
Real Estate Consultant

(661) 204-5994
I have serious concerns about the station area map. The map area leaves out a large portion of the African American Community, south of California Avenue and east of Union. I would like to see a map that would include these disadvantaged communities. Moving the lines further south to Brundage and east to Mt Vernon would be more representative.

I have concerns about how the station area funds are being spent. The exercise conducted by the consultant was confusing and I do not know how it relates.

On Wed, Mar 16, 2016 at 12:52 PM, StationAreaPlan <StationAreaPlan@bakersfieldcity.us> wrote:

Thank you to everyone for the great feedback, values, dreams,... we learned about during the
visioning workshop and I hope everyone enjoyed it and is encouraging others to participate in the future workshops scheduled. Attached is the meeting minutes and a recap of the vision workshop. If you think there is anything we missed that you shared at the workshop please let us know. I have also attached the workshop flyer and postcards. We have all four postcard designs printed here at our office (1715 Chester Avenue, 2nd Floor) if you would like to pick some up and help us spread the word. Please respond to this email and let us know if you would like to pick up some postcards and flyers. Next month’s meeting will be hosted by GET and again we will be sending out agendas and other homework the week before. Thank you.

Cecelia Griego
Associate Planner II
Community Development Department – Planning Division
City of Bakersfield

(661) 326-3788

www.bakersfieldcity.us


Kevin Bush
Real Estate Consultant

(661) 204-5944
Green Loop
Letter No. 2: Adam Cohen, February 10, 2018

2-A Please see responses 2-D and 2-E.

2-B Please see Global Response No. 2 and responses 2-D and 2-E. Additionally, the Lead Agency notes that the project boundaries are generally consistent with those included in the Agreement with the High Speed Rail, which was approved September 23, 2015 (See Attachment A, Agreement 15-189, Exhibit A, Section 2.4). In 2015, minor adjustments were made to the northwestern and southeastern edges of the boundary to account for complete parcels. The emails attached to the Comment letter are from March 2016, after the contracts had already been executed, and requested substantial changes to the Project Boundary.

2-C The Lead Agency notes that this topic is beyond the scope of the DEIR, which analyzes the environmental impacts of the project. The Transformative Climate Communities program presents one potential funding sources for future implementation of Project goals; however, the program requires shovel ready development and infrastructure projects. Should the project ultimately be adopted by City Council, the City could then evaluate and apply for grants as they become available on a case-by-case basis.

2-D See Global Response No. 2 and the response 2-E.

Additionally, the Lead Agency notes that the purpose of the “Green Loop” image is to illustrate a concept where the HSR Station is effectively leveraged, in partnership with the City, to connect existing recreational amenities (the Kern River Bike Path and the Mill Creek Linear Park) to one another, via multi-modal connections. This loop concept leverages existing recreational investments, and lays a foundation to connect those to one another via a new Multi-Use Path that follows the HSR LGA alignment, an enhanced Wall Street Pedestrian Paseo, and continued improvements to the Mill Creek Linear Park to connect it to the existing Kern River Bike-path. This concept would create a complete “loop” of recreational amenities that is unique and appealing for the residents of Bakersfield and the future riders of High Speed Rail.

2-E The Lead Agency notes that the Green Loop image is overlaid upon a black and white aerial photo, and depicts the area within the green loop in a lighter hue to highlight how the green space and related active transportation connections form a connection to existing and proposed open space facilities. Any allegations of “racial steering” are wholly unfounded.
Dear Cecelia, Andy,

Please find additional public comments on the draft EIR/EIS. Can you please confirm that the AIA letter will be added to the public record (as this was previously submitted as a public comment at the Fox Theater public meeting)?

Thank you for your time.

V/r

Adam Cohen
661-912-2986
1.2 Project Description

“The Project area encompasses approximately 2.3 square miles (1,472 acres) surrounding the proposed Bakersfield HSR Station site, which is located along Golden State Avenue near intersections with Chester Avenue and F Street. The Project area is bound by California Avenue to the south, Union Avenue to the east, 38th Street and the Kern River to the north, and F Street to the west (See Figure 3).”

3-B Please provide additional factual background, including but not limited to, the fact that there are two proposed station sites and that the Federal Railroad Administration approved station, as of the date of this environmental document, is the Truxtun Station.

3-C “1. Increase Population and Economic Density In The Urban Core Under the Project, the downtown area would experience significant population growth throughout the 30-year study period. This would include up to 8,570 new residential units, increasing population density in addition to greater economic density based on major increases in retail and office space.” Please explain how concentrating this development at Garces Circle and North of Garces Circle concentrates development in the existing urban core?

3-D “3. Develop Underutilized and Vacant Properties By creating a framework for increased population and economic activity in the urban core, the Project would encourage further development of underutilized and vacant properties through increased demand for space in the area. ” City memorandums and staff reports (and other records) cite the impacts of the Hybrid alignment on parking at Rabobank Arena as a reason for the development of the F Street Station and alignment. Why is the Rabobank Arena parking lot identified as an underutilized parcel for development in this document when the City of Bakersfield has previously cited this as one key reason for pursuing an alternative alignment with a station at F Street?

3-E “4. Connect Existing Activity and Cultural Centers The Project seeks to increase the walkability of Downtown Bakersfield as well as provide for increased bicycle access. This, coupled with intercity HSR, would ensure that cultural centers and other areas of activity are increasingly interconnected throughout the life of the Plan.” Please explain how the current plan achieves this goal by connecting to the existing downtown core, Rabobank Arena/Convention Center, and Amtrak?

3-F “5. Create an Efficient, Reliable, and Effective Multi-Modal Transportation System Downtown Bakersfield would benefit from an effective multi-modal transportation system through the presence of the HSR station, the existing road network, and an increase in pedestrian and bicycle options.” Please explain how the current plan achieves this goal by connecting to Amtrak?

3-G “6. Enhance Sustainability, Livability and a Unique Sense of Place The creation of additional downtown residential units coupled with a more pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly environment would ensure that Downtown Bakersfield would be a sustainable, livable, and unique community well into the future.” Please explain how the current plan achieves this goal by concentrating this development north of two state routes traversing Central Bakersfield.

3-H 7. Secure Funding for Identified Implementation Actions By ensuring that the Project area becomes increasingly vibrant through increased population and economic growth, Bakersfield would be an attractive candidate for local, state, and federal funding for the implementation actions associated with the Project. Why did the city turn down a $35 million grant from SGC to support development in
disadvantaged census blocks in Central Bakersfield, including census blocks on the southside of this study's station area?

The EIR states “The following alternatives are evaluated in this EIR and are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 7.0 Alternatives: 1. Alternative 1: No Project. Buildout would occur under the exiting Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan or any future General Plan. 2. Alternative 2: Low Intensity/Density Design Alternative. This would consist of a reduction of overall commercial square footage/residential units and would focus future development around the HSR station. 3. Alternative 3: Medium Intensity/Design Alternative. This would consist of a reduction of overall commercial square footage/residential units, but less than the Low Intensity/Density Alternative. In addition, it would incorporate a building height cap to limit the height of any future high-rise development in the Project area.”

3-I Please explain why this EIR doesn’t analyze these alternatives identified. For example, in subsequent sections on traffic, the EIR only compares a build/no-build alternative; not Alternatives 1, 2 and 3.

3-J “Of the development alternatives being considered, the Low Intensity/Density Design Alternative (Alternative 2) could be considered environmentally superior, as it would reduce impacts in many issue areas, due primarily to the reduction in future commercial housing unit construction as well as less of a strain on both transportation and utilities infrastructure.” Which alternative is preferred? What’s the outcome of this EIR? Please clarify if this is the finding of the EIR, as this language is unclear. Please state ... “of the development alternatives being considered, Alternative “X” is the preferred alternative” – or words to that effect.

3-K As discussed in Chapter 5 of this EIR, the Project was determined to have no impact or a less-than significant impact to the following environmental issue areas and therefore, impacts to these issue areas were not further considered in the EIR: 1. Agricultural and Forestry Resources 2. Mineral Resources Is this a less than significant impact for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? Please clarify.

3-L “a. Less-than-Significant Impacts The EIR concluded that the Project would have a less-than-significant impact on the following environmental issue areas: 1. Aesthetics 2. Geology and Soils 3. Hazards and Hazardous Materials 4. Hydrology and Water Quality 5. Land Use and Planning 6. Population and Housing 7. Public Services and Recreation” Are these a less than significant impacts for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? Please clarify.

3-M “The EIR concluded that the Project would have a significant impact on the following environmental issue areas, but that incorporation of mitigation would reduce these potentially significant impacts to less than significant: 1. Air Quality 2. Biological Resources 3. Cultural Resources 4. Greenhouse Gas Emissions 5. Tribal Cultural Resources 6. Utilities and Service Systems” Are these significant impacts for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? Please clarify if there are any impacts which are significant for some alternatives but not significant or less than significant for other alternatives.

3-N “CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b) requires that the EIR describe any significant and unavoidable impacts, including those that can be mitigated but not reduced to less-than-significant levels. The EIR concluded that the Project would have significant and unavoidable impacts on the following environmental issue areas: 1. Noise 2. Transportation” Are these significant impacts for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? Please clarify if there are any impacts which are significant and unavoidable for some alternatives but not significant or less than significant or avoidable for other alternatives.
3-O Table 1 – What are the project impacts on SB743 compliance? What are the aesthetic impacts on sensitive residential receptors in the Westchester neighborhood (e.g., the multiple planned 10-35 story buildings)?

“CR-1 The Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource. The Project area contains buildings over 45 years of age and other properties that could be eligible for listing as historic resources. These resources could be affected by future development allowed under the Project. However, the adopted Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan policies, existing municipal code regulations and implementation of mitigation measures would ensure that this impact would be less than significant.”

3-P Why doesn’t this draft EIR/EIS include measures that would ensure that these impacts are less than significant? Isn’t that the purpose of this document (General Plans come and go and are updated, etc.)?

3-Q “GHG-1 The Project would implement transportation infrastructure improvements that would enhance and support use of public transit and active modes of transport, reducing VMT-related GHG emissions in the Project area. In addition, future development projects in the Project area would be subject to SJVAPCD requirements to mitigate project-level GHG emissions and would be required to comply with regulations that reduce GHG emissions. Project impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.”

3-R How would this project reduce VMT by enhancing the use of public transit? There are no public transit plans as part of this draft EIR/EIS. The downtown circulator shuttle referenced in this document was cancelled? What is the plan to provide access from a F Street HSR Station to Rabobank Arena, the Convention Center, the existing downtown core, Amtrak, and the California Corridor?

3-S “LU-2 The Project would not allow new development that would be incompatible with surrounding residential land uses and the existing pattern of development in the project footprint. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant”

3-T How is the addition of high-density development (e.g., multiple high-rise buildings) compatible with surrounding low-density residential uses?

“AES-1 The Project would facilitate changes to the visual character of the Project area, but would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the Project area and its surroundings. Development standards and design guidelines incorporated into the city’s municipal code combined with the Project’s urban design guidelines would improve the visual quality of the environment, and the proposed design review criteria for new developments would ensure their visual compatibility with existing uses in the Project area. Impacts to visual character would be less than significant”

3-U What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

“AES-2 The Project would result in new sources of light and glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. These new sources would not substantially increase the amount of light and glare for sensitive receptors such as residences in the already urbanized Project area, and would be regulated by the City’s Municipal Code. Impacts would be less than significant.”

3-V What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

“AQ-1 The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Construction activities associated with the Project would result in the temporary generation of air pollutants during construction which would affect local air quality. Compliance with SJVAPCD control
measures and construction mitigation measures would reduce construction emissions below applicable thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.”

What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

“AQ-2 The Project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The Project would generate operational emissions associated with new residential and commercial development in the Project area. Future development would be required to comply with rules established by the SJVAPCD to reduce operational emissions from new development and employee travel. Project-level compliance with SJVAPCD requirements would mitigate impacts to regional air quality to a less than significant level. In addition, the Project involves transit improvements that would support transit-oriented development and reduce per capita operational emissions associated with the Project area.”

What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

“AQ-3 The Project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Project development would place new residential and commercial uses in close proximity to major roadways and railways, which generate high levels of diesel particulate matter, a toxic air contaminant. Thus, the Project would potentially expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.”

What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

“AQ-4 The Project would increase traffic along all studied roadway segments, however, increased traffic would not result in the creation of carbon monoxide (CO) hotspots. Therefore, impacts related to CO hotspots would be less than significant.”

What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

AQ-5 The Project would not create objectionable odors that would affect neighboring properties. Impacts related to odors would be less than significant.

What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

AQ-6 The Project would have a less than significant impact to regional air quality and would not cause the regional population to exceed Kern COG population projections. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with SJVAPCD’s air quality plans and impacts would be less than significant.

What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

BIO-1 The Project would impact special-status animal species. Four special-status species were determined to have some potential to occur within or adjacent to the Project area: western pond turtle, burrowing owl, Swainson’s hawk, and San Joaquin kit fox. However, these species would not be expected to inhabit the Project area due to a lack of natural habitat; implementation of mitigation measures for individual projects and requirements of the MBHCP or future HCP would reduce impacts to this species. Potential impacts to special-status animal species would be less than significant with
mitigation incorporated. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**

**BIO-2** The Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. The Project is located within the Metropolitan Bakersfield Habitat Conservation Plan (MBHCP) area. Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-1 should be applied to each future project, as appropriate, that is tiering off from this Program EIR. Adherence to Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would ensure compliance with the MBHCP or any future HCP. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not conflict with the provisions of the MBHCP. Potential impacts to the MBHCP would be less than significant. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**

**CR-1** The Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource. The Project area contains buildings over 45 years of age and other properties that could be eligible for listing as historic resources. These resources could be affected by future development allowed under the Project. However, the adopted Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan policies, existing municipal code regulations and implementation of mitigation measures would ensure that this impact would be less than significant. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**

**CR-2** The Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource due to Ground disturbance associated with new construction. The vast majority of the Project area has been disturbed by previous development over many decades. Therefore, archeological resources that may have existed at or near the surface have likely been disturbed by past development. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**

**CR-3** The Project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature of paleontological or cultural value. Ground disturbance associated with new construction could impact paleontological resources because there are subsurficial occurrences of Pleistocene deposits throughout the Project area. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**

**CR-4** The Project could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries. Ground-disturbing activities associated with the Project could result in damage to or destruction of human burial grounds. Although much of the City is built out, the potential still exists for these resources to be present. However, Impacts to human burial grounds would be less than significant with compliance with CEQA Section 15064.5(d) and (e) and Public Resources Code §5097.98. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**

**GEO-1** The Project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo...
Earthquake Fault Zoning map. No fault lines are located in the Project area. As a result, the Project would not be subject to ground rupture. Impacts would be less than significant. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**

GEO-2 The Project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, involving strong seismic ground-shaking. With modern construction and adherence to applicable California Building Code provisions, seismically induced ground-shaking is not expected to destroy or damage structures and infrastructure. Impacts would be less than significant. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**

GEO-3 The Project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, involving Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. The Project area is not located in a liquefaction zone and has a low potential for impacts related to soil instability based on the depth of groundwater and type of soils present in the Project area. Regardless, compliance with the CBC and the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan policies would ensure that potential hazards due to liquefaction and soil stability impacts would be less than significant. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**

GEO-4 The Project is not located in an area that would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**

GEO-5 With adherence to applicable laws and regulations, the Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**

GEO-6 The Project is not located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), and would not create a substantial risk to life or property. Compliance with CBC requirements would ensure protection of structures and occupants from impacts related to expansive soils. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**

GHG-1 The Project would implement transportation infrastructure improvements that would enhance and support use of public transit and active modes of transport, reducing VMT-related GHG emissions in the Project area. In addition, future development projects in the Project area would be subject to SJVAPCD requirements to mitigate project-level GHG emissions and would be required to comply with regulations that reduce GHG emissions. Project impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**
GHG-2 The Project would promote infill, transit-oriented development consistent with regional and local policies for reducing GHG emissions. Therefore, the project would be consistent with local, regional, and State plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. This Impact would be less than significant. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What infill transit oriented development is being proposed around the Amtrak Station (within the project study area)? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

HAZ-1 The Project would not lead to a significant hazard to the public or to the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Although such materials may be used or transported through the project area, particularly during construction activities associated with development under the Project, impacts would be less than significant. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

HAZ-2 The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment and thus impacts would be less than significant. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

HAZ-3 The Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 miles of an existing school or proposed school. Existing laws and regulations ensuring the safety of the public and the environment would continue to be applied. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

HAZ-4 The Project would not result in an increased risk to public health as a result of being located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Impacts would be less than significant. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

HAZ-5 The Project area is not located within an airport land use plan, but is within two miles of a public airport. However the Project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Impacts would be less than significant. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

HAZ-6 The project area is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and therefore would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No impacts would occur. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

HAZ-7 The Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts would be less than significant. What
are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

HAZ-8 The Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. No impact would occur. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

HYD-1 The Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The Project would involve ground-disturbing activities and the use of heavy machinery that could release hazardous materials, including sediments and fuels. Operation of proposed development could also result in discharges of wastewater that could be contaminated and affect downstream waters. However, compliance with permits and regulations, and implementation of Best Management Practices would ensure that potential water quality impacts would be less than significant. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

LU-1 The Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The Project is consistent with the goals, policies, and objectives of the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan and the Kern County RTP/SCS. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

LU-2 The Project would not allow new development that would be incompatible with surrounding residential land uses and the existing pattern of development in the project footprint. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

N-1 The Project would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels or ground-borne vibration in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. Construction-related activities associated with the Project would intermittently generate temporary high construction noise levels and ground borne vibration in and adjacent to the Project area. Nevertheless, buildout of the Project would comply with the requirements of the Bakersfield General Plan policies for noise. In addition, with adherence to City of Bakersfield Municipal Code Section 9.22.050, this impact would be less than significant. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

N-2 The Project would cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project Traffic generated by Project would increase roadway noise levels for existing noise-sensitive receptors in the Project area. Noise levels would be in excess of applicable local standards established in the Bakersfield General Plan for existing buildings. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the
mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

N-3 The Project would not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Traffic generated by the Project would increase roadway noise levels for new noise-sensitive receptors, such as residences. However, compliance with the goals, policies, and standards required in the Bakersfield General Plan would reduce impacts from roadway noise. Impacts would be less than significant. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**

PH-1 The Project would induce population growth in the immediate area. The increases are within the Kern COG Regional Population projections. Therefore, impacts related to population growth would be less than significant. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**

PH-2 The Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The Project would increase the housing stock in the Project area. Therefore, impacts related to the displacement of housing and people would be less than significant. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**

PS-1 The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for fire or police services. The Project would increase demand for fire protection and police services, and potentially create the need for new service facilities. However, compliance with applicable state and local policies would reduce additional demand for fire protection and police services resulting from the Project, and expanded or new facilities would occur in developed areas, likely in urban areas of the City. Therefore, impacts related to fire protection and police services would be less than significant. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**

PS-2 The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for additional schools. The Project would add up to 6,718 students to area schools. However, with payment of State-mandated school impact fees, impacts related to public school operating capacity would be less than significant. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**

PS-3 The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for additional library facilities. The Project would increase the service population of the Kern County Library. However, three libraries exist in or are in walking distance of the Project area, and the Project area lies in an urban area where construction or expansion of facilities would have minimal environmental impacts. Impacts related to libraries would be less than significant. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?**
PS-4 The Project would increase use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility could occur or be accelerated. However, developers would be required to pay park impact fees and any construction or expansion of recreational facilities to serve the Project area population would occur in an urban setting, resulting in minimal environmental impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

T-1 The Project would conflict with the transportation system performance criteria of the City of Bakersfield and Caltrans at several intersections. The Project would increase traffic levels from existing conditions (2015) through 2025, 2035, 2045 and various CMP facilities would operate at unacceptable levels of service. However, no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts at the affected City and the affected Caltrans intersections, as the City cannot guarantee the effectiveness of the transportation demand management measures. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

T-2 The Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. There are no airports in the immediate vicinity of the Project area; therefore, the Project would not result in the change of air traffic patterns. Impacts would be less than significant. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

T-3 The Project is programmatic and would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use. Impacts would be less than significant. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

T-4 The Project is programmatic and would not result in inadequate emergency access. Given compliance with applicable Local and State requirements regarding adequate emergency access, it is not anticipated that implementation of the plan would lead to inadequate emergency access. Impacts would be less than significant. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

T-5 The Project would Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bikeways, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. Rather, the focus of the Project in terms of transportation is to create an integrated, multi-modal transportation system to improve transit, walking, and bicycling modes as priorities. Increased infrastructure for transit, pedestrians, and bicycles would result from the Project improving circulation in the Project area. Impacts to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure would be less than significant. What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3? What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? How do they differ based on different impacts?

TCR-1 The Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource While the Project would involve surface excavation, which has the potential to impact previously unidentified Tribal Cultural Resources; impacts would be less than significant with mitigation...
incorporated. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3?** What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? **How do they differ based on different impacts?**

U-1 The Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. The Project would generate an increased demand for water. Cal Water would be able to supply projected demand based on existing entitlements provided that any proposed project incorporates conservation measures. Therefore, impacts to water supply would be less than significant with mitigation. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3?** What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? **How do they differ based on different impacts?**

U-2 The Project would result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project’s demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments. The Project would generate a new source of wastewater that would flow through the existing City of Bakersfield sewer system and Treatment Plant No. 2. Local conveyance infrastructure would be upgraded in accordance with the City of Bakersfield Sewer System Maintenance plan, and would not need to be upgraded as a result of buildout under the Project. However, existing wastewater treatment facilities must be expanded to accommodate the projected growth. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3?** What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? **How do they differ based on different impacts?**

U-3 The Project would be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project’s solid waste disposal needs. The Project would generate an increase of up to 12.1 tons of solid waste per day. The Bena Landfill has adequate capacity to serve the Project; therefore, impacts related to solid waste facilities would be less than significant. **What are the impacts for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3?** What are the mitigation measures specific for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? **How do they differ based on different impacts?**

“EIR should be flexible enough to encompass either of the potential alignments/stations and to accommodate either outcome. EIR should not address environmental impacts of the station itself as this is being done in a separate document.” **How was this comment from the CHSRA addressed?** Table 2 refers the reader to the project description which states “The Project area encompasses approximately 2.3 square miles (1,472 acres) surrounding the proposed Bakersfield High Speed Rail (HSR) Station location, located along Golden State Avenue near its intersections with Chester Avenue and F Street. The Project area is bound by California Avenue to the south, Union Avenue to the east, 38th Street and the Kern River to the north, and F Street to the west. Refer to Figures 2 and 3 for the location of the proposed Making Downtown Bakersfield Project.” The project description and Figure 3 fail to describe, identify, and depict both potential alignments/stations. In particular Figure 3, only depicts one HSR station at F Street and fails to depict the Truxtun Station (currently the FRA approved station). Please correct or change Table 2 to state that this comment was not addressed.

Additionally, the comments from Adam Cohen dated September 25, 2016 make absolutely no reference to any impacts associated with the alignments. All of the impacts in this letter refer to alternatives shown at the workshop and specific to the station area process. As such, please delete the following statement “This EIR does not evaluate the specific impacts associated with the LGA scenario. The California High Speed Rail Authority is addressing the LGA impacts within their Supplemental Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement?” and write “The City
of Bakersfield did not evaluate the comments of Adam Cohen submitted at the community workshop for the development of this draft EIR/EIS held on August 23rd, 2016. The City of Bakersfield did not conduct station area and transit oriented development planning around the approved highspeed rail station at Truxtun Avenue (or the Amtrak Station) in spite of being within the Project Study Area.” Please also respond my comment dated September 22, 2016 regarding the adequacy of the notice and comment period for the scoping meeting on September 22, 2016.

Table 3 Project Phasing Phase Location – What are the development intensities for each phase under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? Is the low/density alternative not to proceed with Phase 3? Or is it to reduce densities across all three phases?

Table 3 Phase 1 location states “South of 21st St., north of Truxtun Avenue, east of Chester Avenue, and west of Q Street.” This is in error and does not match the maps. Please correct from “west of Q Street” to “west of Mill Creek linear Park”

Project Objectives “1. Increase Population and Economic Density in the Urban Core” Please edit and change “Economic Density” to “Economic Development and Jobs” – Does the increase in population refer to residential or daytime population? Please specify.

3.4.1 Land Use Concept - Phase 1 (0-10 years) states “The first phase of the Project would be implemented over the first ten years after adoption. Initial activity during this phase would occur towards the southern end of the Project area, primarily south of 21st Street, north of Truxtun Avenue, east of Chester Avenue, and west of Q Street.” Why does this differ from the map? Please correct to say “West of the Mill Creek Linear Park”

Figure 5 – Why is the City of Bakersfield proposing development on the Rabobank Arena parking lot when the city explicitly said this was a key impact/reason for pursuing the BFSSA/LGA alternative? Why is San Joaquin Hospital being rezoned/repurposed under Figure 5 and Figure 6? Why is San Joaquin Hospital not depicted as a “hospital zone” in beige? Please remove the entertainment/retail mixed uses currently over San Joaquin Hospital and clarify that the City of Bakersfield has no intent to relocate or redevelop the hospital property? If the intent is to rezone or change the function use of this property, what are the impacts of this action on community healthcare and healthcare access for Bakersfield residents and the costs associated with relocating and/or moving the hospital?

Figures 4-6 – What does “rehabilitation” zone mean? Please explain.

Table 4 – What are the projections are for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. Does “low” signify Alternative 2? Does high signify Alternative 3? What are the growth projections for a no-build scenario, Alternative 1?

Table 4 does not seem to match the alternatives that were identified for study in the EIR. Table 4 has 4 density options, a high-low range based on no HSR and a high-low range with HSR. Of these numbers, which correspond to Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. Where/what is the 4th project alternative?

“In addition to the growth above, the Project also includes mobility and parking strategies for the Project area described in Section 3.4.3. The Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan includes recommendations for all travel mode types, including automobile, bicycle, pedestrian, and public transit.” What types of public transit (e.g., Amtrak, bus, light-rail, etc.)?
“The proposed HSR station at F Street and Golden State Highway would serve to strengthen and reanimate Chester Avenue, the historic “Main Street” of Bakersfield. Multiple points of access to and from the HSR station would enhance opportunities for transit-oriented development within Bakersfield’s historic core, and would make Garces Circle a regional destination, with significant reinvestment in commercial and hospitality uses and supporting infrastructure.”

Why does this statement conflict with the CHSRA comment “EIR should be flexible enough to encompass either of the potential alignments/stations and to accommodate either outcome” that this draft EIR/EIS says was addressed. How does this statement address multiple points of access to/from a HSR station at Truxtun and a transit oriented development around a Truxtun station?”

“No specific land use and development standards are included in the Project. Therefore, the uses and permit requirements for projects that would be developed under the Project would be based on the existing zoning designations and associated standards established by the City of Bakersfield Zoning Ordinance (Municipal Code Title 17). Future changes in land use and/or zoning that may be completed, such as a specific plan or a development project, for the City to implement the Project as discussed in the Vision Plan for Downtown Bakersfield. Once certified, any project consistent with the Project and this program EIR can take advantage of more streamlined environmental review.”

Why do Figures 4-6 depict notable zoning and land use changes (e.g., conversion of existing residential to retail/entertainment; and the conversion of existing retail/entertainment to residential)?

“Public Realm Upgrades. The Project identifies the expansion of Wall Street, the use of the area beneath the future high speed rail viaduct, and the revitalization of Garces Circle as multi-modal corridors linking new commercial and residential uses with open spaces, activity centers, and recreational uses.”

Why does this statement conflict with the CHSRA comment “EIR should be flexible enough to encompass either of the potential alignments/stations and to accommodate either outcome” that this draft EIR/EIS says was addressed. How does this statement address multiple points of access to/from a HSR station at Truxtun and a transit oriented development around a Truxtun station?” What public realm upgrades are applicable to the other (Hybrid) alignment?

“Transit. Multiple transit options in and out of Downtown Bakersfield currently exist and therefore the Project proposes upgrades and interventions to induce higher quality transit services combined with transit-oriented development. The first transit investment includes upgrading both California and Chester Avenue transit service to Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), which ultimately would include dedicated bus lanes, on and off-boarding stations, transit shelters, upgraded busses, and possibly bike lanes. The second transit investment a circulator shuttle, which would travel along F and 34th Streets, down Q Street to the Amtrak station, and down to California. This shuttle would also link to the BRT lines. The final investment includes the creation of two new mobility hubs located at the future HSR Station and the existing Amtrak station. These mobility hubs would offer multiple transit and transportation options (HSR, passenger rail, bus, bike, and pedestrian connections) either at the origin, destination, or transfer point for a significant portion of the trips.”

For consistency with the CHSRA’s comment stating “EIR should be flexible enough to encompass either of the potential alignments/stations and to accommodate either outcome” that this draft EIR/EIS says was responded to, why does the document not state “Amtrak/Truxtun High-Speed Rail Station (if built)” – or words to that effect.

“Three primary upgrades include: (1) establishing a protected bike lane network and bike friendly intersection improvements within the western, central, and eastern Project area, (2) establishing a bike...
boulevard on K-Street, and (3) establishing an east-west trending bike boulevard on 21st Street, across the Project area. Why was the southern project area excluded from these proposed bicycle improvements?

3.5.1 “The key sites where future development is envisioned include blocks in between Chester Avenue and Central Park, 20th, and 17th streets for the 10-year Phase One.” Why does this statement differ from the Figure 4? Please revise to say in between Chester Avenue and Mill Creek, and 21st St and Truxtun” for the 10-year Phase One Plan.” What is the development goal and intensity? Does this plan not want mid-rise and active ground uses for Phase 1? Why isn’t this identified as a planning goal? Please specify “mid-rise mixed-use development and active ground floor uses” for Phase 1.

“The second 10-year interval, Phase Two, focuses on mid-rise mixed-use development and active ground floor uses, primarily in the blocks along Chester Avenue and around Garces Circle.” How will this impact existing land uses at San Joaquin Hospital? Figure 5-6 show this development occurring on the hospital ... is this correct? What are the low and medium density alternatives for this Phase (Alternative 2 and Alternative 3)?

“This final phase would include mid- to high-rise development, active ground floor uses, as well as consolidation of the development on F Street and 34th Street.” Why does this conflict with the “What We Heard” summary from the city’s community meeting asking for this development concentrated in the urban core between Chester Ave and Mill Creek? How is this considered no significant impact and consistent with the development in the adjacent Westchester residential community? What are the low and medium density alternatives for this Phase (Alternative 2 and Alternative 3)?

“Subsequent projects that are outside the scope of this EIR may be subject to a more streamlined environmental review process if determined appropriate by the City of Bakersfield Planning Department. Should subsequent development projects differ significantly from the anticipated development scope and realistic densities/intensities described in this EIR, such as the size, type, height, or location of structures and uses or the access routes in and around the site, additional environmental review shall be required pursuant to CEQA. Additionally, subsequent specific development projects in the Project area that were not part of the primary development areas identified would require site-specific environmental review pursuant to CEQA.” What are densities/intensities for the parcels in this draft EIR/EIS? Where are the proposed sizes, types, heights anticipated? What Floor-to-Area-Ratio (if any)? What height limits (if any)? How many dwelling units per acre?

“Additionally, subsequent specific development projects in the Project area that were not part of the primary development areas identified would require site-specific environmental review pursuant to CEQA.” Given this statement, what are the environmental impacts for the proposed development? Earlier in the draft EIR/EIS, the document states “This EIR is as an informational document for use in the City’s review and consideration of the Project. It is to be used to facilitate implementation of the Project that incorporates environmental considerations and planning principles into a cohesive policy document. The Project guides subsequent actions taken by the City in its review of new development projects in the Project area and its establishment of new and/or revised development policies and standards for the Project area.” Does this mean that the city will not require CEQA review for projects within the Project Study Area? Is the City trying to circumvent CEQA by not disclosing the full impacts of unknown parcel-specific future development by claiming those impacts are studied within this document?
Table 5 Project Buildout Potential - **What are the buildout estimates for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3?**

“The actual rate and amount of development would depend upon market conditions and regulatory processes. Buildout estimates for residential and non-residential growth under the Project include 8,570 residential units, 2,005,000 square feet of office space, 906,988 square feet of retail space, and up to 2,413 hotel rooms.”

**What are the buildout estimates for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3?**

For the Project to be implemented, it would require adoption by the Bakersfield City Council. No other discretionary approvals would be required for adoption of the Project.

**Does this mean a specific development project or the implementation of this vision plan?**

The study area for the Project is generally located in the area of F Street and Golden State Avenue at the northern edge of Downtown Bakersfield. The Project area encompasses approximately three to five miles around the proposed HSR station and includes the parallel alignments of the Union Pacific Rail Road (UPRR) and Golden State Expressway (SR 204), Golden Empire Transit (GET) bus facilities, and other transit-oriented amenities.

**Why does this statement conflict with the CHSRA comment “EIR should be flexible enough to encompass either of the potential alignments/stations and to accommodate either outcome” that this draft EIR/EIS says was addressed. Why does it say this comment was addressed when it actually wasn’t addressed?**

“The major arterial providing immediate access to the Project area is SR 204, which connects to SR 99, SR 178, SR 14, and SR 58. The Project area’s roadway network consists of a historic street grid with small blocks and alleys. In the Project area, bus lines generally operate on major arterials providing connections beyond downtown, including Chester, 23rd and 24th streets and Truxtun. GET lines also operate on F Street, 21st Street and Q St.”

**Why does this statement conflict with the CHSRA comment “EIR should be flexible enough to encompass either of the potential alignments/stations and to accommodate either outcome” that this draft EIR/EIS says was addressed. Why does it say this comment was addressed when it actually wasn’t addressed?**

“The Project area encompasses approximately three to five miles around the proposed HSR station and includes transit, commercial, industrial, and residential development. The Project area is generally located in the area of F Street and SR 204 (Golden State Avenue) at the northern edge of Downtown Bakersfield.”

**Why does this statement conflict with the CHSRA comment “EIR should be flexible enough to encompass either of the potential alignments/stations and to accommodate either outcome” that this draft EIR/EIS says was addressed. Why does it say this comment was addressed when it actually wasn’t addressed?**

Why do Figures 4-7 only depict one HSR Station Location. Why does this statement conflict with the CHSRA comment “EIR should be flexible enough to encompass either of the potential alignments/stations and to accommodate either outcome” that this draft EIR/EIS says was addressed. Why does it say this comment was addressed when it actually wasn’t addressed?

**Under Section 5, where is the KernCOG Terminal Impact Analysis plan? This is an approved high-speed rail station area plan.**

**Where’s the discussion of SB743 on page 139-140?**
Table 12: “The project would facilitate infill development near existing and planned local, regional, and inter-regional transit. It would also coordinate with the High-Speed Rail Authority to provide sufficient parking to serve transit users and enable high-volume use of transit.”  

**What are the measures being used to support in-fill development in the vicinity of the Amtrak Mobility Hub?**

“As described in the table above, the Project would include improvements to the bicycle network serving the Project area, including creation of a bike boulevard.”  

**What active transportation facilities will provide north/south access across downtown, both east and west of Chester Avenue?**

“The project would facilitate large-scale new development in conjunction with transit improvements to support a mass transit system for Bakersfield. In addition to adding BRT and expanding bicycle facilities, the project would provide a circulator shuttle to serve the downtown area contribute to creating parking for transit users in collaboration with the High-Speed Rail Authority.”  

**A downtown shuttle like this was previously in existence and was removed. Why this is a shuttle and not a light-rail?**

“Though the Project area is beyond the aircraft clear zone for both airports, it is located along the aircraft corridor, where there is the potential an accident could involve an aircraft carrying hazardous materials and fuels in general overflight (Bakersfield & Kern 2002a; Kern 2012).”  

**How is this compatible with the proposed high-rise development around Garces Circle? How does this impact future growth at Meadows Field (e.g., new runways, Class C or Class B airspace upgrades, etc.)?**

5.9 – “The Master Plan for the Mill Creek Linear Park Project was completed in April 2007. The Mill Creek Project consists of a 1.5 mile portion of the Kern Island Canal which runs through historic Downtown Bakersfield, from Golden State Avenue to California Avenue. The canal would be transformed into a “natural creek” and pedestrian corridor. The creation of this linear park, an oasis within the center of Bakersfield, would serve as an added attraction to the growing city.”  

**Why does this state ‘Golden State Avenue to California Avenue when Mill Creek ends at 24th Street?**

“Phase I development would occur within 10 years of Project implementation. Development would occur primarily in the southern portion of downtown south of 21st St., north of Truxtun Avenue, east of Chester Avenue, and west of Q Street. Development would include mixed use entertainment/infill areas, improvements to the existing bicycle network, and a complete street concept on Chester Avenue.”  

**Why does this say West of Q St when Phase 1 extends to West of Mill Creek Linear Park?**

“Phase II development would occur 10-20 years after Project implementation. Development and redevelopment would take place in the immediate vicinity of the proposed HSR station, located along Golden State Avenue near its intersections with Chester and F Streets.”  

**Why does this statement conflict with the CHSRA comment “EIR should be flexible enough to encompass either of the potential alignments/stations and to accommodate either outcome” that this draft EIR/EIS says was addressed. Why does it say this comment was addressed when it actually wasn’t addressed?**

“Phase I development would occur within 10 years of Project implementation. Development would occur primarily in the southern portion of downtown south of 21st St., north of Truxtun Avenue, east of Chester Avenue, and west of Q Street. Development would include mixed use entertainment/infill areas, improvements to the existing bicycle network, and a complete street concept on Chester Avenue.

Phase II development would occur 10-20 years after Project implementation. Development and redevelopment would take place in the immediate vicinity of the proposed HSR station, located along
Golden State Avenue near its intersections with Chester and F Streets. Activities would include rehabilitation of existing areas as well as mixed-use infill areas, office mixed-use, residential infill, and shuttles to take people between the HSR and Amtrak mobility hubs. Phase III development would occur 20-30 years after Project implementation. Development would occur in the area bound by the HSR station to the west, the Kern River to the northwest, and areas adjacent to the Kern County Museum. Under the Project, this area is would experience residential infill, office mixed-use, and retail mixed-use. What are the development intensities for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 under these phases?

Future development that could pose issues related to building height would be addressed on an individual project basis. Why not move the proposed high-rise development to East of H Street, West of Q Street, north of Truxtun, and South of 21st Street to address this issue and other stakeholder feedback (including the American Institute of Architects local chapter and other stakeholders) to place high density development in this area.

“Cumulative development in the Project area, represented by buildout under the Project, could result in an overall intensification of land uses. As discussed in Section 3.0, Project Description, the Project would accommodate up to 8,570 residential units, up to 2,005,000 square feet of office space, 906,000 square feet of retail, and up to 2,413 hotel rooms. Although the Project could guide an increase in intensity beyond that envisioned in the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan, the specific impacts would be less than significant and future development or redevelopment projects that would occur under the Project would be evaluated on an individual basis. Therefore the project-specific impacts associated with land use consistency would be less than significant. Potential impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.” What are the cumulative project impacts for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3?

Figure 18 (and related text) – Why is CA 178 between Union Ave and Chester Ave not studied as an existing noise contour?

Table 24 – Historic populations for Bakersfield and Kern County don’t add a lot of value unless you include corresponding growth rates.

“According to the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan, the population growth of the metropolitan area between 2002 and 2020 was anticipated around 20% (Bakersfield & Kern 2002a). Due to the age of the General Plan, and given that we are two years from 2020, this statement should be deleted in its entirety.

“The city of Bakersfield has had a steadily increasing population with an average annual growth rate at about 3% however, in recent years the rate of growth has decreased (Bakersfield 2016).” Why? This is important.

The draft EIR/EIS states “According to the 2011-2015 American Community Survey (ACS), the median household income for Kern County was $49,026 annually” however Table 25 states “Table 25 Median Household Income in 2015”. Please reconcile ... are the values from Table 25 from 2015 or 2011-2015?

What AMIs for Kern County are Extremely Low Income: up to 30% of AMI; Very Low Income: 31-50% of AMI; and Low Income: 51-80% of AMI?

Regional Housing Needs Allocation – Is this sections complaint with recent changes to California law?
“Full buildout of the Project would involve the development of up to 8,570 residential units, 2,413 hotel units, 905,988 square feet of retail space, and 2,005,000 square feet of office space. This development would induce population growth in the Project area by providing new dwelling units and would also contribute to population growth by providing new retail and office space to accommodate job growth” and Table 29.

What project Alternative is this for? What are the projections for Alternative 1, 2, and 3?

Table 30 and Table 31.

What project Alternative is this for? What are the projections for Alternative 1, 2, and 3?

Figure 22 (and related analysis).

Why aren’t intersections along Q, M, and L Streets studied given potential traffic volumes between a F Street HSR station and access to/from Rabobank Arena, the Convention Center, and Amtrak? Please study.

For the Project, HR&A Advisors, Inc. conducted market analysis of projected growth in land use categories (office, residential, retail and hotel). Nine scenarios were developed: Low (Baseline), Low (With High-Speed Rail) and High (With Downtown Revitalization and High-Speed Rail), for 10-, 20- and 30-year horizons.

Why doesn’t this analysis match and correspond to Alternatives 1, 2, and 3?

“Chester Avenue: One general-purpose lane in each direction would be converted to a business/access/transit lane in which through travel by private vehicles is prohibited, but right turns are allowed. California Avenue: One general-purpose lane in each direction would be converted to a transit-only lane.”

Why doesn’t the change to California Avenue specify ‘travel by private vehicles is prohibited, but right turns are allowed.” Please add this. What sections of California Avenue will be converted (from what intersection to what intersection)? Please specify. What sections of Chester Avenue will be converted (from what intersection to what intersection)? Please specify.

“Chester Avenue: One general-purpose lane in each direction would be converted to a business/access/transit lane in which through travel by private vehicles is prohibited, but right turns are allowed. California Avenue: One general-purpose lane in each direction would be converted to a transit-only lane.”

What will be the level of service impacts along these corridors in 2035 for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? In corridors where lanes will be removed for transit-only lanes, what assumptions are being made about future modal split (both local traffic using those corridors not going to HSR; and local traffic with first/last mile connections to HSR)? What will be the level of service impacts along these corridors in 2035 for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 with autonomous vehicles?

Why are transit-only lanes being considered on California Avenue when this is outside of the project study area?

Why does the call out labeled #3 say 34th Street but # 3 shown on the map is Garces Circle on the map? Is 34th and Chester being converted to a traffic circle?

Figure 23.

Why does Figure 24 differ from the traffic plan proposed by the CHSRA in the BFSSA draft EIR/EIS? Specifically, why does the CHSRA depict Garces Circle in the traffic plan and the city’s draft EIR/EIS show Garces Circle being removed? What would happen to Garces statue?

Figure 23-24 (and related analysis).

Are these the same mitigation measures for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3?
“Traffic conditions at the study intersections listed in subsection b of Section 5.13.3, Existing Conditions, were evaluated for the following scenarios: Existing Conditions (2015) without Project, Planning Horizon (2025) without Project, Planning Horizon (2025) with Project, Planning Horizon (2035) without Project, Planning Horizon (2035) with Project, Planning Horizon (2045) without Project, Planning Horizon (2045) with Project.”

Where is the study of traffic conditions for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? Why doesn’t the traffic study match the Alternatives listed for study at the beginning of the document?

Figure 26 – Why does Figure 26 not match the alternatives being studied in Figure 24? Specifically, Figure 26 retains Garces Circle while Figure 24 removal and/or reconfiguration/closure of Garces Circle.

Figures 23-30 – Intersection 2 Callout – What are the street names? Not all of the East/West Street names are listed for the turning movements? Please clarify.

Figure 24-30 – What are the traffic volumes for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3?

Table 36 – What are the traffic volumes and LOS for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3?

“Introduction of carshare and bikeshare programs; including reserved parking spaces outside of the station for carshare/bikeshare vehicles, and subsidized membership in carshare programs” What is the cost of the subsidized memberships to the city? What is the cost to GET?

“Subsidized transit passes for employees in the Project area” What is the cost of subsidized transit passes to the city? What is the cost to GET?

“Implement an “Employer Pass Program” where operators offer bulk passes to employers at a discounted rate for employee use” What is the cost to the city? What is the cost to GET?

“Guaranteed ride home” program in which employees who took transit or other alternative modes to work are offered a limited number of fully-subsidized taxi rides home after hours” – What is the cost to the city? What is the cost to GET? What is the cost to employers?

There are no airports within the Project area. The nearest airports are Meadows Field Airport, located approximately 1.7 miles northwest, and Bakersfield Municipal Airport, located approximately 2.5 miles south from the Project area. The proposed Vision Plan would not interfere with or alter air traffic patterns in or near the Project area.” What are the impacts of the planned high-rise development at or near Chester and Golden State Avenue on the approach paths, glide slope buffers, and future airspace considerations (including potential Class B and C airspace) for Meadows Field?

What are the impacts of Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, (in terms of development intensity) on all city services (including schools, healthcare, fire, police, water, electric, and solid waste?)

Table 40 Water Demand for Project Buildout – What/where are the impacts/estimates for Alternative 1, 2, and 3?

Table 42 Project Generated Wastewater Flows - What/where are the impacts/estimates for Alternative 1, 2, and 3?

Table 43 Solid Waste Generation - What/where are the impacts/estimates for Alternative 1, 2, and 3?
Section 7 “Each alternative is described and analyzed below. As required by CEQA, this section also includes a discussion of the “environmentally superior alternative” among those studied.” Where were the impacts for Alternative 1, 2, and 3 in Sections 1-6? In other words, the study analysis does not correspond to Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 in Section 7.

Table 44 – Why does Alternative 3 assume 80% buildout of the project? Why does Alternative 1 (the low density alternative, assume 60% buildout of the project? Is the city saying there is only a 20% density differential between the low density (Alternative 2) and the medium density (Alternative 3) Why does the no build alternative assume ~50% development if its no build/no project?

Alternative 2 would generate less peak hour and daily trips compared to the Project. Where are the data for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3?

“Alternative 3 would accommodate 1,715 fewer residential units, 437,500 less square feet of office space, 140,075 less square feet of retail space, and 500 fewer hotel units.” Why does alternative 3 accommodate “less” development when Alternative 3 is the highest density alternative being studied?

“Alternative 3 would generate less peak hour and daily trips compared to the Project, but more than Alternative 2.” Where are the data for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3?

“The “River District” Alternative was considered, which concentrated mixed-use development within and/or adjacent to the Kern River and the F-Street High Speed Rail Station.” Was this part of an alternatives analysis? Where is either the alternatives analysis and/or the river district discussed?

The beginning of the EIR states “Of the development alternatives being considered, the Low Intensity/Density Design Alternative (Alternative 2) could be considered environmentally superior, as it would reduce impacts in many issue areas, due primarily to the reduction in future commercial housing unit construction as well as less of a strain on both transportation and utilities infrastructure” whereas the end of the EIR states “Alternatives 2 and 3 could be considered environmentally superior, as they would reduce impacts related to air quality, greenhouse gas, noise, and traffic due primarily to the reduction in housing units.” Given that the front and back of the document have different CEQA outcomes/conclusions identified, which Alternative (2 or 3) is considered environmentally superior? Will the public have the ability to comment on a revised draft EIR/EIS when the public is told which Alternative is considered environmentally superior? (Please refer to Page 3 and 312, respectively).
Appendix A.

3-CR PDF page 8 of 414 – Why does this study area not match the study area in the main body of the draft EIR/EIS document. Specifically, the first PDF file does not depict both HSR stations currently under consideration whereas the Notice of Preparation filed with the State Clearinghouse does depict two proposed CHSRA stations (one at F Street and one at Truxtun Ave, respectively). Why does the body of the draft EIR/EIS (Figures 3-6) differ from the Notice of Preparation (map in Appendix A)?

Appendix B.

3-CS "Intersection operations were evaluated for the following scenarios: Existing Conditions (2015) without project □ Planning Horizon (2025) without project □ Planning Horizon (2025) with project □ Planning Horizon (2035) without project □ Planning Horizon (2035) with project □ Planning Horizon (2045) without project □ Planning Horizon (2045) with project" Why does this analysis not correspond to Alternatives 1, 2, and 3? Where is the analysis for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3?

3-CT Why does the zoning depicted in Figure 2 of Appendix 2 not match the zoning in Figures 3-6 of the main draft/EIR/EIS document? Are the traffic volumes not based on the proposed zoning?

3-CU Table 5-6 – Where are the analysis/data for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3?

3-CV Figure 6 – Why does the traffic analysis include proposed development that is at the existing San Joaquin Community Hospital site?

3-CW Tables 7-13 – Where are the data and analysis for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3?

Appendix C

3-CX This analysis in this section compares a project and no project alternatives (2 alternatives). Where are the analysis/data for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3?

Appendix D

Appendix E

3-CY This analysis in this section compares a project and no project alternatives (2 alternatives). Where are the analysis/data for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3?

Appendix F

3-CZ Why is the “Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan” an appendix of the draft EIR/EIS? Isn’t the “Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan” supposed to be a CEQA approved document (rather than a supporting document for this draft EIR/EIS)?

3-DA Why does this study area in Appendix A (Notice of Preparation) not match the study area in Appendix F (map on Page 5) and other maps throughout the entire Appendix F. Specifically, Appendix F does not depict both HSR stations currently under consideration whereas the Notice of Preparation filed with the State Clearinghouse does depict two proposed CHSRA stations (one at F Street and one at Truxtun Ave, respectively). This also conflicts with the CHSRA’s comments previously noted that the “city’s
planning and environmental process must be defined to be flexible enough to accommodate either alignment/station outcome until the California High Speed Rail Authority and the Federal Railroad Administration take action on an alignment/station in Bakersfield based on the SEIR/S” – or words to that effect.

3-DB Why do the data in Table 1 of Appendix F not match the data in the body of the draft EIR/EIS or the data used in the analysis of Appendices B-E?

“The final Open House attracted more than 150 participants, and sought to confirm the final vision for Downtown while collecting input and champions for the implementation strategy (see Chapter 4: Phased Development Strategy and Appendix I: Implementation Matrix)” – Why is this statement here?

3-DC Gunnar Hand was recorded stating at the Fox Theater – “we’re not taking questions” or words to that effect. Additionally, why is the letter from the Golden Empire Chapter of the American Institute of Architects (submitted as a public comment on the vision plan) excluded to and not responded to in the draft EIR/EIS or in Appendix F? An additional copy of this was provided to Cecelia Gregio and Andrew Heglund during the public comment period of this document as well for reference.

3-DD Figure 20 – Why is the “Green Loop” considered part of Appendix F when it is outside of the project study area (i.e., north of Columbus St along Union Avenue to the Kern River)? Why isn’t the Mill Creek linear park/green belt along the same canal to Brundage Avenue? Is there a socio-economic and/or racial bias against a low-income Latin American/African American community along the same canal on the southside? Why does the plan propose an infrastructure improvement in a white neighborhood outside of the study area and not an equivalent improvement in an African American neighborhood equally outside of the study area? For environmental justice reasons, if this is retained, please extend the Mill Creek linear park/green belt along the same canal to Brundage Avenue for equity reasons.

3-DE Page 58-59 – The design of Garces Circle is a bit unclear due to the size of the three figures on the right. It is not at all clear how routing traffic on one side of Garces Circle while retaining BRT on the other side of Garces Circle does anything to improve walkability (you still have to cross a circle in which all sides have motorized traffic.

3-DG Page 62-63 – It is not clear why F St and 34th St are identified for regional traffic while Chester Avenue is identified for local traffic. Of these three corridors, only Chester Avenue connects to CA-58 and Westside Parkway via Centennial Corridor.

3-DH Page 80 – Why is the Kern River District listed as a policy action when the draft EIR/EIS (main document) states that the Kern River District was eliminated as an alternative?
A three development strategies (0-10 Year, 10-20 Year, and 20-30 Year) – The parcel immediately south of Rabobank Arena located between the BNSF (to the North) L St to the West; Former 14th St (to the South) and Q St to the East) is identified as Entertainment Mixed-Use Zoning. This site is also identified in Appendix F as a future parking structure. Can you please explain the discrepancy and the duplicate zoning? What are the parking needs/forecasts for Rabobank Arena and the Convention Center given the growth of Transportation Network Companies? What will be the parking needs/forecasts for Rabobank Arena and the Convention Center in an automated future? What are these parking estimates based on?
**Letter No. 3: Adam Cohen, February 10, 2018**

3-A Please see response 1-A.

3-B Please see Global Response No. 3.

3-C Please see Global Response No. 4.

3-D Please see Global Responses No. 3 & 4.

3-E Please see Global Responses No. 4 and 5. The Lead Agency also notes that the Project proposes a multi-modal transportation system with recommendations for roadway improvements and enhancements as well as recommendations to transit network with connections to Amtrak, HSR station and both existing and proposed transit corridors.

3-F Please see Global Responses No. 4 and 5, and response to 3-E.

3-G The Lead Agency notes that the Project recommendations are consistent with TOD development and practices shown in the cases studies prepared as part of the existing conditions report (See Appendix VII). Key lessons learned were that station integration ensures that Bakersfield will have a HSR station that can be fully leveraged. HSR has the potential to induce unprecedented development and one of the most documented effects of HSR is the increased station area concentration and density of development that coincide with HSR service. The project recognizes that possibility and developed a 30-year phased development strategy demonstrating the concentration of growth occurring around the LGA station site.

With this new development node around the station site, the project also incorporates multimodal connectivity between the HSR station and the surrounding neighborhoods and spurs development along connections to the HSR station. Such connectivity policies include multimodal connections that can take people from the HSR station to other intra-city areas, as well as major investments in the public realm.

3-H The Lead Agency notes that the City was not offered a $35 million dollar grant. Grants include a competitive and comprehensive application process. See response 2-C.

3-I The Lead Agency notes that the EIR has been prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, Consideration and Discussion of Alternatives to the Proposed Project, (d) Evaluation of alternatives it states, “The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. A matrix displaying the major characteristics and significant environmental effects of each alternative may be used to summarize the comparison. If an alternative would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the significant effects of the alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.” There is not a requirement to address alternatives to the same level as the project is analyzed.

3-J CEQA requires identification of an “Environmentally Superior Alternative.” As discussed in Chapter 7, Alternatives, and identified in the Executive Summary, Alternative 2 was identified as being the environmentally superior alternative.

3-K See response 3-I. The Lead Agency notes that this document is a CEQA document (PEIR) and not an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
document. NEPA documents, as prepared for CHSRA projects, have different requirements for the study of project alternatives.

3-L See response 3-I.

3-M See response 3-I.

3-N See response 3-I.

3-O The Lead Agency notes that, at this time, compliance with SB 743 (Vehicle Miles Travelled or VMT) is not required. The State is in the process of developing regulations for the implementation of SB 743 and it is up to each jurisdiction if they want to develop local policies traffic and transportation policies related to VMT.

3-P The Lead Agency notes that cumulative aesthetic impacts were found to have a less than significant impact.

3-Q The Lead Agency notes that the EIR is not an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Mitigation Measure CR-1, copied below, would reduce potential impacts to historical resources to a less than significant level.

**MM CR-1 SITE SPECIFIC HISTORICAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT**

Prior to the issuance of grading/building permits for construction activities that have the potential to affect a historical resource, project proponents shall demonstrate to the City of Bakersfield that they have obtained a historical resources assessment by an architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards (PQS) in architectural history or history. The assessment shall include a reconnaissance-level and/or intensive-level survey in accordance with the California Office of Historic Preservation guidelines to identify any previously unrecorded potential historical resources that may be potentially affected by the Project. Pursuant to the definition of a historical resource under CEQA, potential historical resources shall be evaluated under current guidelines. If significant historical resources are identified within a project site, compliance with the Standards and/or avoidance shall be followed and appropriate site-specific mitigation measures shall be established and undertaken.

3-R The Lead Agency notes that the plan calls for a core reinvestment and vision for mass transit in the Downtown:

A further concentration of transit lines supported by multi-modal options will make Downtown Bakersfield the regional mobility hub, which will lead to increased densities around transit, reduced parking demands, and a walkable urban environment. This Vision Plan identifies upgrades and interventions to induce transit-oriented development and prepare Downtown to accommodate projected development through high-quality transit service (VP, pg 42).

Also discussed is a circulation shuttle, “to travel on an upgraded F and 34th Streets (complete streets), down Q Street to the Amtrak station, then on to California Avenue, and over to Chester Avenue before completing the loop back to F Street.”

3-S As discussed under Impact LU-2, the project does not propose development incompatible with surrounding residential uses:
Existing commercial land uses in the downtown area primarily include neighborhood commercial uses scattered throughout downtown, including adjacent to existing residential areas in the northern portion of the Project footprint near the proposed HSR station. Existing residential uses are located east and west of the proposed HSR station as well as scattered throughout other areas of downtown.

The Project outlines three objectives and seven primary goals (outlined in detail in Section 3.0, Project Description). To meet these objectives and goals, the Project is designed to create a sustainable mix of urban neighborhoods focused on providing a blend of commercial uses, residential uses, and a transit-oriented layout and lifestyle centered on the proposed HSR station. It also includes improvements to the existing bicycle and pedestrian network, as well as improved bus connectivity with both the future HSR station and the existing Amtrak station.

3-T See response 3-I.

3-U See response 3-I. See Global Response No 1. The existing City zoning allows for future transit-oriented development and a mix of commercial uses including office, retail, residential and hotel.

3-V See response 3-I.

3-W See Global Response No 3 and 4.

3-X The description of the comments submitted by Adam Cohen on September 25, 2016 has been revised. See Section 9.2 Revisions to the Draft EIR.

3-Y The Lead Agency complied with the noticing requirements of CEQA and the CEQA guidelines in providing notice to the public of the comment period and scoping meeting.

3-Z The existing land use entitlements determine the density of development to occur. In DEIR, see Table 44 Comparison of Proposed Project Alternatives’ Buildout Characteristics for projected development for each alternative.

3-AA The Phase 1 Respond Development Zone extends to “west of Mill Creek Linear Park” and that reference has been corrected in the Final EIR. See Sect. 9.2 Revisions to the Draft EIR

3-AB The Lead Agency notes this request for the record. The increase in population refers to increased residential.

3-AC See response 3-AA.

3-AD All vacant lots and parking lots in the Vision Plan area have potential for redevelopment as infill development projects are proposed. See Global Response No. 6.

3-AE The Rehabilitation Zone signifies an area that could potentially be targeted for rehabilitation assistance programs and policies with a focus on improving the existing residents, businesses and building stock.

3-AF See response 3-Z.

3-AG Table 4 includes project growth projections originally prepared in the Economic Development Analysis (Appendix II) for the project. The EIR alternatives are potential buildout scenarios within the total potential buildout projected.

3-AH See Vision Plan pages 40-45.
Bike improvements occur throughout the Vision Plan area including expansion of existing bike facilities in the southern area. The Vision Plan encourages the comprehensive expansion of the City’s existing bike network, and these three examples were meant to introduce three best practices in closing critical gaps, upgrading existing bike facilities, and introducing new bike facility typologies.

The Vision Plan encourages new development Downtown in the first 10-years to be guided in a way to increase connectivity of the Mill Creek Entertainment District to the Historic Core. The type, intensity and pattern of that development will be more fully elaborated through a community-driven process such as an overlay zone or design guidelines. See response 3-AA. Existing zoning allows mid-rise mixed use development and active ground floor uses in all three development phases.

Comments received at public meetings helped guide the development of the Vision Plan. Significant focus was made on the core of downtown, including revitalization and connection of the core to the HSR Station. The 0-10 year plan focuses on the urban core to guide development in a way to better connect the Mill Creek Entertainment District to the Historic Core. See response 3-I. Existing zoning allows mid-rise mixed use development and active ground floor uses in all three development phases.

No other discretionary approval means there will be no other action taken by City Council after this Vision Plan is adopted. City staff will then start implementation of the plan.

There will only be one High-Speed Rail station in the City of Bakersfield. See Global Response No. 4.

The High-Speed Rail Terminal Impact Analysis was prepared by KernCOG in 2003 to assess the options for Bakersfield’s future high-speed rail station. This report served as early guidance for the future station. Recent HSR Authority action likely lead to the Bakersfield station located at F Street and Golden State Avenue.

SB 743 is discussed on page 247-248 of the DEIR under Section 5.13.5, Transportation.

As demonstrated by the Phased Development Strategy, the Project focuses on creating connectivity in the Downtown core and building on current investments and infrastructure.
to connect Downtown to the rest of Bakersfield. The Project proposes various pedestrian and bike infrastructure improvement and recommends policies, design guidelines, specific plans and various strategies for making downtown more walkable and accessible to the rest of the community, including shuttle service between the HSR and Amtrak stations. See Appendix I: Implementation Matrix.

3-BC The Vision Plan encourages the comprehensive expansion of the City’s existing bike network. Specifically, a K Street Bike Boulevard is planned (Vision Plan, Bike Upgrades Figure 31, pg. 49). In addition, the Vision Plan, “focuses on the three strategies below (see Figure 30) for expanding the bike network, connecting directly with transit, and overall Making Downtown Bakersfield more bike-friendly.” (Vision Plan, pg. 48, Figure 30, pg. 48).

3-BD The Vision Plan proposes a Downtown Shuttle. This does not preclude a light rail system in the future. Generally, light rail systems have a higher start-up cost, more extensive infrastructure and construction impacts, and are less flexible to adapt to changes in travel demands that can occur over a 30-year period.

3-BE Future development will be required to be consistent with aircraft clear zones and other airport planning. Consistency with airport planning will take place on a case-by-case basis as projects are proposed, including high-rise development near Garces Circle.

3-BF Mill Creek Park’s north end is at the intersection of Golden State Avenue and 24th Street.

3-BG Text was changed to say west of Q Street and Mill Creek Linear Park. See Sect. 9.2 revisions.

3-BH See Global Response No. 3 and 4.

3-BI In DEIR, see Table 44 Comparison of Proposed Project Alternatives’ Buildout Characteristics.

3-BJ Based on HSR case studies, and other transit-oriented development best practices, the Vision Plan encourages the highest density and intensity of uses to be located adjacent to the High Speed Rail Station.

3-BK See response 3-I. See Global Response No. 1.

3-BL Page 193 of the DEIR discusses the noise contours used. Because traffic data was not calculated for those intersections, traffic data was not available to calculate noise contours. See excerpt below:

The HUD DNL calculations are based on traffic volume data for 12 chosen intersections taken from the Traffic Impact Analysis (see Appendix B). Section 5.13.3, Existing Conditions, under Section 5.13, Transportation, includes a list of the 12 study intersections. ... Since noise contours depend on daily traffic volume data, only the 12 roadway intersections that were included in the Traffic Impact Analysis are represented in Figure 18. Therefore, noise contours for other major roadway segments in the Project area, such as SR 178 east of Chester Avenue, were not calculated and incorporated into the noise contour map. As such, the noise contour map provides a general depiction of existing roadway noise level patterns in the Project area. As shown in Figure 18, noise levels exceed 65 dBA along all modeled roadways.

3-BM The purpose of the table is solely to provide historic information on population.

3-BN The sentence provides historic context on what information was provided in the General Plan so it will not be deleted from the EIR.

3-BO The purpose of the information is solely to provide historic information on population.
3-BP  The Kern County data is from the American Community Survey 2011-2015; the City data is from the U.S. Census Bureau, 2016.

3-BQ  The data provided in the EIR was included to provide a general overview of housing and income for Kern County, so the low, very low, and extremely low income categories were aggregated.

3-BR  The Vision Plan is not a Housing Element and not required to comply with State-provided regional housing needs allocation requirements. The Vision Plan will help the City reach its housing need by encouraging infill and multi-family residential development downtown. The Vision Plan projects 8,570 additional housing units through 2045.

3-BS  This is the project not an alternative. See response 3-BI.

3-BT  This is part of an assessment of the project, not an alternative. See response 3-l. See Global Responses No. 1.

3-BU  Intersections studied in the Traffic Impact Analysis were chosen to provide a representation of traffic impacts within the project area. The intersections studied include traffic that would be generated between F Street and Rabobank Arena, the Convention Center, and the Amtrak Station.

3-BV  See response 3-I. See Global Response No. 1.

3-BW  The descriptions of proposed road changes on page 241 of the EIR are a general description and accurately represent what is being proposed within the study area.


3-BY  Transit along California Avenue relates to circulation within the project area.

3-BZ  Figure 23, 30th Street is mislabeled as 34th Street. It has been corrected in the Final EIR. See Section 9.2 Revisions to the Draft EIR.

3-CA  The Vision Plan offers conceptual future design adjustments to Garces Circle. This was not studied in the CHSRA document as it is not currently an approved City design. Specific changes would require additional review in the future.

3-CB  No. See response 3-I. See Global Response No. 1.

3-CC  See response 3-I and 3-K. The traffic study compares the Vision Plan at various horizon years, not a comparison of project alternatives.

3-CD  The two figures represent different design alternatives for Garces Circle. Figure 24 shows the future configuration without Garces Circle.

3-CE  Turning movements without traffic counts are due to one-way streets where those turning movements do not occur.

3-CF  See response 3-I. See Global Response No. 1.

3-CG  See response 3-I. See Global Response No. 1.

3-CH  There are various ways to subsidize transit programs. This is outside the scope of this project. This would be assessed and studied during implementation of the Vision Plan.

3-CI  See Global Response No. 1 and response 3-BE.

3-CJ  See response 3-I. See Global Response No. 1.
The alternatives studied were developed to assess the possibility of reducing identified significant and unavoidable impacts as identified in CEQA Section 15126.6 Consideration and Discussion of Alternatives to the Proposed Project.

15126.6 (b) Purpose. Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1), the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.

Alternative 2 is the Low Intensity/Density Design assuming 60% buildout of residential compared to the project. Alternative 3 is the Medium Intensity/Density Design assuming 80% buildout of residential compared to the project. Full percentages of these alternatives are shown in Table 44 of the DEIR on page 300. Alternative 2 identifies a reduction in development to assess the feasibility of reducing identified project significant impacts to a lesser level and the consequences of reducing impacts on project objectives. Alternative 3, Medium Density is an average of the Proposed Project and Alternative 2 for the same reason as just described for Alternative 2.

No project means even without adoption and implementation of the Vision Plan the City still projects growth and development to occur.

Alternatives 2 and 3 are both less dense than the Project and, therefore, accommodate less development compared to the Vision Plan (the project).

The “River District” was considered but rejected from further consideration due to the potential of increased environmental impacts.

Alternatives 2 and 3 both have lesser impacts than the Vision Plan due to reduced density. Because Alternative 2 has less development compared to Alternative 3, it was determined the environmentally superior alternative in the Executive Summary. This has been clarified in section 7.5. Although both Alternative 2 and 3 have lesser impacts, they do not fully meet project objects of connectivity with various transportation improvements and future policy changes.

The study area after the NOP public review process was updated to include all existing commercial zones in close proximity to the HSR station at F Street and Golden State Avenue.

Each 10-year planning horizon is assessed in the alternatives analysis. No. See response 3-I. See Global Response No. 1.

None of the figures depicted identify City zoning. Any mapping discrepancies/errors will be corrected in the Final EIR.

The proposed development was for traffic analysis only to assess higher density development in that area consistent with the Vision Plan. See Global Responses No. 5 and 6.
The Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan is the project being assessed in the DEIR and is therefore included as an appendix to the DEIR.

The data in Table 1 of Appendix F does match the data used in the EIR. An EIS was not prepared for this project. The market analysis scenario “High HSR + Downtown revitalization (Full HSR Integration)” are the numbers representing the Vision Plan and studied in the EIR.

The Final Open House took comments from the public about the Draft Vision Plan which is incorporated into the Final Vision Plan document. Questions at this public meeting, and other public meetings, were taken during the open house portion of the meeting, including at the information board gallery, interactive model, and on submitted comment cards.

The Vision Plan does not provide an actual design for Garces Circle. It provides a concept that will need to be further refined and designed through implementation of the project.

The Vision Plan explains the designation of F Street and 34th Street as follows (Vision Plan pg. 60):

“This section explores various considerations of how the HSR Station should be positioned at the F Street Station location and accounts for primary automobile access at Golden State Avenue (Highway 204), with a Multi-Modal entrance for pedestrians, cyclists, transit and automobiles along F and 34th Streets; the main pedestrian and bike entrance being Garces Circle Pedestrian Plaza described above. Related infrastructure improvements will serve to provide multiple points of entry into the HSR site and will frame future development within and around the HSR station.”

The Kern River District is listed as a policy action in Phase 3 (2035-2045) as redevelopment is anticipated to push north along Chester Avenue toward the Kern River. The Vision Plan also anticipates, “Some form of public-private-partnership could redevelop the ball-field property to further reconnect the City to the Kern River, while developing a new ball-park district centered on a new AAA stadium or other major sports and/or entertainment facility.” (Vision Plan, pg. 80) The Kern River District is seen as a potential development pattern that could occur with implementation of Phase 3.

The development strategies figures in the FEIR and the figures found in the Vision Plan, identify this area as a Respond Development Zone. This is not the same as zoning as you would find in a Zoning Ordinance. The plan proposes within this area, “A new overlay district could set development standards and provide additional incentives in the area between Downtown’s historic core and Mill Creek Linear Park (see Appendix I: Implementation Matrix)”. The Vision Plan does not provide actual development standards or regulations. Those are specified within the City’s General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.
I understand. We will treat your email below, with your comments and your commentary, as comments to the EIR. Those comments will be responded to in the Final EIR.

Andy Heglund
Deputy City Attorney

BAKERSFIELD CITY ATTORNEY’S OFFICE
p 661 326 3686 | f 661 852 2020

From: Adam Cohen [mailto:adam.p.cohen83@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 9:46 AM
To: Andrew Heglund
Cc: Cecelia Griego; Kevin Bush; Troy Hightower
Subject: Re: Public Comment Regarding the "Green Loop"

Hi Andy, to clarify, the following comment (below) was submitted and is included in the draft EIR/EIS. However, there is no response to this comment. The response states “This EIR does not evaluate the specific impacts associated with the LGA scenario. The California High Speed Rail Authority is addressing the LGA impacts within their Supplemental Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement” Please note, nothing in my public comment in the draft EIR/EIS was related to the impacts of LGA. The comment was entirely about the station area plan process and/or related impacts from the city’s draft EIR/EIS. I would be happy to setup a call with you and Cecilia to discuss further if needed. Thanks, Adam

Original comment:
Issued raised in this letter include:

4-B § Failure of the City to incorporate public comments from the Community workshop held on August 23rd, 2016;

4-C § Failure of the City to conduct station area and transit oriented development planning around the approved highspeed rail station at approximately Truxtun and U Streets (Hybrid Alternative);
§ Failure of the City to conduct station area and transit oriented development planning around the existing Amtrak station;

4-D § Failure of the City to adequately disclose the route and impact of relocating Amtrak to the vicinity of F Street and Golden State Avenue, as presented in Alternative C at the August 23rd workshop; and

4-E § Failure to provide an adequate comment period after the public scoping meeting on September 22, 2016.

On Wed, Feb 14, 2018 at 9:06 AM, Andrew Heglund <aheglund@bakersfieldcity.us> wrote:
Good morning, Adam.

We’re not sure exactly what prior comment that was not responded to you are referring to. If you are talking about comments submitted in response to the NOP, those, as comments to the NOP, will not be responded to in the Final EIR. However, we will consider your comments below to be comments submitted on the EIR for response in the Final EIR.

Andy Heglund

Deputy City Attorney
BAKERSFIELD CITY ATTORNEY’S OFFICE
p 661.326.3686 | f 661.852.2020

From: Adam Cohen [mailto:adam.p.cohen83@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 8:36 AM
To: Cecelia Grego
Cc: Kevin Bush; Troy Hightower; Andrew Heglund
Subject: Re: Public Comment Regarding the "Green Loop"

Thanks Cecilia. I’ll defer to Kevin Bush related on whether he would like to be added on the notification list (I believe I already am on that list and would like to be on the electronic notification if not currently on that list).

As noted previously to Andy Heglund, I would appreciate a response to my prior comment that was included in the draft EIR/EIS and not responded to. The consultant or city staff that drafted the response didn't respond to the comment and said that it wasn't relevant because it was specific to the impacts of the alignment and not the station area. However, this is not correct. Nothing in my comment was specific to the impacts of HSR or the alignment. These comments are pasted below. Please see my notes regarding each comment in bold.

Original comment:
Issued raised in this letter include:
§ Failure of the City to incorporate public comments from the Community workshop held on August 23rd, 2016; (This was related to the city’s workshop for the station area plan development, not the LGA scenario).
§ Failure of the City to conduct station area and transit oriented development planning around the approved highspeed rail station at approximately Truxton and U Streets (Hybrid Alternative); § Failure of the City to conduct station area and transit oriented development planning around the existing Amtrak station; (This was related to the city's workshop for the station area plan development, not the LGA scenario).
§ Failure of the City to adequately disclose the route and impact of relocating Amtrak to the vicinity of F Street and Golden State Avenue, as presented in Alternative C at the August 23rd workshop; and (This was related to the city’s workshop for the station area plan development, not the LGA scenario. Note, one of SOM’s scenarios had the Amtrak station moved to F Street and Golden State Avenue with no explanation of the railroad (Amtrak) tracks or how they would get there).
§ Failure to provide an adequate comment period after the public scoping meeting on September 22, 2016. (This is specific to this EIR process, not the CHSRA's supplemental EIR)
Consultant/city response: "This EIR does not evaluate the specific impacts associated with the LGA scenario. The California High Speed Rail Authority is addressing the LGA impacts within their Supplemental Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement"
From: Adam Cohen [mailto:adamp.cohen83@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, February 10, 2018 1:19 PM
To: Cecelia Griego
Cc: Andrew Heglund; Willie Rivera; Andrae Gonzalez; Michael Turnipseed; Troy Hightower; HRitch;
dave.dmohowski@yahoo.com; Kevin Bush; Gunnar Hand; Jeff.goldsmitDH.com; Freddy Prince;
barbara@mcclanahan hurricaneattorneylaw.us; Kim Schaefcr; linda@bakersfieldrealtor.org;
info@upsideproductions.biz; Brian Van Wyk; dwilliams@farmersagent.com;
dkwatson@ft.newyorklife.com; pparks@bakersfieldcollege.edu; AElaho-oriz@chevron.com; Tomeka
Powell; Leticia Perez; Marvin Dean; andrae@andraegonzales.com; Jacqui Kitchen;
daniel@caterdesigngroup.com; Jonathan Yates
Subject: Public Comment Regarding the "Green Loop"

Dear Ms. Griego,

I am writing to provide a formal public comment regarding the "Green Loop" as part of Bakersfield's Station Area Vision Plan draft EIR/EIS. The Green Loop is contained on Page 35 of Appendix F. I have attached a copy of the referenced page to this email.

I have read through the materials provide by the City of Bakersfield, and provide you the following facts, circumstances, and observations for your consideration. I must say that, although disheartened, I am not surprised by the critical deficiencies and lack of consideration for disadvantaged and minority communities. All attempts to get the city to include these communities have been met with resistance.

My concerns related to the Green Loop are outlined below:

Throughout the entire Station Area Planning Process, minority business and community leaders (including the Kern County Black Chamber of Commerce Executive Director), repeatedly met with Mr. Andrew Heglund, Ms. Jacqui Kitchen, Gunnar Hand, and other project staff and consultants expressing concerns regarding the project boundary. During these meetings, including but not limited to our meeting on or about March 2016, Mr. Hightower, Mr. Bush, and myself expressed concerns about the station area boundary excluding large portions of the African American community South of California Avenue and East of Union Avenue (emails from Mr. Bush and Mr. Dmohowski highlighting these concerns are attached).

During our in-person meeting at the Department of Community Development with Mr. Heglund, Ms. Kitchen, and Mr. Hand (who joined telephonically), Mr. Hightower and I were told that the study area boundaries would not be changed and that the entire Vision Plan would encompass only the area within the redline boundary. In pertinent part, the northern boundary of the study is West Columbus St (between Chester Avenue and Union Avenue). A copy of the Notice of Preparation Study Area Map is attached.

During the station area planning process, I also met with the City Manager's office (Chris and Caleb) regarding the Strategic Growth Council's (SGC) Transformative Climate Communities (TCC) Program. I informed them that SGC was looking to fund up to $35 million of active transportation improvements in disadvantaged communities within the City of Bakersfield and that we had preliminary discussions about a South Mill Creek extension to Brundage Avenue that SGC expressed interest in potentially funding. I was told by the City Manager's
office that their office was not interested in applying for the grant money if the money had to be spent in a disadvantaged community (a requirement of the funding program). This information was also relayed to Councilmember Gonzales who neither followed-up with myself or the Executive Director of the Kern County Black Chamber of Commerce. The $35 million in grant funding has since been awarded to Ontario ($70 million had previously been awarded to Fresno). I am astonished that city leadership would rather give up this grant funding than apply for projects that can create ladders of economic opportunity in some of our city's poorest neighborhoods.

Imagine our surprise, in spite of being told in no uncertain terms by Mr. Heglund and Ms. Kitchen that the boundaries were immovable and that the vision document would only include areas within the redline, when we viewed the "Green Loop" on Page 35. The Green Loop depicts transportation and greenbelt/active transportation improvements along the Kern Island Canal outside of the project study area to the north (from West Columbus Street to the Kern River). Interestingly, this greenspace addition outside of the study area happens to be within Census Tract 6, Block Group 1, which according to the U.S. Census Bureau is more than 60% White.

Repeated requests to have this green space improvement extended South along the Kern Island Canal from California Avenue to Brundage Lane have been met with resistance. Interestingly, a southward addition would be within Census Tract 20, Block Groups 1-3, which according to the U.S. Census Bureau is 25-29% White. The double standard to add transportation/quality of life improvements outside of the study area boundary on the northside while simultaneously excluding similar improvements on the southside (whether resulting from incompetence, racial insensitivity, or something far more heinous is unknown) shocks the conscience. It's telling that the study area map is depicted with a redline as "redlining" is the practice of denying municipal services or capital improvements to residents of certain areas based on the racial or ethnic composition of those areas. The differing treatment of two neighborhoods outside of the study area are inherently unequal.

It should also be noted that the neighborhood of Westchester, also outside of the study area, is depicted as "white" on this figure (Pg 35 - attached) while areas within the study boundary south of Truxtun Avenue are depicted as "black." As such, there are concerns about the colors of the shading of the aerial photography on this map and the perception of racial steering.

For equity and environmental justice reasons, the City of Bakersfield (and it's consultants) must correct this injustice by adding greenspace/active transportation corridors along the Kern Island Canal between California Avenue and Brundage Ln and apply a uniform shading across the aerial photography of the map.

Should you require additional information, or need me to clarify any statements made in this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me at your earliest convenience.

Very respectfully,

Adam Cohen
661-912-2986
Letter No. 4: Adam Cohen, February 14, 2018

4-A These are comments that were received during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the project. These comments were acknowledged in Table 2 NOP Comments and EIR Response in the DEIR. CEQA Guidelines section 15082 provides direction regarding the NOP. In this section there is no requirement for a direct response to comments received during the NOP period. Section 15082(4) does state in part, “The draft EIR in preparation may need to be revised or expanded to conform to responses to the notice of preparation. A lead agency shall not circulate a draft EIR for public review before the time period for responses to the notice of preparation has expired.” The NOP public review period started on 8/29/2016 and ended on 9/27/2016. The DEIR circulation period began on 2/5/2018, well after that period. The response in the table is only a summary of how the comments were addressed.

4-B The community workshop on August 23rd, 2016 was the first comprehensive effort to gather public input on where and what type of development should occur downtown. The purpose of the first community workshop was to solicit public input on the project as a means of furthering the overall planning efforts. The format of the meeting provided participants time to review the information boards with project representatives and discuss about national and international case studies of Downtown revitalization and High-Speed Rail development (HSR). The participants were encouraged to join project representatives as part of the open house format and engage with a creative, interactive site model of Downtown Bakersfield. To obtain clear input, participants formed break-out groups for a collaborative experience to develop a vision of Downtown Bakersfield. A multiplicity of diverse alternatives were conceived and presented by the various groups. The community showed excitement about the prospect of a future High-Speed Rail station, knowing that it offers a unique opportunity to revitalize Downtown Bakersfield and reintroduce Bakersfield to California as a destination. Nevertheless, much of the discussion hinged on the merits of the proposed F Street location versus the proposed Truxtun Ave location. See Global Comment No. 3. City took public feedback and incorporated connectivity both statewide as well as locally. Ideas for improving connectivity included incorporating transit, pedestrian linkages and bike infrastructure.

4-C See Global Response No. 2 and 4.

4-D The adoption of the Vision Plan will not relocate Amtrak from its current Truxtun Station to the HSR station location at F Street and Golden State Avenue.

4-E The Lead Agency provided a 30-day public comment period as required by CEQA. The public hearing was held per the Lead Agency’s CEQA guidelines with adequate time for public comments to be submitted.
Hi Cecelia, Andy,

Can you please clarify which Phased Development Strategy is the correct one for the purposes the Station Area Vision Plan and providing public comment on the draft EIR/EIS.

1. The Stakeholder Working Group was provided with the following document (posted on the website as "final phased development strategy" - or words to that effect): http://www.bakersfieldcity.us/civicax/filebank/blobload.aspx?BlobID=30579

2. This document appears to substantially differ from the lower resolution copy (Figures 4-6) in the in the text of the draft EIR/EIS. http://www.bakersfieldcity.us/civicax/filebank/blobload.aspx?BlobID=32075

3. The maps in Appendix F of the draft EIR/EIS also differ substantially from both of the maps above (and in particular the maps noted in Paragraph #2). Please to Appendix F Printed Page # 70-71; Page # 76-77; and Page #82-83. http://www.bakersfieldcity.us/civicax/filebank/blobload.aspx?BlobID=32073

4. Of note, the Development Strategy presented in paragraph #1 seems to match the development strategy in the city’s public presentations that the city counted as part of the public outreach effort as part of this EIR process. Please refer to slides 18-20 (March 2017 presentation) http://www.bakersfieldcity.us/civicax/filebank/blobload.aspx?BlobID=31214 and http://www.bakersfieldcity.us/civicax/filebank/blobload.aspx?BlobID=32072 (Slides 19-21, December 2017 Presentation).

5. All of the above maps (including those in the draft EIR/EIS) also differ from the phased development strategy presented in the consultant’s presentation at the public hearing at the Planning Commission. Please refer to slides 42, 44, and 46. http://www.bakersfieldcity.us/civicax/filebank/blobload.aspx?BlobID=32126

As you can imagine, all of these discrepancies in land use classification across these maps designated as the draft EIR/EIS, appendices to the draft EIR/EIS, and final development strategies are creating a lot of confusion for the public and a diverse array of stakeholders. Can you please clarify the correct map depicting the land use vision? Will the public have the opportunity of a full comment period once this discrepancy is resolved and/or the opportunity of reviewing a revised draft EIR/EIS? This is critical so the public has the opportunity to make public comments on the correct version of the phased development strategy and so that city staff has the opportunity to accurately identify and respond to the public's comments. As you can imagine this is difficult to do if the public is not all talking about the same "version" of the development strategy. Simply stated, to properly solicit and respond to comments, everyone needs to be on the same page.
Please do not hesitate to reach out if you need me to walk you through the variations on the maps or locating any of the figures referenced above (as some have printed page numbers and others have digital PDF page numbers). Thank you for your time and consideration on this matter.

Thank you,

Adam Cohen
661-912-2986
Letter No. 5: Adam Cohen, February 16, 2018

5-A The figures provided to the Stakeholder Working Group and presented early in the process were working files presented to obtain feedback on the design. Based on the input received from the public and others, those figures were modified and therefore are different than Figures 4-6 in the DEIR. Figures 4-6 were earlier versions of the 0-10, 10-20, and 20-30-year plans of the project. Appendix F, Making Downtown Bakersfield, contains the final versions of those plans based on further input, as does the presentation to the Planning Commission on 1/18/2018. Figures 4-6 have been corrected in the Final EIR to match the final versions found in Appendix F. The analysis in the DEIR is based on the anticipated development extent identified in the three phases (office and retail square footage, residential units, and hotel rooms) which is the same in both the earlier figures and the final figures found in Appendix F. These differences show the progression and refinement of the Vision Plan for Downtown Bakersfield.
Dear Cecelia,

I am writing to formally express my support for the Golden Empire Chapter of the American Institute of Architects response to the Station Area Plan and Phased Development Strategy. A copy of their letters is attached to my comment. Please include both on-the-record.

In their letter, AIA states "The emphasis on the Golden State & F' Street site and development proposed around it could serve to draw away from the traditional core of downtown rather than compliment it ... We do recommend that a similar effort be made looking at the Truxtun Avenue Amtrak location originally proposed so the stakeholders and public can make a true comparison ... The earlier massing concept shows 25 story towers and numerous 10 story towers adjacent to the F' Street Station Site. These may need to be reduced in height, and future taller towers directed back toward the downtown core in order to integrate with the existing downtown" - or words to that effect (letter attached).

I also agree with the AIA position. The 10-20 and 20-30 Year Phased Development Strategy will draw development (and redevelopment) away from the traditional core of downtown rather than compliment it. This is evidenced by the numerous high-rise towers adjacent to the F Street Station Site and separated from the existing core of downtown. As such, I would request that this density be re-focused in the area bordered by G Street to the West, 22nd Street to the North, Mill Creek Linear Park to the East and California Avenue to the South. This would allow future development to compliment the existing downtown core, rather than compete with it.

Additionally, in line with the AIA position, I too agree that a similar effort be made looking at the Truxtun Avenue Amtrak location originally proposed so the stakeholders and public can make a true comparison. Even if this is not the ultimate station for high-speed rail, the Amtrak Station, with its close proximity to Rabobank Arena and other downtown destinations, will continue to serve as an important site for transit-oriented development that should be planned for irrespective of if high speed rail is built (or where it is built). Why isn't there more development concentrated in the downtown core and around the existing Amtrak Station?

As previously noted in my email dated February 10th, I request that the Green Loop be extended to include the Kern Island Canal from California Avenue to Brundage Ln to correct the earlier environmental justice and inequity issues previously raised.

Finally, I would like to request the ability to comment on the confirmed phased development strategy. As noted in my email dated February 16th, 2018, there are numerous inconsistencies in the phased development strategy that exists in the draft EIR/EIS (the main body of the text). Appendix F of the draft EIR/EIS, and presentations made to the public (including the presentation made by staff and city's consultant during the public hearing of this draft EIR/EIS. With that being said, I would like to reiterate my request for additional density in the downtown core and within 1/2 mile of the Amtrak Station including but not limited to development in the Entertainment District (bordered by Chester Avenue to the West, Union Avenue to the East, 17th Street to the North and California Avenue to the South).

Please do not hesitate to reach out if you require any clarifications of any statements made in this letter. You have my gratitude for your thoughtful consideration and response to these comments (and my earlier comments) submitted during the public comment period.
Very respectfully,

Adam Cohen
.661-912-2986
To the Stakeholder’s Committee & General Public:

The Golden Empire Chapter of the American Institute of Architects (AIA) wishes to express appreciation for being included in the conversation as Stakeholders for Making Downtown Bakersfield. Regardless of how long High Speed Rail takes to develop, or whether it comes to fruition, we believe it is important to plan wisely for Downtown Bakersfield either way.

Many of the items in the 0-10 year strategy would be helpful toward the growth of downtown and ensuring its viability into the future. Formation and expansion of a Downtown Business Improvement District, establishing Downtown Design Guidelines and ordinances that encourage development, both in Infill and in proven developing districts like Mill Creek, will be critical to the success of this effort.

In the 10-20 and 20-30 year strategies the steps to encourage development, especially mixed-use development, and establish funding mechanisms will be necessary to continue growth, as well as expanding infrastructure for this development. We believe that studies such as this can aid us in planning for those infrastructure needs.

As with every group endeavor there are some concerns. The emphasis on the Golden State & “F” Street site and the development proposed around it could serve to draw away from the traditional core of downtown rather than compliment it. We realize that this site may be easier for the HSR authority but, in turn, may throw greater expense on the City in developing connecting transportation corridors along Chester Avenue and “F” Street. We do recommend that a similar effort made looking at the Truxtun Avenue/Amtrak location originally proposed so the stakeholders and public can make a true comparison.

The earlier massing concept shows 25 story towers and numerous 10 stories adjacent to the “F” Street Station Site. These may need to be reduced in height, and future taller towers directed back toward the downtown core in order to integrate with the existing downtown.

In many ways Bakersfield is not like other cities. We are very independent and not inclined to be squeezed into molds for other cities. This is a big vision for big projects, but we need to keep a place for the modest endeavors by architects, developers, and end users alike.

All in all this was a good effort by the stakeholders. Gunnar Hand & SDM, and the City staff who assisted them, are to be commended for trying to make some sense of our many viewpoints. This is not set in stone, but it is a start. Many decisions lie ahead if we are to chip out a well sculpted future for our city.

Respectfully,

Timothy R. Stormont, AIA
Mandy Freeland, AIA
Rob Trost, AIA
John Cohrs, AIA
HST STATION AREA DEVELOPMENT:
GENERAL PRINCIPALS AND GUIDELINES

There would be great benefits to enhancing development patterns and increasing development densities near proposed high-speed train (HST) stations. To provide maximum opportunity for station area development in accordance with the purpose, need, and objectives for the HST system, the preferred HST station locations would be multi-modal transportation hubs and would typically be in traditional city centers. The State of California is leading the nation with legislation such as AB 32 to adapt state policy to global climate change and SB 375 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through coordinated land-use and transportation planning. HST Station area development should promote the implementation of SB 375 and sustainability principles with smart growth development. To further these objectives, when making decisions regarding both the final selection of station locations and the timing of station development, the Authority would consider the extent to which appropriate station area planning and development principles are supported by local authorities.

In addition to potential benefits from minimizing land consumption needs for new growth, dense development near HST stations would concentrate activity conveniently located to stations. This would increase the use of the HST system, generating additional HST ridership and revenue to benefit the entire state. It also would accommodate new growth on a smaller footprint. Reducing the land needed for new growth should reduce pressure for new development on nearby habitat areas, in environmentally fragile or hazardous areas, and on agricultural lands. Denser development allowances also would enhance joint development opportunities at and near stations, which in turn could increase the likelihood of private financial participation in construction and operations related to the HST system. A dense development pattern can better support a comprehensive and extensive local transit and shuttle system, bicycle\(^1\) and pedestrian paths, and related amenities that can serve the local communities as well as provide access to and egress from HST stations. The Authority's adopted policies would ensure that implementation of the HST in California would maximize station area development that serves the local community and economy while increasing HST ridership. The Authority is committed to cooperating with local communities to develop HST stations appropriate to the scale and needs of each community.

General Principles for HST Station Area Development

HST station area development principles draw on transit-oriented development (TOD) strategies that have been successfully applied to focus compact growth within walking distance of rail stations and other transportation facilities. Applying TOD measures around HST stations is a strategy that works for large, dense urban areas, as well as smaller central cities and suburban areas. TOD can produce a variety of other local and regional benefits by encouraging walkable, bikeable compact and infill development. Local governments would play a significant role in implementing station area development by adopting plans, policies, zoning provisions, and incentives for higher densities, and by approving a mix of urban land uses. Almost all TOD measures adopted by public agencies involve some form of overlay zoning that designates a station area for development intensification, mixed land uses, and improvements to the pedestrian/bicycle environment. TOD measures for major facilities are generally applied to areas within one-half mile of stations, and this principal would be followed for HST stations.

\(^{1}\)HST will include facilities to accommodate bicycles.
Station area development principles that would be applied at the project level for each HST station and the areas around the stations would include the following features:

- Higher density development in relation to the existing pattern of development in the surrounding area, along with minimum requirements for density.
- A mix of land uses (e.g., retail, office, hotels, entertainment, residential) and a mix of housing types to meet the needs of the local community. Different styles of TOD may be appropriate for different HST station areas.
- A grid street pattern and compact pedestrian-oriented design that promotes walking, bicycle, and transit access with streetscapes that include landscaping, small parks, pedestrian spaces, bus shelters, lighting, wayfinding signs, bike lanes, and bike racks. New buildings should incorporate high energy efficiency and building performance standards.
- Context-sensitive building design that considers the continuity of the building sizes and that coordinates the street-level and upper-level architectural detailing, roof forms, and the rhythm of windows and doors should be provided. New buildings should be designed to complement and mutually support public spaces, such as streets, plazas, other open space areas, and public parking structures. The Authority will work cooperatively with each local community to assure the design process accommodates both the operating requirements of the HST system and local conditions and character.
- Limits on the amount of parking for new development and a preference that parking be placed in structures. TOD areas typically have reduced parking requirements for retail, office, and residential uses due to their transit access and walkability. Sufficient train passenger parking would be essential to the system viability, but this should, as appropriate, be offered at market rates (not free) to encourage the use of access by transit and other modes, where available. Shared parking would be planned when the mix of uses would support it.

Implementation of HST Station Area Development Guidelines

The statewide HST system is likely to have more than 20 stations. The Authority has the powers necessary to oversee the construction and operation of a statewide high-speed rail system and to purchase the land required for the infrastructure and operations of the system. The responsibility and powers needed to focus growth and station area development guidelines in the areas around high-speed stations are likely to reside primarily with local government.

The primary ways in which the Authority can help ensure that the HST system becomes an instrument for encouraging maximizing implementation of station area development principles include:

- Select station locations that are multi-modal transportation hubs with a preference for traditional city centers.
- Adopt HST station area development policies and principles that require TOD, and promote value-capture at and around station areas as a condition for selecting a HST station site.
- Provide incentives for local governments where potential HST stations may be located to prepare and adopt Station Area Plans and to amend City and County General Plans that incorporate station area development principles in the vicinity of HST stations.
1. Select Station Locations that Are Multi-Modal Transportation Hubs, Preferably in Traditional City Centers.

HST stations in California would be multi-modal transportation hubs. To meet the Authority’s adopted objectives, the locations that were selected as potential HST stations would provide linkage with local and regional transit, airports, and highways. In particular, convenient links to other rail services (urban rapid transit, heavy rail, commuter rail, light rail, and conventional intercity) would promote TOD at stations by increasing ridership and pedestrian activity at these hub stations. A high level of accessibility and activity at the stations can make the nearby area more attractive for additional economic activity.

Most of the potential stations identified for further evaluation are located in the heart of the downtown/central city area of California’s major cities. By eliminating potential greenfield sites, the Authority has described a proposed HST system that meets the objectives of minimizing potential impacts on the environment and maximizing connectivity with other modes of transportation. These locations also would have the most potential to support infill development and TOD.

2. Adopt HST Station Area Development Policies that Require TOD, and Promote Value-Capture at and around Stations as a Condition for Selecting a HST Station Site

Through subsequent CEQA and NEPA processes, the Authority would determine where stations would be located and how many HST stations there would be. The Authority has identified TOD and value-capture at and around stations sites as essential for promoting HST ridership. The Authority would work with local governments to ensure these policies are adopted and implemented.

Local government would be expected to promote TOD and to use value-capture techniques to help finance and maintain station amenities and the public spaces needed to create an attractive pedestrian environment. Because the HST stations would be public gathering places, value-capture techniques should be used to enhance station designs with additional transportation or public facilities. It is the Authority’s policy that parking for HST services at HST stations should, as appropriate, be provided at market rates (no free parking) to encourage access by alternative means. The Authority would maximize application of TOD principles during the site-specific review of proposed station locations. In addition, for HST stations in the Central Valley, the Authority will undertake a comprehensive economic study of the kinds of businesses that would uniquely benefit from being located near HST station areas, including a thorough estimate of the kinds and numbers of jobs that such businesses would create.

The Authority has prescribed the following criteria for HST station locations:

- To be considered for a station, the proposed site must have the potential to promote higher density, mixed-use, pedestrian accessible development around the station. Transit accessibility and proximity to transit corridors are also important considerations.
- As the HST project proceeds to more detailed study, and before a final station location decision is made, the responsible local government(s) are expected to provide (through planning and zoning) for TOD around HST station locations.

---

2See the final statewide program EIR/EIS (California High-Speed Rail Authority and Federal Railroad Administration 2005), Section 1.2.1, Purpose of High-Speed Train System.
3Sites in rural areas with very limited or no existing infrastructure.
4The Government Accounting Office defines value capture strategies as: "...joint development, special assessment districts, tax increment financing, and development impact fees [that] are designed to dedicate to transit either a portion of increased tax revenue or additional revenue through assessments, fees, or rents based on value expected to accrue as a result of transit investments."
5As part of the "Staff Recommendations" adopted at the January 26, 2005, Authority Board Meeting in Sacramento.
Give priority to stations for which the city and/or county has adopted station area TOD plans and general plans that focus and prioritize development on the TOD areas rather than on auto-oriented outlying areas, and adopted trip-reduction and greenhouse gas-reduction strategies.

As the project proceeds to more detailed study, local governments are expected to help finance (e.g., through value-capture or other financing techniques) the public spaces needed to support the pedestrian/bicycle traffic generated by hub stations, as well as identifying long-term maintenance of the spaces.

The imperative to link transportation investments with supportive land use was made clear in a study by the MTC. The study showed that people who both live and work within a half mile of a rail stop use transit for 42% of their work trips, more than 10 times as much as others in the region. While HST service offers a different scale of travel, the fundamental principles of compact access and high mobility apply.

In California, regional agencies and transit providers are adopting policies that link funding for transit expansion with land use. These include:

- MTC – which has adopted a TOD policy for regional expansion projects to help improve the cost effectiveness of regional investments.
- BART – its Strategic Plan mandates that BART partner with communities to make investment choices that encourage and support TOD and increased transit use.
- SACOG – the Sacramento Blueprint process built a strong foundation of political and community support for the compact, mixed-use growth scenario adopted in the region’s long-range transportation plan, and as a result, SACOG dedicated $500 million for smart growth construction and $250 million for smart growth planning, bike/pedestrian activities, public involvement, and support services.
- SCAG – SCAG manages the Compass Blueprint Demonstration Project program that funds local agencies to carry out innovative planning efforts that align with the Compass Blueprint principles. These efforts include TOD planning, parking systems management, and smart growth planning efforts.
- LA Metro – its Joint Development Program encourages comprehensive planning and development around station sites and along transit corridors.
- SANDAG – promotes smart growth and TOD to its member jurisdictions through funding and technical assistance.

The Authority will analyze these policies and others like it throughout the state and country in developing specific TOD guidelines.

---

3. **Provide Incentives for Local Governments in which Potential HST Stations Would Be Located to Prepare and Adopt Station Area Plans, Amend City and County General Plans, and Encourage TOD in the Vicinity of HST Stations**

Throughout future environmental processes and the implementation of the HST, the Authority would continue to work cooperatively with the communities being considered for HST stations. It is important to understand HST as a system that will have regional as well as statewide ridership. It will provide an opportunity to improve and expand local and regional transit systems leading to the HST stations and to have additional job and housing growth along those transit corridors. The Authority is committed to working with host cities and other local agencies throughout the process, in a cooperative manner, sharing data and information to enable each station area to benefit from the efforts and successes at other stations.

Local governments can use a number of mechanisms to encourage higher density HST-oriented development in and around potential HST station locations and to minimize undesirable growth effects. These include developing plans (such as specific plans, transit village plans, regional plans, and greenbelts), development agreements, zoning overlays, and, in some cases, use of redevelopment authority.

Increased density of development in and around HST stations would provide public benefits beyond the benefits of access to the HST system itself. Such benefits could include relief from traffic congestion, improved air quality, promotion of infill development, preservation of natural resources, more affordable housing, promotion of job opportunities, reduction in energy consumption, and better use of public infrastructure. The Authority and local government working together would determine which mechanisms best suit each community and could be implemented to enhance the benefits possible from potential HST station development.

Most successful contemporary examples of urban development are the product of long-term strategic planning. For example, in France and Japan, where there has been considerable success guiding new development around HST stations, local governments typically prepare long-term plans that focus growth at each HST station area. Regional plans are also typically used to coordinate station area development with existing urban areas and reserves for parks, agriculture, and natural habitat.

Over the last 5 years, four of the major regions of California—Los Angeles, San Diego, Sacramento, and the Bay Area—have developed regional blueprints. Eight counties in the Central Valley are now conducting their own blueprint process. All of these blueprints focus on supporting the existing downtowns and increasing transit ridership as critical ways for future growth to be environmentally and economically sustainable. The HST could provide a major boost to these blueprints by greatly increasing access to the downtowns, directly supporting local and regional rail systems, and indirectly supporting bus and light rail systems with an infusion of additional riders. The importance of local and regional transit service to provide feeder and distributor functions for the HST service should be emphasized.

A useful starting point for station area development is to work with members of the community to identify needs and missing assets they would like to see as part of any new development, such as parks, libraries, and food stores, and to assess the market sizes needed to attract and retain such uses. Early, regular, and ongoing public involvement in the planning process will assure local character and preferences are incorporated into the project, and enable the local community to influence its interface with the statewide project. Local government also can review the availability of land around potential station sites to achieve development that is of sufficient size to be economically viable. Then an illustrative site and phasing plan for a station area that is realistic from a market perspective can be developed and shared with the community. Finally, a station area plan can be prepared, which would ensure the community and potential developers of a public commitment to promote compact, efficient, TOD around station areas. Infrastructure improvements for station area development should be included in the station area plan.
Significant growth is expected in large areas of California with or without an HST system. The proposed HST system, however, would be consistent with and promote the state’s adopted smart growth principles and could be a catalyst for wider adoption of smart growth principles in communities near HST stations. Well sited stations that are integrated into their communities and connected by local and regional transit will help the state realize some of the principles of AB 32 and SB 375. With strong companion policies and good planning, HST stations should encourage infill development, help protect environmental and agricultural resources by encouraging more efficient land use, and minimize ongoing cost to taxpayers by making better use of our existing infrastructure.

The Authority’s selection of station locations and the timing of station development would consider adherence to the principles in the section, as well as the findings of the associated environmental documentation. In pursuing its objective of providing a profitable and successful HST, the Authority will use its resources, both financial and otherwise, to encourage the local government authority with development jurisdiction at and around potential HST stations to take the following steps:

- In partnership with the Authority, develop a station area plan for all land within a half mile of the HST pedestrian entrance that adheres to the station area development principles (described above).
- Use a community planning process to plan the street, pedestrian, bicycle environment, transit facilities, parks and open spaces, and other amenities.
- Incorporate the station area plan through amendment of the city or county general plan and zoning.
- Use community planning processes to develop regional plans and draft conformance amendments to general plans, which would focus development in existing communities and would provide for long-term protection of farmland, habitat, and open space.
- Identify opportunities to preserve local culture, character, and sense-of-place while still meeting other policy principles.

---

7As expressed in the Wiggins Bill (AB857, 2003), and in government code 65041.1.

8Such a plan could take the form of a specific plan pursuant to California Government Code sections 65450–65457 or a Transit Village Development Plan pursuant to California Government Code sections 65460–65460.10, which specify the content for such a plan, or another form as determined appropriate by local government.
Letter No. 6: Adam Cohen, February 19, 2018

6-A The Lead Agency has accepted the American Institute of Architects Golden Empire letter dated March 30, 2017 and attached HSR Station Area Development: General Principals and Guidelines as part of the public record.

6-B The Lead Agency notes your support of this statement. See Global Response No. 4.

6-C The Lead Agency notes your agreement with AIA position. The Vision Plan would not prohibit future development in the downtown core.

6-D The Vision Plan identifies the Amtrak Station as multi-modal hub with connectivity enhancements to HSR station and other downtown amenities. See Global Response No. 3 and 4.

6-E See Global Response No. 2.

6-F See response 5-A. See Global Response No. 4.
I want the High Speed Rail Station to be on Truxton Avenue. It makes better sense. Thank you!

G. Peters
Letter No. 7: G. Peters

7-A See Global Response No. 3. The decision on HSR alignment and station location is outside of the scope of this EIR and is a decision under the authority of the CHSRA.
The HSR Station should be located on Truxtun Ave. The citizens of Bakersfield deserve an actual HSR station not a park and ride as proposed on F St. It is important that Bakersfield present itself as a destination rather than a pass through place. This can only be accomplished by a station. I can't tell you how many times when asked "Where I'm from" I've been met with a sympathetic "Oh" or a nose holding "Ew". In my opinion the F St. location reinforces those reactions... that Bakersfield is a place to pass through, be from but not live, and certainly not a place to visit. Bakersfield has a lot to offer and this is best represented by the location on Truxtun Ave., in the middle of our revitalized downtown area with all the restaurants and eateries, convention centers and arenas, court and city buildings, and hotels. Locating the HSR on F St., away from that core downtown area, will ultimately lead to it's decline and most certainly to it's death.

Another concern is the added pollution and congestion that would be created by vehicles traveling from the F St. location to the downtown area. We all know it would difficult if not impossible to walk the two miles to the downtown area from F St. Garces Circle can't handle the additional traffic. Fire and ambulance service would be compromised. We already have horrible air quality, additional vehicles traveling from F St. to downtown will only make it worse. This becomes a quality of life issue for our residents especially those living downtown.

It is important to be thoughtful about how we present our City to the people who will riding the HSR. We need to present Bakersfield in the most positive way possible...our best foot forward. An actual station located in the downtown where visitors can walk and explore goes a long way towards accomplishing that goal. A park and ride on F St. does not.

Francine Simmons
Letter No. 8: Francine Simmons, January 17, 2018

8-A  See Global Response No. 3 and response 7-A.

8-B  Air quality impacts were studied in the DEIR and it was determined the project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. This analysis starts on page 71 of the DEIR. See also response 7-A.

8-C  See Global Response No. 3.
TO: THE CITY BAKERSFIELD
FROM: VANESSA VANGEL
RE: CALIFORNIA HIGH SPEED RAIL
24th Street LOS Impacts and support of the Truxtun Avenue Station location
DATE: January 18, 2018

I am writing to provide formal comments in response to the Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated Alignment draft EIR/EIS. With respect to the draft EIR/EIS, my position can be summarized as follows: I support the May 2014 Project (known as the Hybrid Alignment) with a station at Truxtun Avenue and oppose the Locally Generated Alignment. If the Locally Generated Alignment is ultimately selected, I would like the station location at a location other than F Street and Golden State Avenue (preferably in Old Town Kern in the vicinity of Summer Street between Beale and Baker).

High-speed rail should be an intermodal connection next to Amtrak and within walking distance of the downtown core. The Truxtun Station is located within walking distance of the downtown area including multiple hotels, the convention center, Rabobank Arena, many government office buildings, a federal courthouse, the Maya Theater complex, Bakersfield’s Ice Center, and McMurtry Aquatic Center. The Mill Creek Linear Park, an active transportation facility linking to the Truxtun Station site further enhances its walk- and bike- ability.

In addition to noting my preference for the Hybrid Alignment and opposition to the Bakersfield F Street Station Alignment (BFSSA), I would like to provide a few specific comments regarding the F-B LGA draft EIR/EIS.

Table 3.2-28 and Table 3.2-29 (DRAFT EIR/EIS) do not account for the impacts of all signalized intersections along SR-178 through downtown Bakersfield (also known as 23rd and 24th Streets). Why weren't the following intersections studied for analysis:
- F St at 24th St
- H St at 23rd St
- H St at 24th St
- Chester at 23rd St
- Chester at 24th St
- L St at 23rd St
- L St at 24th St
- M St at 23rd St
- M St at 24th St

Why wasn't a complete traffic analysis of the entire CA-178/23rd/24th Street corridor conducted? What are the impacts of vehicle trips from Westside Parkway/Centennial Corridor to the station at F Street? Given that there is no northbound 99 connection to Centennial Corridor, what are the impacts of North/South traffic on LOS and intersection delay at the above noted intersections? What are the impacts of North/South traffic on LOS and intersection delay at H St and Brundage; H St and California Avenue; Brundage and Chester; Chester and California Avenue; Union Avenue and Brundage; and California Avenue and Union Avenue? On all of these intersections what are existing traffic analysis and future traffic analysis with the F-B LGA alignment?

Plainly stated, the Bakersfield F Street Station Alignment is not locally preferred and bad for our community. Again, please keep the Hybrid alignment with a station at Truxtun next to Amtrak.

Thank you for considering these comments and addressing my questions.
Vanessa Vangel
2224 “A” Street
Bakersfield, Ca. 93301 vanessavangel@yahoo.com 661-345-6512
Letter No. 9: Vanessa Vangel

9-A See Global Response No. 3 and response 7-A.

9-B See Global Response No. 1.
TO: THE CITY BAKERSFIELD  
FROM: DARLENE VANGEL  
RE: CALIFORNIA HIGH SPEED RAIL  
Bakersfield Station Location  
DATE: January 18, 2018  

To whom it may concern -  

I am writing to formally state my preference and support of the May 2014 Project, known as the Hybrid Alignment, with a station located on Truxtun Avenue. I am in very strong opposition to the Locally Generated Alignment (LGA) - Bakersfield “F” Street Station Alignment (BFSSA). As a 40 year resident of the Historic Westchester Community of Bakersfield, which is adjacent to the proposed “F” Street Station, this location makes absolutely NO common, logistical or financial sense. In addition, the fact that our City’s decision makers are pushing and promoting the LGA is somewhat problematic and ambiguous. Thank you for considering my comments and concerns.

Darlene Vangel  
2216 “A” Street  
Bakersfield, CA 93301  
darlenevangel@icloud.com  
661-563-2144
Letter No. 10: Darlene Vangel

10-A See Global Response No. 3 and response 7-A.
California High Speed Rail Authority, Cecelia Griego

Planning Commission & City Manager, Mayor Karen Goh, Council Member Andrae Gonzales

Kern County Supervisor Mike Maggard

Re: High Speed Rail; Fresno Bakersfield portion

Note: due to a personal medical emergency I was unable to draft comments or otherwise participate in this planning process but am now on the mend and getting back up to speed. I regret the late submission of these comments.

Ladies & Gentlemen:

From an urban planning perspective we oppose the F St. alignment option for the High Speed Rail project. That is the site apparently preferred by some Bakersfield city staff vs. the earlier one proposed for the BNSF alignment. Numerous opponents of this option have and continue to make sound points regarding its unsatisfactory nature.

In making choices like this we should first look to history. Since the 19th Century Bakersfield has had a powerful economic entity that, having most of the land west of town, worked like a giant vacuum “sucking” the economic energy from central Bakersfield to their land south and west of town. In that they have been very successful. Originally known as Miller & Lux, but in the 1960s known as Tenneco West prevailed in getting the long overdue CS Bakersfield campus located, not at a better location near the White Wolf area, but west of town on their land for the blatant reasons to facilitate taking some of the finest agriculture land in the world out of production for the benefit of real estate development. In that they succeeded in spades. More recently Castle & Cooke the latest successor to the historic Miller & Lux interests, sought to locate the new, also long overdue, federal courthouse 8 miles west of town vs. the legal and government center where it obviously belonged.

Citizen opposition to this option and their outrage at the reaction of an arrogant US General Services to this badly considered scheme resulted in it being located downtown much closer to where it should be. This history speaks to the problem of the conflict of the desires of special financial interests and their economic goals as opposed to what are better urban planning options to the benefit of the citizenry and the long term economic and environmental interests of the area.

Again, referring to history in the late 19th Century, the Southern Pacific Railroad located their Bakersfield depot, not in Bakersfield, but in the town of Sumner, a community of their own creation east of town. This resulted in a trolley line being extended to the SP depot that
had to be built to transport travelers from Sumner, that ultimately ended up developing its own smaller scale urban assets, to downtown Bakersfield, their true destination. Sumner is now known as Old Town Kern, a Bakersfield neighborhood, defined by portions of Sumner and Baker St.

No route for HSR can be made without cost and the taking of property. That’s a fact of late development in already developed communities but the F St. option is isolated and disconnected from the urban core and other important transportation options and likely final destinations of passengers arriving via HSR. Like CSU Bakersfield locating such assets in areas for reasons not consistent with sound urban planning values works well for the interests that benefit but force the community to make unpleasant adjustments to accommodate longer commutes and redundant or missing support development.

Among the objections to the BNSF alignment are claimed losses of the city utility yard, 4101 Truxtun Ave. At this point the proposed route is on an above grade viaduct meaning the only property loss to the city would need only be the footprints for support columns likely taking out some parking spaces. Other than that city buildings could remain as they are now for continued use. Because of the size and layout of the city property if any structures were to be lost they could be relocated nearby on this property. Some, because they are modular or portable structures could be simply picked up and moved.

That part between Oak St. and Chester Ave. routed above grade would be between 16th St. and the BNSF yard and until relatively recent times most of this was open land with postwar private residences built along the north side of 16th St. up to the Mercy Hospital campus. Development has occurred on much of that formerly open land including a storage rental facility that could continue to operate directly under the viaduct. To the east there are some professional office buildings whose owners might object to rail noise but these were built after the announcement of the proposed HSR project which means the developers had prior knowledge to make different choices for the location of these office structures however the noise from the current at grade operations are much noise and longer in duration than the HSR train passing by. At that part of the operation with the slow speed of the passenger train as it approaches the depot would cause little noise intrusion.

The work of routing the HSR viaduct around Mercy Hospital is difficult but should be planned to occupy above existing ground based rail operations to eliminate any added operation noise and vibration not already present at this location.

At the Bakersfield High School campus the properties between the BNSF tracks and 16th St. are of lower value than the campus structures themselves. With routing north of the BNSF tracks the hybrid alignment actually goes around the Bakersfield High School campus north of such historic assets like Harvey Auditorium eliminating legitimate fears about a degradation of environmental quality to these historic and culturally significant assets. At H St. the viaduct should route south of the tracks allowing it to be a challenge to only a handful of commercial buildings, and substandard housing, some of which are currently abandoned as documented in the Cultural Resources Survey 1985 updated 2017 by the Historic Preservation Commission.

This leads the BNSF alignment proposal to the station site preferably near the current Amtrak Station. East of the Amtrak station along the south side of the BNSF tracks to Union Ave. has a large quantity of distressed underutilized properties, owners of which would likely be
eager to sell. East of Union Ave. properties on both sides of the BNSF alignment are distressed and would likely be easily acquired leading to more open area to Oswell St. and the route returning to ground level.

For the reasons clearly stated by opponents to the F St. station site, the Truxtun Ave. proposal is, by a long shot, the preferred location. This perspective is supported in detail in the Kern County Council of Governments’ Metropolitan Bakersfield High Speed Rail Terminal Impact Analysis, July 2003. Among the reasons stated include transportation interface with other mass transit options including Amtrak, Greyhound, Golden Empire Transit, taxi and non-motorized transportation and, importantly, the reasonable alternative of walking to likely and nearby destinations. Note with our poor local air quality any option to reduce the use of fossil fuel that would reduce additional impact on our already poor air quality would be desirable.

The F St. UP alignment option needs to go back on the shelf and details and issues surrounding the Truxtun Ave. BNSF alignment option need to be studied and worked out. Thank you for your consideration of this matter and this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Stephen A. Montgomery
NARVRE Unit 013, Local Legislative Representative
http://www.narvre.info
UTU Local 835 Alumni
2115 1st Street
Bakersfield CA 93304-2707
661-496-6585

CC: Jason Cater, Cathy Butler, Paul Gipe, Adam Cohen, Jonathan Yates, Ken Hooper, Gordon Nipp
Letter No. 11: Stephen Montgomery

11-A  The Lead Agency has noted your opposition. See Global Response No. 3 and 4, and response 7-A.
January 14, 2018

Jacquelyn R. Kitchen, Community Development Director
City of Bakersfield Planning Department
1715 Chester Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Re: HSR Station Location

There are currently two options being studied for the HSR station: 1) downtown Truxtun; 2) Locally Generated Alternative (LGA). I offer a brief analysis of these two alternate station locations.

**Access to HSR station.** The downtown station is more accessible to downtown Rabobank Convention Center, governmental agencies, hotels and entertainment activities than the LGA station, which is an isolated island bound by railroad tracks and Golden State Hwy. The downtown station is more accessible to the City. The LGA requires extensive infrastructure improvements of roads and highways. The downtown station has access from Hwy 99 via Truxtun Avenue and California Avenue as well as access from Golden State Hwy.

**Economic potential.** It is entirely possible that people will not utilize the HSR to visit Bakersfield due to the inconvenient location of the LGA station. If the HSR station is going to impact the economy of Bakersfield, it should be located in downtown. Everything downtown would be within walking distance of the station. According to the HSR Screening Report “The proposed (downtown) site maximizes the ridership and revenue potential, connectivity and accessibility, and is compatible with existing and planned development while minimizing impacts to natural and cultural resources.” The Kern Council of Governments reviewed the different sites and stated “The Truxtun site offers the best opportunities for the station to serve as a catalyst of the new downtown economic development.”

**Heavy Maintenance Facility (HMF)**

Only the downtown station route offers the opportunity for the HMF via BNSF. The LGA route does not have this option available. Shafter is a strong contender for the HMF with property donated. The Shafter HMF has been studied as part of approved Environmental Impact Reports for the Freson-Bakersfield Hybrid alignment. The HMF is forecast to generate a quarter of billion in annual GDP growth. With Bakersfield economy still struggling from the downturn in oil production, the City should be trying to diversify its economic base. Many organizations such as the Kern Taxpayers Association, Kern Transportation Foundation, Kern Economic Development Corporation, and Kern County Black Chamber of Commerce are working in unison to bring the HMF to Bakersfield.

It is not clear why the City Council and “local stakeholders” opposed the downtown station. In closing the HSR station should be located downtown.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

John Karnes, Architect
2521 Beech Street
Bakersfield, CA 93301

[Signature]

Susan Karnes

CC: HSR, Sacramento, Ca.
Letter No. 12: John and Susan Kames

12-A See Global Response No. 3 and 4, and response 7-A.
I’m against the whole thing. Bakersfield has had terrible 20-30 future planning, whoever is in charge needs to be replaced. First they end a highway (58) into a shopping mall, then they have to buy back all the houses they let people build and now they want to destroy the hospitals here in Bakersfield.

First, why spend all that money on a speedy train that's going to stop at every little town, what good is the speed if you are stopping every two seconds. The existing train is a cheaper train doing the same thing going to the same places.

Second, it will cost more to ride that expensive train when done, after all of us tax payers have paid trillions of dollars. Most people that ride the train can’t afford to drive to there locations or it's cheaper to use than driving.

Third, why don’t they put a train to Las Vegas and tie a line in Mojave to go to Los Angeles which would actually help, because the existing train buses people over the grapevine to get to LA, since there is no train track.

Fourth, why mess up the Adventist Health Hospital (San Joaquin Hospital) when they have a beautiful campus with several new medical facilities surrounding it. If you are going to waste are money take the building behind Mercy. It will be less impact for everyone, even though I still don’t believe we need this expensive train.

This is a waste of money for something we already have. Adding new tracks to other locations like LA, LV and the to the coast from Bakersfield is money better spent. Leave to the government to build a mountain for a mole.

Virus-free. www.avast.com
Letter No. 13: Rhonda Pierce

13-A See Global Response No. 3, 4, and 6, and response 7-A.
Regarding the city redevelopment plan of 10, 20, and 30 years. I have to wonder why the focus is not downtown central and an HSR station on Truxtun. If you can’t get that area reinvigorated, development will continue to move out to the suburban expanses not Columbus or F st. The 10 year move toward Mill Creek is good but what is the point of destroying a perfectly good hospital only to replace it with commercial high rises that may or may not be filled. Is the Sumner area to be destroyed and sacrificed by the HSR so that the Columbus mess can be redeveloped. All of this seems like the city is being pushed and pulled by the owners of various land areas that have connections with the city of some sort rather than good redevelopment patterns. I am not a planner but this looks too political to me.

Mike Ladd
Letter No. 14: Mike Ladd

14-A  See Global Response No. 3, 4 and 6, and response 7-A.
Hello,

I'm concerned about the city of Bakersfield's plan for the area in and around San Joaquin Hospital. Why has that San Joaquin Hospital area been rezoned on the 10-20 and 20-30 development maps? Is it the city's plan to rezone and force San Joaquin Hospital out of downtown? Will these zoning changes hamper or stop future San Joaquin Hospital development?

Francine Simmons
Letter No. 15: Francine Simmons, February 16, 2018

15-A  See Global Response No. 6.
I support the 0-10 Year Development Plan and Oppose the 10-20 and 20-30 Year Development Plans.
Letter No. 16: Pamela Dougherty

16-A  Thank you for providing your support for the 0-10 year plan and the Lead Agency notes opposition to the 10-20 and 20-30 year development plans in the record.
To Whom It May Concern:

I believe that the current efforts to identify an appropriate HSR location should focus on the high-density downtown core and NOT on "F" Street. It makes absolutely no sense to remove easy access to arenas, restaurants, and local businesses. And, further, to continue negative impact on one of Bakersfield's most lovely neighborhoods.

Julie Riegel
Cedar St.

Sent from my iPhone
Letter No. 17: Julie Riegel

17-A See Global Response No. 3 and 4, and response 7-A.
Dear Ms. Griego:

As a forty-four year resident of Bakersfield, I am a stakeholder in Bakersfield’s development plans and the statewide HSR project. Furthermore, I have no property impacted by either of the proposed alignments or downtown development. My comments are predicated on the logic leading up to the station location at F Street and SR 204.

**BACKGROUND**

After nearly three years of analyzing a Draft and a Revised Draft Fresno to Bakersfield Section EIR/EIS, the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS was approved in May 2014. It included the Hybrid Alternative as the Authority’s preferred alignment which brought HSR into Bakersfield on the BNSF right-of-way paralleling Truxtun Avenue to a station location near the intersection of Union Avenue and Truxtun later called the “May 2014 Project.” This alignment would severely impact several City facilities, freeway projects, medical facilities, businesses, schools, churches and 384 private residences. Many of these severe impacts were left without mitigation measures. In June 2014, the City of Bakersfield filed a CEQA lawsuit against the High-Speed Rail Authority. In a settlement agreement, the Authority agreed to collaborate with local agencies and stakeholders to identify a new alternative. The new alternative is called the Locally Generated Alternative (LGA). It brings HSR into Bakersfield on the Union Pacific right-of-way with a station location at the intersection of F Street and SR 204 (Golden State Avenue). The LGA was evaluated in a Fresno to Bakersfield Section Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS in November 2017.

Comparison of impacts between the LGA and the May 2014 Project shows the LGA to be superior. The Authority supports the LGA. In December 2017, on a 7-0 vote, the Bakersfield City Council adopted a comprehensive resolution supporting the LGA.

In order to prepare the City of Bakersfield for a station in its downtown on the proposed state-wide HSR system, the City initiated a planning effort called “Making Downtown Bakersfield.” The planning involves development of a Project (the Project) for the area around the future station. The Project area encompasses approximately 2.3 square miles (1,472 acres) surrounding the proposed station site which is located along Golden State Avenue near intersections with F Street and Chester Avenue. Specifically, the Project is described as a Station Area Plan/Project that establishes a strategic vision for the future development of the areas surrounding the proposed station. The Project is evaluated in a Draft Environmental Impact Report dated January 2018.
COMMENTS

The proposed station location is in a relatively uncongested area of the City that could use the possible economic boost from a rail station. The purpose of the Project is to provide guidance for future downtown development. Project objectives are as follows:

1) Increase population and economic density in the urban core
2) Support residential and commercial activity
3) Develop underutilized and vacant properties
4) Connect existing activity and cultural centers
5) Create an efficient, reliable and effective multi-modal transportation system
6) Enhance sustainability, livability and a unique sense of place
7) Secure funding for identified implementation actions

The Draft EIR evaluates the following issues:

1) Aesthetics
2) Air Quality
3) Biological Resources
4) Cultural Resources
5) Geology and Soils
6) Greenhouse Gas Emissions
7) Hazards and Hazardous Materials
8) Hydrology and Water Quality
9) Land Use and Planning
10) Noise
11) Population and Housing
12) Public Services and Recreation
13) Transportation
14) Tribal Cultural Resources
15) Utilities and Service Systems
16) Other CEQA Discussions

It is noteworthy that the EIR concluded the Project would have residual impacts less-than-significant without mitigation in the following environmental issue areas: Aesthetics, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Population and Housing, and Public Services and Recreation. It is also noteworthy that the EIR concluded the Project would have a significant residual impact on the following environmental issue areas, but that incorporation of mitigation would reduce these potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Utilities and Service Systems. During the Notice of Preparation scoping process it was determined the
environmental issue areas of Agricultural and Forestry Resources and Mineral Resources would have no residual impact or less-than-significant impact and were not further considered in the EIR.

This leaves two, Noise and Transportation, of the fifteen environmental issue areas to be further considered in the EIR. In the case of noise, the EIR concludes the Project would cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels from roadway noise above levels existing without the Project especially during construction. By complying with the requirements of the Bakersfield General Plan policies for noise, much of the impact of roadway noise can be reduced to less-than-significant. Project design requirements would incorporate permanent noise barriers and sound attenuating features to reduce noise. However, the residual noise impact results in a significant and unavoidable designation.

Regarding transportation, the Project would conflict with the transportation system performance criteria of the City and Caltrans at several intersections. It was determined no mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts at these intersections resulting in a residual impact designation of significant and unavoidable. Other aspects of transportation analyzed in the EIR include: air traffic patterns, design features and incompatible use, adequacy of emergency access and how the focus of the Project creates an integrated, multi-modal transportation system that improves overall transit including pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. Each of these aspects is given a residual impact designation of less-than-significant without mitigation.

The EIR also evaluates three Alternatives:

1) **No Project.** Buildout would occur under Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan.
2) **Low Intensity/Density Design.** Overall reduction of commercial square footage/residential units and future development would focus around the HSR station.
3) **Medium Intensity/Design.** Overall reduction of commercial square footage/residential units but less than the Low Intensity/Density Alternative. Additionally, it would incorporate a building height cap limiting the height of any future high rise development in the Project area.

Of the three alternatives considered, the Low Intensity/Density Design (Alternative 2) could be considered environmentally superior.

In conclusion, with the Project objectives in mind and the seemingly limited residual environmental impacts of the Project, I support the Project. It provides for Bakersfield to be a “Station Community” on the proposed statewide high-speed rail system and provides a plan for orderly, environmentally friendly development of downtown. The potential for downtown development provided by the Project is critical to Bakersfield’s future considering the state mandated dismantling of redevelopment agencies.

Sincerely,

William C. Descary
Letter No. 18: William Descary

18-A  Thank you for providing a comprehensive summary of the analysis and findings contained within the Draft EIR. Your comments in support of the project are also noted for the record.
To whom it may concern,

I was at the meeting on January 18 2018 for the HSR vision plan. The vision plan of revitalizing downtown was great! However, the HSR location on F st does not go with the vision plan, it's too far away. The truxton and union station (or anything in that vicinity) seems lie a perfect fit. You want people traveling on the HSR to be able to walk to shops and restaurants and stay in the area. If they take an uber or cab they may not even end up downtown and it is more of an inconvenience. The whole point of revitalizing downtown is to have everything downtown. Also, upon the closing comments of the committee, commissioner Koman made a statement that he did not think the staple for the city should be a strip club and a muffler shop that says no muff too tuff. To me it sounded like he was basing his decision of where the HSR should go based on what businesses he wants gone and not what would actually be best for the city. I do not agree with that at all. We need to look at what will benefit the city and bring more jobs and income, I do believe that would be downtown area and not all the way on F st near oildale.

Thank you,
Kira Gravely
Letter No. 19: Kira Gravely

19-A  See Global Response No. 3 and 4, and response 7-A.
February 19, 2018

Cecelia Griego
Principal Planner
City of Bakersfield Community Development Department – Planning Division
1715 Chester Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

RE: Bakersfield Station Area Plan Draft EIR Comments

Ms. Griego,

I am a local transportation consultant with over 10 years’ experience with the California HSR project. My office is located in downtown Bakersfield and I ride the conventional passenger train Amtrak on a regular basis.

I have a number of written comments that I would like to submit. However, the Notice of Availability for the Station Area Plan Draft EIR states that issues could be raised orally or submitted in writing by 5:00 pm February 19, 2018 the day the comment period ends.

However, February 19, 2018 is Presidents Day and national holiday. Your office was closed. Therefore it was impossible to submit oral or written comments. In addition the US Post Office was also closed meaning it was not possible to mail a written comment post marked on the day the comment period closed.

The following are some of the comments I would like to have submitted today if your office was able to accept comments as the Notice of Availability stated. See attached NOA.

20-A

The study area used in the station area plan was not defined with public input. Typically studies areas would include a ¼ or ½ radius around the potential station sites. The study area does not include these areas for either the proposed HSR station site at F Street or the approved site at Truxtun Avenue.

20-B

The areas that were studied and recommendations in the Draft EIR do not adhere to the defined study area and are not consistent with information presented in public meetings. The visions and future development patterns developed do not include the approved downtown HSR station on Truxtun Avenue adjacent to the existing Amtrak train station.

20-C

At all of the stakeholder meetings, public meetings, and the recent public hearing that I attended all of the issues above were raised.

20-D

The significant freeway and roadway improvements required to access a station at F Street identified in the HSR Authority Draft EIR for the Locally Generated Alignment are not considered in the station area plan.

20-E

Connectivity and integration with the existing Amtrak passenger rail service and bus connections to many cities in southern California are not considered in the station area plan.

20-F

In conclusion, the station area plan is not consistent with the station area plan development guidelines developed by the HSR Authority.

I highly recommend that you revise the station area plan or at a minimum extend the comment period.

Respectfully,

Troy Hightower
Transportation Consultant
Po Box 2493
Bakersfield, CA 93303
thightower@tdhintl.net
NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (DEIR) AND
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF BAKERSFIELD

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on August 29, 2016, the City of Bakersfield, as Lead Agency, issued a
Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project described below.

The purpose of this notice is to advise that, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA),
the State CEQA Guidelines, and the City of Bakersfield’s CEQA Implementation Procedures, the City of
Bakersfield has prepared the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the project described below.
As mandated by State law, the DEIR is now available for Public Review for 45 days and the public
comment period is as noted below.

Copies of the DEIR and all related documents are on file and available to the public through the City of
Bakersfield Community Development Department - Planning Division, located at 1715 Chester Avenue,
Bakersfield CA 93301. The public may also contact the planner assigned to this project, Cecelia Griego,
Principal Planner, at (661) 326-3788 or cgriego@bakersfieldcity.us. The City website address is
www.bakersfieldcity.us.

- Applicant: City of Bakersfield, 1715 Chester Ave, Bakersfield, CA 93301
- Case Reference: High Speed Rail Station Area Plan Vision Plan (“Making Downtown Bakersfield”):
  SCH # 2016081071
- Project Location: Approximately 2.3 square-mile area around the proposed Bakersfield High Speed
  Rail (HSR) Station location, along Golden State Avenue near its intersection with Chester Avenue
  and F Street. The Project area is bound by California Avenue to the south, Union Avenue to the east,
  38th Street and the Kern River to the north, and F Street to the west.
- Project Description: The Project is a Station Area Vision Plan that establishes a strategic vision for
  the future development of the area surrounding the future HSR Station in Downtown Bakersfield. The
  Project addresses key factors affecting future development within the Project area, including, but
  not limited to: land use patterns in the context of the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan; urban
  design and infrastructure; multi-modal transportation services and circulation; parking, pedestrian
  and bicycle access; open space and recreation; arts and culture; and other principal factors. The
  Project establishes a conceptual phased approach to future physical development, including a
  long-term (30-year) development projection which would include up to: 2,005,000 square feet of office
  space; 8,570 residential units; 906,988 square feet of retail; and 2,413 hotel rooms.
- Anticipated Significant Impacts on the Environment: The DEIR has identified significant unavoidable
  Noise and Transportation impacts associated with the proposed project.

- Public Hearing: NOTICE IS ALSO HEREBY GIVEN that a public hearing accepting testimony regarding
  the adequacy of the DEIR will be held before the Planning Commission of the City of Bakersfield on
  Thursday, January 18, 2018 at 5:30 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, at the
  Council Chambers of City Hall, 1501 Truxtun Avenue, Bakersfield, California, 93301. Additional
  hearings will be also scheduled for final consideration of the EIR.

- Public Review and Comments regarding the proposed project and/or adequacy of the DEIR,
  including requests for additional environmental review, will be accepted in writing on or before
  February 19, 2018 and may be sent to the Planning Division at the address noted above. The period
  for public review during which the City will receive comments on the DEIR will begin on January 5,
  2018 and end on February 19, 2018. Testimony at future public hearings may be limited to those
  issues raised during the public review period either orally or submitted in writing by 5:00 p.m. the day
  the comment period closes.

DATED: January 5, 2018

JACQUELYN R. KITCHEN, Community Development Director
Community Development Department

IF YOUR PROPERTY IS RENTED OR LEASED, WE REQUEST THAT YOU PROVIDE YOUR TENANT(S) NOTICE OF THIS PUBLIC HEARING.
Letter No. 20: Troy Hightower

20-A These comments have been accepted and included in the FEIR.

20-B See Global Responses No. 2 and 3.

20-C See Global Response No. 4.

20-D See response to comments above.

20-E See Global Responses 1 and 4.

20-F Connection to the Amtrak station with transit and other forms of transportation are discussed in the Vision Plan, such as the Downtown Shuttle, “Regardless, it is imperative for the Downtown shuttle to be bi-directional, connect the Amtrak station to the future HSR station site, and the flexibility to augment its service to coincide with the growth of Downtown.” As well, mobility hubs “would be at the future HSR station and the current Amtrak station (the site of the proposed commuter rail station).” (Vision Plan, page 44)

20-G The Lead Agency acknowledges the statement that the project does not meet HSR Authority guidelines and notes that the Station Area Plan meets the parameters of the signed agreement between the City and HSR Authority in the development of a Station Area Plan. The comment period will not be extended.
Hi Cecelia,

I would like to voice my concern with the City's station area plan for the F-St/204 station. I am fundamentally opposed to the choice of location and to the corresponding area plan. Here are my reasons:

1. **We need to keep our focus on improving our true downtown**: shifting the city northward is not in the best interest of the city. It is wrong to assume that just because things are improving downtown, that if we cannibalize the organic growth downtown by shifting development efforts northward, that our true downtown will become as vital and healthy as we hope. The failure of the city to field an application for $35 million from the Strategic Growth Council is a prime example of this. Our downtown could have had significant improvements with that money.

2. **The station area plan primarily benefits white communities**: We are ignoring minority and disadvantaged communities on the other side of Union avenue and to the south of California avenue. Why shouldn't these neighborhoods benefit from the HSR and redevelopment?

3. **The cost and time it will take to rezone SJ Community Hospital**: We cannot be wasting millions of dollars moving a hospital. It is one of the largest employers in Kern County and a key healthcare provider. The squandered money spent on relocating the hospital and the inconvenience this represents for hospital patients and employees is not worth it for the City's proposed alternative use of the land.

4. **The loss of the Shafter HMF**: coming off the biggest drought experienced in my lifetime and a record low rainfall winter, it's clear that Kern county needs to diversify it's economy. The HMF will make Kern County a hub for HSR innovation in the US. It will directly employ 2,000 people and create jobs for another 1,000 people in supporting industries. We can't have the HMF and the LGA. The LGA is already an inferior alignment to the Hybrid alignment, and when the HMF is taken into consideration, it's disastrous.

We do not want the station at F St. and 204. Scrap the station area plan and make one for the approved location at Truxtun. It's what we will have to do when (hopefully) the HSRA rejects the LGA EIR.

Thanks for taking my comment into the public record,
Jonathan Yates
Letter No. 21: Jonathan Yates

21-A     See Global Responses No. 3, 4 and 6. The location of the Heavy Maintenance Facility is outside the scope of this EIR.
THE CHAIR: This is the only item on tonight's public hearing agenda is the taking of public comments on the draft making Downtown High Speed Rail Station Area Vision Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report. After everyone has had the opportunity to comment on the project, the public hearing will be closed, and the comments will be provided to the City staff for consideration in response. The CEQA public comment period will remain open until February 19th, 2018, so you can continue to submit your written comments to the City up until that time.

Now that I've explained the process to you, I will ask staff to provide us with a presentation on the project before I open the public hearing.

Ms. Kitchen.

MS. KITCHEN: Thank you, Chairman Lomas. Good evening Planning Commissioners and public. Thank you for attending tonight.

First and foremost, I want to acknowledge the team that is here with me tonight. We've been working on this project together for over two years, and it has been a genuine group effort. We have Cecelia Grego here who is the principle planner in my department and the project manager for this vision plan.
We also have Andy Heglund who has been our counsel through this process. And we are also joined by our consultant Gunnar Han and members of his team. And this group effort has also involved City staff from Public Works, Technology Services, as well as support from Kern COG and the City Counsel, and most importantly participation by the residents of Bakersfield who have participated in many workshops, community meetings, stakeholders committee, and much more.

So I will start out tonight by providing a little bit of background and explain why we are here. In 2008, California voters approved Bond Measure, known as Proposition 1A, for the nation's first voter-approved financing mechanism for the high speed rail.

The California High Speed Rail Authority was established for the planning, design, construction, and operation of the future statewide high speed rail system. The Authority states that by 2029 the high speed rail system will run from San Francisco to the Los Angeles basin in under three hours at speeds over 200 miles per hour. At final build out, the station will -- or the system will eventually extend to Sacramento and San Diego totalling 800 miles with up to
24 high speed rail stations located throughout the state.

This is all relevant to Bakersfield because the Authority has selected Bakersfield to be one of those 24 station cities. And the Authority has indicated that this enhanced connection to the rest of the state will provide opportunities for economic development, job creation, and revitalization of our community.

As you can see, Bakersfield is well situated at the center of this future high speed rail system and provides an extraordinary opportunity for high speed rail riders to connect to the rest of the state -- to the west and to the east -- all through Bakersfield.

So after the approval of Proposition 1A, the state began extensive environmental studies of each segment of the high speed rail line including preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Fresno to Bakersfield section. That document identified a preferred alignment from Fresno to Bakersfield, known as the Hybrid Alignment, which is shown as the blue line on this map. That Alignment follows, in part, the BNSF rail line through Bakersfield and would include a station located on Truxtun Avenue near the current Amtrak station.
In May of 2014, the authority's Board of Directors certified that final EIR. However, upon review of the Hybrid Alignment, the City concluded that, in addition to potentially impacting more than 300 homes, the Hybrid Alignment also affected many city assets including the corporation yard, housing projects, and parking facilities at the Rabobank Arena and Convention Center. The Hybrid Alignment would also affect Mercy Hospital on Truxtun and the future Bakersfield Commons project. Therefore, the City filed a lawsuit against high speed rail in June of 2014, and several other entities also filed suit including the County of Kern, First Freewill Baptist Church, Dignity Health, World Oil, the City of Shafter, and Kings County.

City staff identified an alternative alignment, and proposed it to the high speed rail for further evaluation. That alignment is showed as the green line on this map. In December of 2014, the Authority agreed to study this alternative alignment, which settled the City's lawsuit. And this alignment became known as the "Locally Generated Alignment" and generally follows the Union Pacific rail line and includes a station at "F" Street.

So since then, in 2015, the Authority advised
that they were offering planning grants to the selected station cities. And the purpose of these grants was to allow each city to prepare a station area plan for the area around the proposed high speed rail station. The City accepted that grant, and in December of 2015, the City Counsel approved an agreement with the consulting firm of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill to develop this station area plan, which would help the City prepare for the benefits that may come with a high speed rail station.

Now, when the City accepted this grant, we also wanted to insure that this planning process would have an independent utility and help the community think broadly and build upon past planning efforts to launch an updated vision for the revitalization of downtown Bakersfield overall. So therefore, we've spent the last two years hosting a variety of community workshops, meetings, discussions, and public interactions. And then we then integrated the input received into this making downtown Bakersfield vision plan.

The process revealed that Bakersfield residents want to see a downtown that is vibrant, walkable, connected, safe, and full of amenities. So during that same time period, the high speed rail
continued their work on their supplemental CEQA document to study the LGA Alignment.

In May of 2016, the High Speed Rail Board identified the LGA as their recommended preferred alternative alignment. That action was important because it gave the City direction on which station location to study in this vision plan. In November of last year, the Authority then released their draft supplemental EIR/EIS. That document analyzed the LGA and compared it to the Hybrid Alignment among other alternatives. Ultimately, the document identified the LGA as the preferred alternative and specifically states in part, that "It would result in lesser impacts associated with agricultural lands, residential displacements, special status plant species, riparian areas, and permanent impacts to jurisdictional waters. That it would cost less to construct, would improve traffic, pedestrian, and bicycle safety and circulation in the City of Shafter, and would reduce overall systemwide travel time."

The public review for the State's document recently closed, and their next step will be for the High Speed Board Authority to consider certification of that supplemental EIR and approval of the LGA as the alignment through Bakersfield. The high speed rail has
indicated that that decision may occur later this year, and I see that they are here in the audience this evening.

So earlier this month, I'm excited to say that the City completed our work on the draft vision plan and associated draft EIR, and we released it for public review on January 5th. Our consultant, Gunnar Hand is here this evening to provide an overview of the extensive public outreach process and the results and to provide an overview of the vision plan then the accompanying environmental document.

So before I turn it over to Gunnar, I have a few housekeeping items quickly. At first, I wanted to explain that the fundamental purpose of the Station Area Plan is to establish a strategic vision for the future development of the area around the high speed rail station. Now, we know that the ultimate decision regarding the location of the station will be made by the high speed rail at some point in the future. We also know that there are a variety of opinions about which location is preferred -- Truxtun or "F" Street.

So while this vision plan followed the Board Authority decision in May of 2016 and includes a location at "F" Street, the important thing to remember is that our entire downtown will be affected and
potentially revitalized by a station regardless of the location.

So this vision plan is intended to address the bigger picture for downtown. It looks at key factors and concepts that can affect the future development of downtown such as land use patterns; urban design and infrastructure; multimodal transportation services and circulation; access for parking, pedestrians, and bicycles; open space and recreational opportunities; the importance of the arts and culture and much more. As Gunnar will explain, the plan establishes a conceptual phased approach of the future physical development over the next 10, 20, and 30 years and truly focuses on downtown overall.

So lastly, I wanted to talk about the purpose of tonight's hearing. The purpose of tonight's hearing is to present this draft plan and the draft EIR to the public and to provide the public with an extra opportunity to present their comments regarding the adequacy of the draft EIR. The draft EIR was released on January 5th, 2018, and the comment period is scheduled to close on February 19th of 2018.

Tonight's hearing is not required by the State CEQA Statute, and it's actually part of the City's Official CEQA Implementation procedures. So
after Gunnar's presentation tonight, the public will have an opportunity to present their comments. The Planning Commission and staff will not be responding to those comments tonight. However, commissioners may offer comments of their own if they wish to do so, or they can present them in writing prior to February 19th. All comments received throughout this process will be recorded and provided to staff for response.

After all the comments are received this evening, staff is recommending that the Planning Commission make a motion for all comments to be forwarded to staff for preparation of a response and the final EIR. The vision plan and EIR will then be scheduled for an additional public hearing later this spring after the final EIR is completed. At that hearing, the Planning Commission will have an opportunity to discuss the comments received, ask questions, make statements, and finally make a recommendation to City Counsel regarding certification of the final EIR and approval of the vision plan. At that point, the project will then be scheduled for City Counsel for final consideration, and I would note that that meeting also provides the public with another opportunity to be heard on this important project.

So with that, I will turn it over to
Gunnar Hand, our consultant from SOM. He will provide you with a very exciting presentation about the last two years of this public effort.

MR. HAND: There we go. Thank you Ms. Kitchen, Madam Chair, fellow Planning Commissioners, members of the public and staff.

Again, my name is Gunnar Hand. I work for the Los Angeles office of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill. I was on the consultant side, the project manager for our team, and I think today we wanted to kind of take a step back and give you the full picture for the benefit of everyone here tonight.

As Ms. Kitchen said, it was a two-year process, where we think that we've put together a relatively robust engagement process, working with the community hand-in-hand on developing, essentially, a revitalization project -- or a revitalization plan for downtown, one that would make downtown high speed rail ready. So I think today I'm going to go over generally how we started this project, the outreach that we did, some of the early existing conditions and analysis that we did that really propelled the development of scenarios, and ultimately the vision that you have in front of you today.

After I complete, very quickly, Eric VonBerg
with Rincon Consultants who is the lead on the environmental document, will come and provide additional couple of slides and comments for everyone's consideration.

So project goals. These have been the same project goals since the RFP. They've carried through the entire process; and really, again, the essence of this project was to be really, sort of, two things -- a downtown revitalization strategy, but also a high speed rail station area plan. And I would say, through the course of the process, what we found collectively as a stakeholder group and as a City and as a consultant is that making downtown Bakersfield high speed rail ready was revitalizing downtown Bakersfield.

This timeline is essentially out of date. I left it up there because I think it's important to know that we've been going through a very diligent process over the last six months with the environmental document and the development of the vision plan. Essentially, early last summer is when we had our last, sort of, public meeting, and we started to transition from a planning stage into an implementation stage. And I think, to the credit of the community, there's a lot of things that you've seen in the plan that have already, sort of, started to take shape and form and
move forward, a testament, I think, to really the grassroots revitalization that's going on in downtown Bakersfield, which, quite frankly, happened well before I even showed up.

But, again, I think just to frame the context, this is stuff that we all know about downtown Bakersfield, but I think is really important to reiterate and that is: We know downtown has a lot of potential. It has a lot of great cultural venues, both new and old. There are lots of programs that happen downtown, and when they do, I think a lot of people show up to those programs. I think that speaks to the desire and the character and the uniqueness of downtown within the region. There's a lot of historic buildings even though we lost a lot of them in the 1950s earthquakes there's still a very good building stock in downtown Bakersfield -- some being preserved, some not as much. But there's also been quite a bit of investment downtown. Back in the old CRA days we the Mill Creek Linear Park. A lot of developments still happening up until the last couple of years, residual projects from the old CRA, but we've put a lot of money into downtown.

It is still the government center of the region. It is still the central business district of
the region, but there's also a lot of opportunity. We see a lot of underutilized properties predominantly on the upper floors, things that could be very -- very quickly sort of -- we believe with the right type of focus, revitalize that existing, sort of, building floor area and space. We did a market analysis and part of our consideration was the absorption of not necessarily just building new, but that sort of underutilized floor areas in those second, third, fourth floors of downtown attracting some of that square footage that we projected.

Again, but there's also a lot of in-fill opportunities whether there's surface parking lots, vacant parcels still in and around the project area. Again, lots of opportunity. And I think that there's already a lot of good connections that exist for its size. For instance, Bakersfield has a relatively robust bike network. Of course, we can always do better. Every city can. But I think it's important to reflect on the work -- the good work that has already been done that is already ongoing that really we took when we came here to Bakersfield a little over two years ago and tried to run with. And I think that's really what we really tried to focus with this project was there was so many things happening, not necessarily
in silos, but things happening independent of one another. And this was really an opportunity to bring all those stakeholders together, tie a bow around it, and sort of move us together, collectively, in a much more impactful way.

And, again, I think we're on the verge. We're feeling it right now. There's a lot of new retail and restaurants downtown. There's this, sort of, energy that's starting to collect and grow. And so what we wanted to do, again, with this vision plan was: How do we capture that? Maybe, in a way, codify it and really propel it forward into the future with some new ideas, some new energy, but also some collective effort.

So the process. And I think for the process I'm going to go over quickly the engagement process first, and then I'll get to, sort of, the mechanics of the different milestones of the work plan for making downtown Bakersfield.

So we had three primary engagement milestones that I'm going to review. What's not going to be included in these slides is all the things that happened in between that. We had a stakeholder group made up of many stakeholders in and around downtown -- property owners, business owners, residents, other
advocates, nonprofits. We had a work planning group with the City, different departments, and the High Speed Rail Authority. And there was just a whole bunch of other events that I was invited to or Jacqui, or Cecelia were invited to -- or excuse me -- Ms. Kitchen or Ms. Grego were invited to, where we sort of worked in and around downtown, sort of, spreading the word initially, seeking additional buy-in, trying to encourage more people to come to the table and give us their ideas, and get engaged in their community.

And the first one of those big milestones was this, sort of, vision workshop process that we did. We did 11 of them. Over a 150 people showed up across those 11, but we did those inside the project area and outside the project area. This really -- the focus of these vision workshops was to identify the community values that Ms. Kitchen outlined earlier and that you can see at the top of your screen here. But really, it was important for us, in our first brush, go to where people are, as opposed to call those folks to us. We saved that for the other two engagement activities. I think there was a, sort of, progression of momentum across the project timeline. We, sort of, saw new faces, we're always coming to the table at these different events, new ideas, and, again, new
stakeholders to carry it through.

Our second event happened in August 2016. This was right around when we were starting to develop different scenarios for -- for this development that we were projecting with high speed rail. Excuse me. And so we did a community workshop to really try to ask the question: "Okay. We're projecting this amount of development. Where do you think it would be best suited?" And I think that there was a, sort of -- a recognition there that while it sounds like a lot, the project area is a relatively large space. So we needed to be strategic in how we, sort of, focused that development, at least in terms of how we vision it.

And then the final public hearing happened, again, sort of, late last spring or last spring, and it was held at the Fox Theater. And I think this was before we really started out the development of that final vision. We did not want to have a final engagement opportunity where we said, "Here's the final plan. What do you think?" We really wanted to have that, sort of, last litmus test with the community to sort of get better ideas of how we can take those scenarios that we've developed -- and I'll dive into those a little bit later -- how we got those scenarios that we developed together and put them into a phase
development strategy. And it was also sort of a milestone, if you will, in and of itself, where we said, "Okay. Now is the time where we shift from a planning group, a stakeholder group, to kind of an implementation or a booster committee." And that was sort of the milestone hosted by Merrigo.

So I think it's important to also go over the existing condition analysis and some of the highlights that we learned because it is in the study of this place and of the people, of the culture, that I think grew some of our greatest ideas early on, and then we sort of worked through the rest of the process, vetting those ideas, fine tuning them, and identifying champions, really.

So I'm going to go over the existing conditions analysis next. So we learned a couple things from both our market analysis and our physical asset study moving forward and that was: We are definitely competing with the more suburban development around downtown, but we think with the different -- with investment, we can compete better to attract more jobs and more housing.

Same thing. With more -- with interventions, again, because of the uniqueness of downtown across the region, a relatively large region, you know, maybe even
bigger than Kern County, we know that we can attract more hotels and more retail downtown. And when you look at, sort of -- this is sort of the nerdy plan review -- of downtown Bakersfield, it is part and parcel with the most walkable community in the United States, arguably, which is Portland, Oregon. The block sizes are small, you guys have alleys, that makes it -- multiple different ways and routes that you can get around downtown. It's very, very walkable. I think that there's just, sort of this -- there was this perception. And as we all know, perception can be reality. But, again, going from downtown to Mill Creek is not a very long distance. So how do we close that perception gap with different interventions? And, again, I think it was important for us early on, you know, when we came here and we saw the bike lanes and we saw the, sort of, the built environment and the, sort of, design, if you will, of downtown. And we started to dive into the policies.

You guys have complete street policies. You were -- you were doing, sort of, all these best practices that you asked us to come into and to, sort of, both educate and elevate the discourse, but a lot of it was already happening, which this was not a surprise to us, but it may have been a surprise to the
City that you were -- we were a validation of: "No, you're on the right path."

We also started, I should say, an infrastructure analysis looking at all the different telecommunications, water, electric, sewer, storm water. The vast majority of those are controlled by private utilities. And the gist of the infrastructure analysis, I would say, was private utilities -- as private utilities are -- say they can meet any demands because that's how they make money. And then we sort of set on the path with sewer and storm water with Mr. Padilla's help, in fact, to try to start the assessment of what it would take to analyze what our sewer and -- excuse me, sewer and storm water policy is moving forward. That ended up becoming one of, as you'll see -- as you have seen, perhaps, as you've read it, but you will see later in this presentation -- ended up becoming one of our top 11 implementation actions in the first 10 years.

But when we drove around and walked around and took transit around, we also saw that there was, again, a lot of potential in terms of underutilized parcels. Underutilized being sort of the soft sites, if you will, for future development, whether it's infill on surface parking lots or vacant parcels. When
we started mapping out all the different alleyways, again, another condition that we thought was unique. You can kind of see in this image the red lines of the alleyways. Some are horizontal, some are vertical, some are gaps. But the one line of alleyways that had continuous integrity all the way from Mill Creek to the river, essentially, also happens to be where you guys already had a pedestrian sale -- a pedestrian mall on Wall Street.

We saw a lot of different types of open space. Again, the investment in the Mill Creek area along the Kern River, but also, sort of, parcelled out there has been sort of streetscape improvements throughout downtown, as well. But we also saw that they were somewhat disjointed, there was a lack of connectivity amongst them. But then we said, "Well, if high speed rail comes through on this corridor, for instance, we have an opportunity to bring the river into the community and connect the Kern River Trail to the Mill Creek Trail or Mill Creek Linear Park."

But the one that I always like to end on that we learned from the existing conditions analysis came from our study of other high speed rail station areas around the world. As you know, this is the only high speed rail system other than the one that's kind of
planned to go from Palmdale to Las Vegas. But at the
time when we were doing this, that was still, kind of,
in the air. There is no high speed rail system in our
hemisphere, so we had to look elsewhere.

So we did our best to have, sort of, a
comparable size and location to different cities mostly
in Europe. And what we found was those stations and
those station areas optimized their economic
development by having strong pedestrian and transit
connectivity to that station. So you can unlock that
much more development if you have a strong
pedestrian and transit access to it. And I think
that's when we started realizing that the "F" Street
location, while "F" Street is one of the entrances, it
was also along what is, essentially your, quote,
unquote "Main Street" Chester Avenue.

So the vision. I talked about open space a
little bit in the last couple slides. But what we saw
here was if you, sort of, take this idea of expanding
what you have on Wall Street and connecting the river
to Mill Creek, if you try to bring the high speed --
excuse me -- the river through the high speed rail
station site and connect it to Mill Creek and if you
potentially do extend even Mill Creek -- again, this is
a vision plan. So we're looking way out into the
future. If you continue Mill Creek along the canal up to the river, you create this ring of open space that frames a focus of future development, again, with the highlight on Chester Avenue. And so this is just an image of, sort of, looking south along Chester Avenue with the high speed rail in the bottom right. Again, transit connectivity and what we're, sort of, rethinking what Garces Circle could be and how it connects to the city, formerly the, sort of, historic gateway into downtown. So how do we re-imagine that?

So I'm going to go over, quickly, some of the type of logical improvements, public realm being the first. So, again, we, sort of, looked at both the existing projects that were already happening -- the 23rd, 24th Street. How do we know if we're going to move forward with that project? How could we leverage that to improve, sort of, connectivity from what you could call, sort of, the historic core to the northern downtown area? But also, how you could potentially improve Wall Street really not doing anything terribly different than what you've already done to that one section of it -- just -- trying to get my bearings here. I apologize -- just west of Chester, but what would it look like, again, if you were to extend it all the way down to the Linear Park.
And again, in terms of bike facilities, I think some of this was closing the existing gaps which had already been planned in your bicycle master plan. So we're just, sort of, reiterating things that had already been happening. We don't need to reinvent the wheel if we've already gone through these planning processes in the past -- excuse me -- but also thinking about new typologies.

On "K" Street, for instance, we thought about this idea of a bike boulevard. It is also sort of broken in half right just north of 21st Street. It doesn't go all the way through. It has, sort of, a tight-knit, sort of, feel. How do we introduce these new typologies? If you don't necessarily feel comfortable riding your bike on Chester, is there another way -- a parallel, sort of, more leisurely path moving forward? So, again, we try to put forward new best practices, new ideas in a vision planning process, but also just sort of work with what was already -- what is already there and expand on that.

And, again, this is just another image of, sort of -- if you're looking north and west, you can see the Garces Circle -- do I have a little -- there you go. You can see sort of the high speed rail station over here with this, sort of, new district
along Garces Circle, this being Wall Street. Again, as this, sort of, organizing principle to attract development. Just like high speed rail attracts development to it, any sort of public improvement attracts a private development in the sense that it is an amenity that can be supported.

And then transit enhancements. And, again, these are already in some of your regional transit plans. But really, sort of, how do you take the existing transit access both on California Avenue and Chester Avenue and start to, sort of, upgrade that slowly over time into a bus rapid transit system in the long term? There's these, sort of, instrumental steps that you can take that doesn't have to cost a lot of money right up front, but, sort of -- again, how do you work towards that in an organized fashion? But also we had this idea, and I know that had been tried in a previous lifetime, but this idea of some sort of connector shuttle. We didn't want to, you know, moving forward with, sort of, the "F" Street location on the focus of this vision plan, we didn't -- we also felt it was really important to still connect all the stuff that's going along around -- occurring around Mill Creek in general, but also connecting that Amtrak station high speed rail in the future.
So we created -- we had this idea of creating -- or reintroducing, perhaps, a shuttle system that would, sort of, circulate around downtown. All the buses currently either go through or sort of go in and out of downtown, sort of, connecting all of those dots, again, as part of this idea of how to bring all of those amenities together. And, again, this is sort of a shot of Chester Avenue with certain -- with bus rapid transit, maintaining the bike lanes, but again what does it look like when we extend Wall Street across Chester. And then we had floated the idea multiple times, both as consultants, but also from the stakeholders as well, and this is just an idealized version of it, but what would it be like if we could bring back the clock tower? Not exactly in its historic location, but pretty close.

So that takes us to phase development strategy. And, again, this is, sort of, what it looks like in 10 years, 20 years, 30 years. And each of those segments has a different focus because it reflects the different increment of development that we can expect from, sort of -- in coordination with the build out of the high speed rail system. So we get a little bit of development in that first, sort of, 10 years just because there -- this is a rapidly growing
region. So we talked a lot about: How do you shave off a couple percentage points of what already is that natural growth and focus that into downtown with these, sort of, interventions or public realm improvements or other infrastructure improvements?

Moving onto the, sort of, 20-year phase. The idea being, you know, it will not be in full build out, but it will -- the expectation is that high speed rail will be in operation in that period of time. It will land somewhere in the middle. So what do we do to connect that high speed rail station into the historic core? And then in the third year build out when the high speed rail is at its full build out -- so from Sacramento and San Francisco all the way down to San Diego -- it's just that many more people moving through the system produces that much more economic activity.

So I'll go through those really quick. And so between now and 2025, our focus again -- and this is an image, again, that green line -- sorry -- that green line right here -- is that Wall Street corridor, this being Chester Avenue and Mill Creek back there; right? So with that type of intervention, or public realm improvement, again, as an organizing principle for improvement, how can we focus in full development in
that area to, again, breakdown that perception that it's a long distance from Chester Avenue to Mill Creek, and it's really not; but, also, how can we create, sort of, more activity in that area and expand prosperity across downtown. And it looks a little something like this.

Again, these phase development maps are all in the plans for everyone to look at. These are sort of the collection of all of those ideas I showed earlier broken out by bike lane transit and public realm improvements. But that, sort of, blue shade, if you will, is where we think it's important to take what's going on in the historic core and start to move it towards Mill Creek Linear Park, again, taking an investment that we've already made in downtown and connecting it to what we've been calling the historic core, but also recognizing that there's -- that development strategy is still ongoing.

So 2025 to 2035, again, this is when high speed rail is now in operation, the focus being along Chester Avenue. It's a little bit farther than, say, Chester Avenue to Mill Creek Avenue, but not too much. But, again, I think that there's this perception, part of it by 23rd and 24th Street, part of it by the railroad tracks, part of it by the freeway, but how do
you start to close that gap both perceptionally and physically? And, again, sort of, similar to the strategy in the first 10 years, but really sort of building out a little bit around the high speed rail station as that lands -- that is where development will be attracted to. It's a massive public investment, but, again, how do we, sort of, connect that so we don't have two nodes of development but, sort of -- or, sort of, two downtowns, if you will. But two nodes of the same downtown. That spine being Chester Avenue, which is the historical spine of the region, not just the city.

Again, these maps are all in the plan for everyone's view. And, again, the blue sort of focusing -- really focused -- concentrated on Chester Avenue. Again, you see, sort of, the expansion of the bike network, sort of the upgrading of the two main transit corridors in the region, but also a recognition that when high speed rail is in operation, it will attract quite a bit of development. So we have to prepare for that, and we have to think about that. And with the level of development that we're thinking about, again, it's an opportunity to -- if you look at Garces Circle right now, it's very automobile oriented. But there's a transformation that could happen with the
right tools, with the right focus, and, I would point out, with the right patience.

I think very often in some of our high speed rail case studies that we looked up, cities would jump to whatever development came first. And so the last thing you want to do is, for instance -- I'm not bagging on Walmart -- but build a Walmart next to the high speed rail station. It is important to, sort of, land bank those uses for when we expect the type of development that will occur which is a much more denser mixed use type of development.

And then the final, sort of, phase development, if you will, 2035 to the project horizon which is 2045. Again, all of these, I think, always focus on that absorption rate I mentioned earlier is always focus on the core first and then sort of try to connect Mill Creek to the historic core. Always focused on the historic core first and then sort of make that connection along Chester Avenue. Always focus on the core first even in that 30-year segment -- that 30-year timeframe. But, again, start to really fully build out this idea of, kind of, Garces Circle district. And there is a quite of bit of soft sites currently out there. And, again, you sort of see it right here.
I think that there's an expectation and, again, this is based on our case studies, that currently, as thinking has it, there's potentially even development in and on the high speed rail site, itself, but we didn't want to factor that in because we weren't sure how that would work or if that would work or if that was even the strategy of the high speed rail authority. It was, again, the strategy of other high speed rail systems predominantly in Japan. They are real estate developers and transit agencies, for instance, in other countries. But, again, sort of focusing on that corridor, building out this new Garces Circle district, if you will. But also, in that 30-year timeframe, when we get full build out, how do we then connect along 34th Street?

So I think throughout the course of all of these development strategies, we had this really -- it would be safe to say that we focused on the core first, but how do we spread that prosperity out, even outside of the project area along these, sort of, more -- these local-serving but also regional corridors? Oh, sorry.

And that led us to the economic development strategy, which is that first year -- that first 10-years implementation strategy. Again, just like we identified that making downtown Bakersfield high speed
rail ready is revitalizing downtown Bakersfield. Our economic development strategy is what we should be focusing on to implement the first 10 years. So you see some things, again, that are already in play currently, whether it's the bid or setting a goal for residential units in and around downtown, whether it's doubling the population or not. And then, again, I -- we started at the top 10, if you will, but over the course of the process, working with both the stakeholders and the City, we threw in that 11 -- we should get a dozen or even a baker's dozen, but it didn't work out that way, so we had 11 at the end of the day. Again, with the idea of the infrastructure master plan, we sort of heard over and over again on that point we need to understand the capacity if we're expecting this amount of growth. And, again, I think that's a City function because we heard loud and clear from the private utilities that they'll be okay. They'll make the investments to make it work, for instance.

So what are the investments that the City needs to do to keep on par with that? And I think that's something that we identified as a need moving forward. I can go over all 11, but I think you guys -- they're pretty straightforward. If you have any
questions, we're more than happy to answer them.

So that, sort of, leads me to at least next steps on the vision plan -- and, again, I think Ms. Kitchen outlined these as well already.

So we're here right now at the Planning Commission Hearing. Mr. VonBerg is going to come up here in just a second and go over the Draft Environmental Impact Report that meeting is happening now. And then we sort of moved through this process. Ideally we'll move to the City Counsel process, will be adoption, but, again, I think for us both at SOM and also at the City and very early on in this planning process, it was really important that we tried to make a planning process that was implementation starting at Day 1. We tried to do everything that we could to build capacity both locally among stakeholders, but also within the city to sort of empower them with both the tools but maybe even the knowledge of how to do this in the future. And as you all know, implementation is never done, and that's where the real work begins, quite frankly.

And so with that, Mr. VonBerg you want to come over and take the hot seat?

MR. VONBERG: You can stay there.

MR. HAND: Okay. I'll do the slides for you.
MR. VONBERG: All right.

Good evening Madam Chair and Planning Commission. Eric VonBerg with Rincon Consultants and we're part of the team preparing the EIR for this project, you know, the really exciting part -- right? -- CEQA.

So just to get back, the purpose of an EIR is really to inform the public agency decisionmakers and the public, identify possible ways to minimize any identified significant impacts, and then to describe reasonable alternatives that, maybe, can reduce those impacts. The number one reason I really, you know, pursue is that to inform the public and so they can make an educated decision on projects.

The next one. So CEQA is really about process and getting through the process is as identified here is that you start out with a Notice of Preparation, letting everyone know -- the public -- that we are preparing an Environmental Impact Report. And then, with that, comes a scoping meeting which was held in September of 2016. We received 14 comments on that. The purpose of the NOP is to -- for the public to identify what issues they want addressed in the Environmental Impact Report. And then at that point, then we prepare an Administration Draft Environmental
Impact Report, and then that becomes then the public report that goes out for public review which was identified as -- in January of this year. That's out and so we're in that 45-day public review period right now for the -- for the EIR. And then once that 45-day review period is over, then we take all those public comments, respond to all those comments, and then that becomes the final EIR, which would include any, maybe, changes to the EIR based on those comments or new information, and then that is -- then goes to your city counsel for approval.

So as Gunnar described, the vision plan that's -- that's what we addressed in this EIR is what would be the potential impacts from this vision plan, you know, looking out 30 years. And in this case, it's what we call programmatic EIR. So looking at, sort of, the 30,000-foot level of what would be the potential impacts because we don't have a specific project to look at. So in that case, we looked at the list of impacts that are required to be addressed. And as you can see on the screen, there was certain impacts that were identified as less than significant that we didn't identify any real impacts that could occur from this project or that it's really something that would need to be more addressed as projects -- specific projects...
come in. There is, then, this list of significant impacts that -- potentially significant, but then with mitigation, it would be reduced to a less than significant impact. And then we identify two potentially significant impacts -- noise and transportation.

Going back to the impacts that could be mitigated listed here, the first three were: Air quality, biology, and cultural resources. And these were all -- pretty much can be addressed with, sort of, standard mitigations of complying with the Air Pollution Control District for specific areas, the health risk assessment for air quality. Certain projects might have potential impact to endangered species so that they would do project level investigations on that to see if there are any potential impacts and then develop mitigation for those specific projects. And that would be the same with cultural resources, as well, just identifying through further studies.

And then the next three are: Greenhouse gas emissions, travel and cultural resources, and utilities and service systems. And, again, these were all addressed with standard mitigations to further studies when projects come in to make sure that there's enough
water for it. That there's -- you know, potential
to -- for too much water to used so that creates --
make sure they use different efficiency standards to
reduce the overall use of water within the downtown so
that we don't go over capacity.

And then that gets us to the two significant
impacts. The noise. The main issue here was that
there would be additional traffic and congestion in
downtown. That's what you want with the revitalized
downtown. There's specific older buildings that you
can't, you know, put in noise attenuation measures so
that those noise levels reach over a threshold -- the
standard thresholds for the City so that those could be
a potentially significant impact that we couldn't
reduce the impacts to.

And then regarding transportation that we
looked at, you know, you're going to increase
congestion here. You're going to have more people in
the downtown. You have your local street system, and
you can't really expand that because of the existing
infrastructure that's there. In a lot of ways, we
don't want to do that. We want to, you know, look at
mitigating that impact through transit, getting more
walkability like the plan addresses. But as well as
projects come in, we want to -- for certain projects,
they have to do a Traffic Impact Study to see what
level of impact there is there, and so these
transportation impacts will then be addressed, again,
at each project level. But overall, it was anticipated
that it would still be a significant impact for
downtown.

So then the last thing with an EIR is then
developing alternatives to look at those significant
impacts and other impacts to see if there's ways to
reduce that. One required is the no project
alternative. So basically in this case it's the
sticking without the vision plan and just moving
forward with the standard plans that are in place for
downtown and what would be the impacts there.

Alternative 2, was what we'll call
"low-intensity design standard." So not going fully
out with the vision plan, but reducing the amount of
development that would occur. And then Alternative 3
would be more than Alternative 2, but still less than
the total vision plan there. And it was determined
that Alternative 2 would be the -- what we call the
"environmentally superior alternative" that would
have -- would reduce some of those impacts. But then
with Alternative 2, you don't meet all the project
objectives that you want with the vision plan and what
you're anticipating with that.

    So, again, that was -- so the broad overview of the Environmental Impact Report and so, you know, the next step in the process is we're in the public comment period here, so we'll be receiving comments tonight and then as well, you know, people can get those comments on the -- next slide -- so that those can still be sent to the City up to the 45-day review period, which will end on February 19th. There's the information up on the screen as far as receiving that -- the information. And then that will all be addressed in the final Environmental Impact Report and so that becomes all part of the whole public record for the city counsel to make the decision on that.

    With that, that ends the presentation. Happy to answer questions or we can....

    THE CHAIR: Thank you.

    Ms. Kitchen, do you have anything else?

    MS. KITCHEN: No. I think that about covers everything. So once again, the purpose of tonight's hearing is for the public, now, to be able to provide comments. And we will take those into consideration and go back to our desks, per se, and prepare the responses to each of those comments as they are received.
Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Can we bring the lights back up, please?

Thank you.

At this time I will open the public hearing on this and ask those who wish to comment come forward to the microphone. Everyone that wishes to comment will have the opportunity to do so, but please be courteous to others who wish to speak and do not repeat the remarks of previous speakers.

You may pose questions during your comment, but the Planning Commission and staff will not answer them tonight. And if you wish to leave your documents for the Planning Commission for review, please feel free to provide those with the clerk at the conclusion of your comments. To insure that your comments are recorded accurately, please speak clearly and slowly and state your name and address -- and address before you begin speaking.

Remember to speak into the microphone and please do not speak at the same time as someone else.

May we have the first speaker?

Hello.

MR. DEAN: How are you doing?

THE CHAIR: Can you state your name, please.
MR. DEAN: Yes. My name is Marvin Dean. I'm here to make a few remarks for the public record. I'm here to represent myself and also representing -- I'm a citizen of the First Ward, and I'm also a candidate for the First Ward City Counsel. I'm also here to represent tonight the High Speed Rail San Joaquin Valley Association, of which I'm a founding member, and also the Kern Minority Contractors Association which sat on the High Speed Rail Business Advisory Council.

I've been a long-time supporter for high speed rail. Some of you know that. And I was very pleased with the fact that the City and the County eventually settled their lawsuit with high speed rail to look at a locally generated plan. I was all excited about that, and that's this process. I was also -- and I want to thank the staff for this vision. They had a stakeholder group that helped put together this process, and I was one of the stakeholders that was involved in that. So I want to thank the staff because they opened it up and made it very inconclusive for everybody to be involved.

That being said, I do have some -- let me just say, first of all, generally, I overall support the recommendation, in general. But I do have a few concerns that I want to raise. And I'll start with the
last one is: I had spoke to the consultant, as you look at that last slide where it showed the question mark, and then it shows southeast Bakersfield -- it showed east Bakersfield, and then it said "Lakeview." I would have liked it to say "southeast Bakersfield." We are a community out there. We're not just Lakeview. It's the southeast community; just like east Bakersfield is considered a community. So if that could be corrected because some people have the negative thing about -- when we think about that area as Lakeview as some of you know.

Now, Jacqui had talked about that the decision has not been made whether or not we will have a downtown station. It's just where it's going to be, whether it's going to be on "F" Street or if it's going to be the initial route which is on Truxtun and Union Avenue. So we will have a station, and I'm glad that we will have a station. And if it's really quite -- as long as we have a station, I'm okay with wherever the station is, but I'm leaning for the station on Union and Truxtun because I think it's going to give us the biggest boom for our community.

And one of the things that this plan did not do, and I tried to influence the process but I hear tonight kind of why it was, that I would have looked
at -- seeing a vision plan for both sites not just the "F" Street site, but a vision plan also to give emphasis on what it would look like if the site was moved to the Truxtun and Union site.

And I would just ask if the decision is made by the governing Board of the high speed rail authority and the FRA -- which we'll know shortly because I think they close the comment period on the 16th -- and if it's decided to stay on Truxtun and Union where it's already been signed off on, that we take a second look at the vision plan, and we look at the build out, what would happen with the potential vision plan for that area.

And I'm concerned about that area because I believe it will bring major growth to the southeast part of our community and old town, the east part of our community. When you do a radius around that area, and I don't think we've done that to look at the economic benefit, I think right now -- and I'm not opposed to it -- I'm concerned about all of Bakersfield. I love all of Bakersfield. Born and raised here. But I think this plan pushes the growth towards Oildale versus to the core of the city. And that's another reason I support that location and for a lot of reasons I think that's really the main location.
But that's not the drive tonight, but I just want to put in the public record that if the decision is made to stay where it's already been signed off on as Truxtun and Union in that area kind of near the Amtrak, that we look at another vision plan for what does that mean in terms of the vision of the growth potentially -- let's draw a map around the station a mile or three miles out and look at that area and see what it means to the housing, economic development, and all those things so we can really have a plan that's going to really benefit our community wherever the station is at. So that's my comment.

But all in all, I want to thank the staff for what they've done and opening up the process. It was fair.

One last thing I'm going to say on this, and then I'll sit down. I'm pleased that the settlement was made to allow the City and the County and us to get our own plan. But I think it's cost us, somewhat. Because initially the plan to -- initial operating system was going to go from Madera, Fresno, Bakersfield, Palmdale, on into the LA area. Because of this delay, the focus or the shift is to go north. That means -- and you hear about the financialling as it is -- so we don't even know when we will get a
station and when it will come into the build out of Bakersfield. And we're going to be years away. And I think that delay was partly caused because of the decision. They had to go north.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you Mr. Dean.

Do we have any other speakers? If you intend to speak, it would be great if you can come up to the front row. Then we can get an idea.

Thank you.

MR. DEL MOTTER: My name is Terry Del Motter. I am a retired pharmacist, and I have lived in Bakersfield virtually all of my life. When I grew up, Oak Street was the edge of town on the west side.

Anyway, I'd like to start off by saying that I favor the "F" Street location for the terminal for the high speed rail terminal. And the reason I say that is that I believe that the "F" Street location lends itself to -- in conjunction with the building of that station -- to provide for a Triple-A baseball stadium in Bakersfield. The size of our community is such that to be a great city, we need professional baseball. We have lost our A-Class Affiliate, but just as Fresno has an affiliation with the San Francisco Giants at the Triple-A level, if Bakersfield had a
Triple-A caliber stadium, we would be a natural for an affiliation with the Los Angeles Dodgers. And if it were designed and planned, the high speed rail as well as the Triple-A stadium were planned and constructed in conjunction with the high speed rail, I believe it would be a wonderful thing for the community. We already own the land -- the public owns the land where Sam Lynn ballpark is. And if we had the proper access from North Chester, Golden State Avenue, Columbus Street and Airport Drive by way of Oildale Drive, I believe it would be a real benefit for the community.

Great cities have water, and we are so fortunate that we have the Kern River that comes through our community from the mouth of the canyon to Hart Park to the Panorama Preserve all the way out past Cal State Bakersfield and ultimately Buena Vista Lake. But where it comes through Bakersfield, specifically Oildale, it has been neglected, and it would be an opportunity to enhance the overall community, not just the downtown area.

But it -- we already have the bike trails that go along the river, and I think that we are not taking advantage of the asset that we have in the Kern River such as San Antonio Texas does. So anyway, I believe that a Triple-A stadium and attracting a
Triple-A baseball team is very important for the future of Bakersfield and the high speed rail is also very important, but if we could combine them in the same general area, I think it would be a double win.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

Next speaker.

MR. COHEN: Good evening, Madam Chair.

Can I ask for the consultant to bring up the 10-, 20-, and 30-year --

THE CHAIR: Can we get your name?

MR. COHEN: Yes. Adam Cohen.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

MR. COHEN: And with your permission, I'd like to ask the consultant to bring up the 10-year development strategy as well as provide you guys with some documents.

THE CHAIR: We'll get -- hold on just a second. Are you all right? Okay. We'll get you hooked up right now.

MR. COHEN: Thank you, Gunnar.

MR. HAND: Uh-huh.

MR. COHEN: And I'm going to have you go to the 20 and the 30 in a moment. Do we have a bigger one, or is this as big as it's going to get?
MR. HAND: I think that's it.

MR. COHEN: Okay. All right.

So I would like to -- you know, my position is -- ironically I don't normally agree with Marvin Dean -- but my position is the same as his on high speed rail, you know, that the Truxtun station is really important really for the intermodal connectivity and with the connection to the convention center and the arena.

Jacqui did a wonderful job of showing how we're halfway in the system, and so it's not likely that you're going to ride high speed rail five hours roundtrip to a business meeting in San Diego or San Francisco, but you're probably going to meet in the middle. And so what's walkable around there is important.

And I think, you know, what's interesting is that this process has really, in many ways, preceded the release of the EIR for that location. And having seen that EIR, there's some fundamental issues that aren't addressed in this station area process. For example, the addition of a freeway interchange at "F" Street and Golden State Avenue. Also, the addition of a 30-foot tall retaining wall on the north side of that station that limits walkability to 34th Street. So
there's an implicit assumption -- and Gunnar said it perfectly in the presentation that walkability is key. And there's an implicit assumption in everything that was developed thus far that this was going to be walkable because no one had seen what the High Speed Rail Authority was developing when this document was developed. We now know it's not walkable, that there are some physical obstacles.

So I'd like to point out here, I don't think anybody is going to have any issue on the 10-year development strategy. My only issue with this particular slide is that in the draft document, it's noted as development to "Q" Street where, in fact, the actual document shows that the development actually goes to Mill Creek. So that's one requested correction that I would have for staff. But I don't think I have any issue with this.

But I would like to go to the next -- the 20-year -- and actually let's just go to the 30-year so -- thanks, Gunnar. You can't really see it too well because of the lights here, but what the 30-year shows is full build out of -- thank you. It's still hard to see, but I can kind of show -- you might see it better from this copy when I put this up here. So the 30-year -- and I'm going to pass this around to you.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Why don't we just put it up on the elbow so the public can see it, as well.


Colors are a little better, but still not as bright as I would have hoped. We can go back to the overhead, ma'am. Thank you.

So what this shows is it shows infill development, first going on the 10-year east to Mill Creek, which I said, I don't think anybody else is going to disagree with that. And then it shows us then switching directions entirely putting development on Chester Avenue right where the hospital is. It has us redeveloping San Joaquin Hospital with infill development, which hasn't been addressed with them. And in so doing, that's not the way economic development works. That's not the way cities grow. We start with infill and then we build up. Once we build out, we build up. And so to develop vision documents that does infill and then says, "Okay. Now that we've built out, we're going to build in a different direction rather than filling in with denser development" does not make a lot of sense. And as you guys have in your handouts, I passed out the high speed rail guidelines for development around the station, I
think there's a lot of things in this EIR that conflicts with those, and some of our best professional experts here locally said it best.

And if you go to the one-page document, down in the middle two paragraphs, "as with every group endeavor, there are some concerns. The emphasis on Golden State and "F" Street site and the development around the proposed site could draw and serve to draw away from the traditional core of downtown rather than to complement it." We do recommend that a similar effort be made into looking at the Truxtun and Amtrak location, and I would agree with those experts. I would agree with this -- what Marvin Dean said as well that goes along with that. That even if high speed rail is at "F" Street, that doesn't eliminate the fact that we need transit-oriented development around Amtrak. Yet that hasn't even been addressed in this plan in the 10-, 20-, or 30-year plan. Okay.

The other thing that I want to note is that shuttle service is not necessarily going to solve our transportation problems with the disconnect. Not just between "F" Street and Amtrak, but the disconnect between that and our 10,000 seat arena. You know, all of a sudden, you know, when high speed rail comes to town, we become a statewide facility that could be used
for meetings, conventions, and the like. And so all of a sudden you can see yourself having a concert or some other major event in town and now having anywhere from 5- to 10,000 people getting into an Uber or a taxi and going directly from the station elsewhere to downtown because you can't walk between it. So I think these are some fundamental issues that need to be resolved.

I would like to conclude by just making some comments specific to the alternatives that were in the draft EIR. There's the three alternatives: No build, a low-density, and a medium-density alternative. And yet the analysis that's done all the way throughout the EIR doesn't compare that until you get to the last chapter. And so you go through it. It references that you go to Table 36 to look at traffic, for example. And they have a no build and a project alternative not Alternative 1, 2, and 3. And this is a significant deficiency in that document. And so I think it's really important that these issues be addressed before this body makes a recommendation, before the document is even certified I would encourage there to be a revised draft that addresses that issue, particularly with the alternatives not being fully identified throughout the analysis.

So with that, again, I would like to say that
there needs to be some planning around the Amtrak site for a variety of reasons as noted previously, and that we need to focus our development in the downtown core. And if you go to "F" Street and, you know -- there needs to be a way to get people to the downtown core that's not in motorized -- in a private vehicle.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

Can we bring up the lights, again, please? We don't want people walking in the dark.

MR. HIGHTOWER: Good evening, Madam Chair, Commissioners, and Staff. My name is Troy Hightower. I'm a local transportation consultant. I'll try and be brief. I want to start at the big picture on the high speed rail in general.

I do ride the train. That's my normal mode of transportation because I go up and down the state a lot. I've ridden on high speed rail in Europe, and I think one of the biggest economic benefits to Bakersfield in our region is that high speed rail will connect us to the global economic hubs of LA and the Bay Area. Coming down here to Bakersfield, I have concern about this station -- the study area which is on the screen now, that yellow dash.

Do you also have the one that also has the
rings around the -- my concern is that typically when you do these types of studies, the studies are either quarter-mile, half-mile, one-mile ring -- that's it. Thank you, Gunnar. And that's on the screen now. That's typically the study area you would have, but you can see the study area that was selected does not include those areas. It has portions of the radius around "F" Street station and portions around the Truxtun station. So -- and I brought this up in some of the stakeholder meetings with staff, and we've discussed it before that the study area could be that rectangle, but it should, at a minimum, include the radius around the stations. And I agree with some of the other commenters that since the Authority has not selected a station and as Ms. Kitchen has said they haven't selected it yet, the Truxtun location has been approved in their EIR that a study effort should include both.

I understand that's a large study area, but my understanding is that this effort was funded in the tune of 900 million -- I mean 900,000 by the State. So I think the resources are there to include that. In addition, going to the EIR, a lot of the analysis is done and focused around the "F" Street station. And I can't tell whether it's within the red boundary area
they're analyzing or whether it's that dashed circle. It's not clear. It is clear that there is very little analysis of the southeast part around the other station location.

So my concern about that is: One of the purposes of the EIR is to provide accurate information on the proposed projects. So if you want to compare, it should be a reasonable apples to apples, and I don't see it being that way as the way it's drafted now. And then furthermore, on the development patterns, the zero to 10-year pattern that was developed, I think that's very reasonable. One -- since it goes basically from Chester to Mill Creek, the Truxtun location is right there at Mill Creek. So the zero to 10, I think, could be done, could go forward no matter which station is selected, and I would support that.

In addition, there's another concern about a parallel effort the State is doing with the EIR for the alignment known as the LGA that was mentioned. That's the trap. So that process is now estimated not to be completed until October of this year. So I -- it makes me wonder why we should finalize a plan on an alignment that hasn't been cleared, itself. So I think this may be a little premature, and I think -- I would recommend the Commission to consider two things.
One, more information about the Truxtun location or comparable. It would be great to have another vision, as I mentioned before, around that Truxtun station so we could all compare. My understanding, from the market analysis that the consultant did, the data did include the whole area. So there are good numbers to show what kind of growth could be at the downtown station. So to consider that as well as looking at finalizing -- I would suggest not finalizing this plan until at least the alignment has been environmentally cleared.

Thank you. Thank you, Gunnar.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

Next speaker.

MR. WESLEY: Hi. My name is Windel Wesley, Jr., and I'm really excited about the high speed rail. Mainly because I think it's very vital to the growth of Bakersfield in a very good way economically. And this has been a very long process, and I know everybody wants their area -- whether it's Oildale or wherever it's from -- to benefit from this and you can't always please everybody. I realize that. But if you take a big plan and then build on that plan -- I'm from San Jose, California. They have light rail. Light rail can eventually make everybody that
much closer to downtown, and you want to bring that light rail into the high speed rail this way you cut down on a lot of traffic, you build a parking garage, and everybody's happy. You can take that light rail and bring it to all the key areas in your city where everybody wants to go, whether you're on the north, the south, the east, and the west.

So we've wasted a lot of years. We need the jobs. I also heard that we lost what was a maintenance yard because of all this. That's a bummer. That maintenance yard would have been very vital economically to Bakersfield. Being that I'm from the Bay Area, maybe I can talk to Governor Brown. Because I am an outsider, maybe he'll listen to me. And this city has been great to me, so I would definitely back you guys. And I think it would make a difference because I am an outsider. I'd like to see that maintenance yard back here where it belongs.

That's all I've got.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

Do we have any other speakers?

MS. CISNEROS: Hello. My name is Heather Cisneros. I would just like to address a few things that I've heard here tonight. I am a resident of the Riviera, Westchester neighborhood. Literally a
5- to 10-minute walk from the proposed "F" Street station. I do a lot of walking in my current neighborhood and use the bike path frequently. I also have a two-year-old son who loves trains, and we weekly take a visit to the existing Amtrak station. So my perspective might be a little bit different than some of the other residents, but I haven't heard from any residents in the neighborhood tonight. So I just wanted to add my comments to the record.

First of all, from what I saw from the presenter, all of the development was regarding the Garces Circle area. I didn't see much that commented on the actual "F" Street area, which is where the station would be located. There are a few businesses in that area, but it is a mostly residential district, so that is something that I would like to see taken into consideration and addressed more.

The Mill Creek area, one of the things that they said was connecting the new high speed rail station to the Mill Creek area in their development plan. However, the existing station for Amtrak is right near Mill Creek. As I said, I frequent the train station with my son, and we have walked often from the train station to Mexicali to have lunch and then down Mill Creek so we can watch the ducks and see the
fountains. So having a high speed rail in the existing area does not negate the development that has been done in the Mill Creek area. It is very useable to have the high speed rail there and to continue with the Mill Creek development.

Another comment was when planning for the future development, and someone else commented on this also, it really doesn't seem like there has been any apples-to-apples comparison. Everything seems to be focused on "F" Street. So I think it would be important for you to make an educated guess to be able to have the information showing what a 10-, 20-, and 30-year plan would be if it were Truxtun versus "F" Street so you can look at both development plans and see how that will affect the city.

I think that would also give citizens some confidence that both were being considered. At this point, from what I have personally seen, it seems everything is geared towards "F" Street already, that a decision has already been made informally, and that, you know, the other one is not really an option. However, as the last speaker said, the alignment plan has not been finalized by the State, and so it kind of seems like everything is not connecting.

In addition, as I said, the existing
neighborhoods there don't really seem like they've been taken into consideration. I have not completely read the EIR, so maybe there is more in there that I have not seen. I will go back and review that.

But in addition to the traffic in the areas, the walkability of the neighborhood, the things that we have now as existing residents, how is that going to be affected? Noise, traffic, those are obvious, and those are the ones that were the top impact on the EIR.

However, there are a lot of young families that have moved into the neighborhood recently, and those are things that we are concerned with.

And I did want to make a comment. One of the other previous speakers had mentioned the Triple-A baseball. I am a huge baseball fan, and I have gone to games at the Grizzly Stadium in Fresno, and I don't know how many of you have, but it is not in a very good area. It is not in an area of town I would want to compare our future development to model. I would love to see baseball back in Bakersfield, but I wouldn't want to try and model Fresno's plan as far as that goes. So I wouldn't use that as an example.

Also, their Amtrak station is very close to their Grizzly Stadium. Also, not a great area. So just a few things to think about. However, I do agree
with one of the previous speakers that I think it's important to keep the traditional core of downtown, to keep development around the existing Amtrak station, whether the high speed rail is there or not. I think it would be nice to see future development around there because it is a nice station. It's a nice area. I'm probably the only person that I know of who goes there just casually, who doesn't use the train, but goes to watch with my son.

We also happen to go to the Beale Library which is right there. That's why we go to the station. And we also like to go to the Rabobank and look at the fountains. So all of those things downtown -- it is nice to be able to have a place to walk, to look at things, to enjoy our downtown community.

So thank you very much.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

Any other speakers? And I'll just caution some things were a little repetitive there. The points that have already been made, please try -- we are trying to address all new points. Thank you.

MR. DECHERY: I'm Bill Dechery, Madam Chair and Commissioners. I'm a 43-year resident of Bakersfield and have been following this project very astutely since 2011 when the first EIR was issued and
that was a draft EIR and that had two alignments coming along Truxtun Avenue to get to the proposed station at Truxtun, and it was very destructive. It took out the corporation yard, Mercy Hospital, and there was a lot of public concern -- public outrage, if you will. And as a result of that, about a year later, the Authority issued a revised EIR with the hybrid alignment which was essentially lined down between the two other proposals and really wasn't very helpful, it really offered little improvement.

So the -- fast forward to the LGA, which is a totally different alignment and in studying it, I used a summary of this supplemental EIR. And I basically relied on a table, S2 which is a user-friendly table. It states the impact, and it shows the implications with the Truxtun alignment, if you will, versus the LGA. And it's 18 pages, and it goes on with a lot of detail. And when you study that, there's really no comparison between the LGA-- the Truxtun alignment and this LGA. The LGA is far superior.

So my point is, with the concern of the Truxtun station, we can't lose sight of the destruction that goes along with that. And certainly, I think it explains why we have spent so much time studying the "F" Street. It's really a far superior location. We
can't destroy part of the city to build another part, and I think with the LGA we can avoid all that destruction with the corporation yard, Mercy Hospital, Rabobank Arena, parking. The LGA is a far superior alignment, and that's why it is the station that "L" Street and State Route 204 makes a lot of sense.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Any other speakers?

MS. BENDER: Madam Chair, Planning Commissioners I wasn't --

THE CHAIR: State your name.

MS. BENDER: Carol Bender.

I wasn't really planning on speaking, but after hearing what Bill had to say, I totally concur what he said. But I also wanted to comment that I see extending the downtown up to the 204 as a natural progression, and for those people who do live in Westchester, and my daughter having lived there, "F" Street and the Montgomery Ward area there has all the potential to be revitalized and be a vital part of our downtown and extension of our downtown. I don't see it as an either/or.

I believe that the 10-year plan makes sense, and it is close to Mill Creek; and it is close to our Amtrak station so we are paying attention to that as an
asset. But in looking 20 years or 30 years forward, I would hope that we would grow our downtown, that we would extend it north, that we would revitalize that area to make it more friendly to the neighborhood of Westchester that used to shop along "F" Street, that used to shop at Montgomery Ward, that used to have restaurants a little bit newer than Westchester Bowl, although they have great fish. But that area needs some attention, and I don't -- I see that as a big plus.

And the other aspect of the Truxtun location, in addition to the community assets that we would lose or that would be impacted and not mitigatable, you're going to be destroying and having high, 70-feet up in the air trains going through northwest Bakersfield homes and whatnot and impacting far more residents and people with noise, air, and visual aesthetic negativity all the way around.

The other piece being that recently this week we found out that the alignment -- the Fresno to Bakersfield alignment is needing 2.8 billion more dollars to mostly acquire land that they haven't been able to acquire. So whether they even get here in 30 years or not is a question. And should they decide not to continue south because of the expense of going
through Tehachapi or changing their mind and going down
5, if we end up being the end zone where the
Bakersfield station does get built but we're the end of
the line, it would be far less destructive to have it
end there than have it destroy all of our neighborhoods
to Truxtun and have it never be completed. It's just
logical to me.

Thank you for your time.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Anyone else?

MR. GARNES: Good evening. John Garns, local
architect, and I'm not fully prepared this evening. I
just found out about the meeting a bit late and arrived
late, so I apologize for missing that presentation.

I'm here to speak in favor of the downtown
location for several reasons. One, I think the
economic development should be within the downtown that
we have already spent considerable funds for -- the
park and many other -- all the trees downtown. When
people use the high speed rail, they're coming for
events. Events could be Rabobank, which is right
there. Hotels are immediately available. The
"F" Street would require much more development in that
line.

I wasn't clear on the heavy maintenance
facility that we had lost that opportunity. I thought
that was still an option that was still available and if it was, it would only be available for the downtown station route. It's -- I'm also not clear on the cost. It was my understanding the "F" Street one would be more expensive because the downtown estimate included cost for the high -- for the heavy maintenance facility. So I appreciate everybody's effort in doing this. I realize it's a very sensitive and important decision for downtown.

And thank you for hearing me out.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

Is there anyone else?

Going once. Going twice. All right.

Do -- we will now move onto Commissioner comments. Are there any commissioners wishing to weigh in, ask any questions to be addressed?

Commissioner Cater.

COMMISSIONER CATER: I didn't think I would be the first one up. I thought saw Larry press his button. He did a fake out.

Thank you all for coming tonight. It's really great at these meetings when public come out and express their support. I just, in looking at the plan -- I want to, first of all, thank city staff and the community and SOM and just all the work that went
into it. And I think it's an inspiring document.

I think it's inspiring because it hits on big ideals that extend beyond a specific site. I think often in this process, and with anything that takes a lot of -- many years of planning, things change and things are fluid. So I respect that the document creates strategies that create how -- kind of, a sentiment of how we would like to grow as a downtown. And so with that, just looking at some of the implementation plans in the zero to 10 range, I think there's a few things regarding infrastructure and pedestrian plans that I think affect the everyday of how we do business as a city. And so the question that I have for staff in moving forward with the next meeting where we'll actually discuss the document is, you know, actionable items as far verifying storm water, verifying sewer, implementing walkable strategies so as we receive funding to increase handicap access and intersections and, you know, do curb and gutter, are we working towards the vision that's stated in this document. And so I just appreciate a staff response on that for our next meeting.

MR. HEGLUND: And let me just be clear, Commissioner Cater, that the comments made by Planning
Commission tonight are just comments like the public is making. So they'll just be responded to in the final EIR.

COMMISSIONER CATER: Yes. And that's fine. Yeah, I guess -- so I guess my more general comment would be the, kind of, actionable items for infrastructure and pedestrian improvements in the downtown area.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Commissioner Koman.

COMMISSIONER KOMAN: Thank you.

I want to thank the staff for the detail that was included in this report. I'm very pleased to see that. As some of you know, my background as a past chairperson of the Redevelopment Agency, I have a vested interest in the downtown redevelopment. And this is, in my mind, a very good extension of those things that the City has already been working on for the last, about, 20 years now. So I'm glad to see we haven't abandoned what we started. We try to make this plan work with that. You know, we're obviously not here to discuss the merits of high speed rail, but it's really important that the City continue to look at how that impacts us. And if there's an opportunity to benefit from it, we need to be looking at that. And so I appreciate the overall plan.
I'd like to reserve specific comments -- I'll send to you in writing that I have. One of mine, specifically, is the in and out of downtown. You know, many people live southwest, northwest, other areas and it's frequently difficult for them to get to the downtown and then get out of the downtown. And so there's a reluctance of people that live outside of the downtown to come downtown for evening events, come to dinner -- those kinds of things. There's a little bit of reluctance and part of that has to do with the infrastructure, roadways -- those kinds of things. So I'd like to have that addressed, as well.

You know, I look forward to some changes at Garces Circle so that the welcome mat for Bakersfield off Golden State Highway is not a strip club and a muffler shop that says, "No muff too tough." I'd like to see us have a little bit more welcoming presence there in that area. So anyway, just get back to that.

Thank you very much, the staff for their work. And I appreciate the audience's comments. I was very pleased to see so many positive comments that questions, yes, and we all have questions. I think that over time those questions will be addressed. And, you know, maybe, all of us will be satisfied. Maybe we won't have everything that we want, but I think that
all this public comment will come up with a good plan that serves Bakersfield into the future. You know, we wonder if high speed rail will occur in my lifetime. I don't know. But I'm glad to see us looking 30 years down the road.

So thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

I see no other lights so I will now close the public hearing. Can I get a motion to refer the comments received tonight to staff for response? I need a motion.

COMMISSIONER BELL: I make a motion to refer to staff.

THE CHAIR: That was from Commissioner Bell. May I have a second?

COMMISSIONER WADE: I'll second that.

THE CHAIR: Commissioner Wade.

Roll call vote?

THE CLERK: Commissioner Lomas?

THE CHAIR: Yes.

THE CLERK: Commissioner Bell?

COMMISSIONER BELL: Yes.

THE CLERK: Commissioner Cater?

COMMISSIONER CATER: Yes.

THE CLERK: Commissioner Koman?
COMMISSIONER KOMAN: Yes.

THE CLERK: Commissioner Wade?

COMMISSIONER WADE: Yes.

THE CHAIR: And I'd like to remind the public that the public comment period on the draft making Downtown High Speed Rail Station Area Vision Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report remains open until February 19, 2018, so you can still submit your comments if you weren't able to, or if you think of something else, you're still able to do so.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>4:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jurisdictional</td>
<td>6:16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### K

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K</th>
<th>23:9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>keep</td>
<td>31:22 60:2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>2:6 4:13 18:1 20:12,19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### L

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>62:6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>43:22 52:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack</td>
<td>20:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>45:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeview</td>
<td>41:4,6 41:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land</td>
<td>8:6 26:10 29:9 45:7,7 63:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lands</td>
<td>6:14 28:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lane</td>
<td>27:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lanes</td>
<td>18:16 25:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large</td>
<td>16:11 17:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>list</td>
<td>34:19 35:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listed</td>
<td>35:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen</td>
<td>56:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literally</td>
<td>56:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>litmus</td>
<td>16:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live</td>
<td>62:17 68:4,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lived</td>
<td>44:12 62:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local</td>
<td>36:19 52:13 64:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local-serving</td>
<td>30:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locally</td>
<td>4:22 32:16 40:14 50:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>located</td>
<td>3:1,24 57:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lomas</td>
<td>1:17 69:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>18:13 24:13 27:2 41:19 55:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long-time</td>
<td>40:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looked</td>
<td>22:13 29:4 34:19 36:17 41:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looks</td>
<td>8:4 25:18 27:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los</td>
<td>2:22 10:8 45:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lose</td>
<td>61:22 63:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lost</td>
<td>12:15 44:23 56:9 64:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lots</td>
<td>12:10 13:13 13:15 19:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loud</td>
<td>31:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>love</td>
<td>42:21 59:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loves</td>
<td>57:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low-density</td>
<td>51:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low-intensity</td>
<td>37:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lunch</td>
<td>57:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>45:8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ma'am</th>
<th>49:7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>43:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>main</td>
<td>21:16 28:17 36:7 42:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintaining</td>
<td>25:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintenance</td>
<td>56:9 56:11,18 64:24 65:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>42:15 51:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority</td>
<td>19:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mak-</td>
<td>1:3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Letter No. 22: Planning Commission Public Hearing Transcript, January 18 2018

Comments from Marvin Dean

22-A The Lead Agency acknowledges your request to change the label Lakeview to Southeast Bakersfield on one of the presentation maps at the hearing. However, this label does not appear on any of the maps within in the Vision Plan or the EIR for the Vision Plan.

22-B Please see Global Response No. 3

22-C Please see Global Response No. 4

22-D The CHSRA chose the LGA and F Street Station as their preliminary preferred alignment and station location in Bakersfield.

22-E Please see Global Response No. 2 and No. 4. The Lead Agency recognizes your request to prepare a second Vision Plan for the Amtrak Station with a one to three mile radius around the station. The Amtrak station is within the project area and was incorporated as part of the Vision Plan process. The Lead Agency received enough grant funds for preparation of one station area plan.

Comments from Terry Del Motter

22-F Please see Global Response No. 3 and No. 5. The 30-year development strategy has a vision for a possible new baseball stadium near the Kern River to replace the current facility. See Vision Plan Section 4.5, page 80.

22-G The Vision Plan discusses the beneficial use of the Kern River as part of the Vision Plan. Please see Appendix F, Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan Part 1, section 3.2 Creating the Ideal Public Realm – A Green Loop Around Downtown, page 32.

Comments from Adam Cohen

22-H Please see Global Response No. 3

22-I Please see Global Response No. 3 and 4.

22-J Please see Response No. 3-BB. The scope of the Vision Plan does not include the design of the high speed rail station. The plan does discuss walkability as a core component of the plan.

22-K Please see response to 3-AA

22-L Please see Global Response No. 5. The HSR guidelines for development around the station do not have authority over the CEQA review process.

22-M Please see Global Response No. 3 and 4.

22-N Please see Global Response No. 3 and 4.

22-O Please see Response No. 3-I and 3-K.

Comments from Troy Hightower

22-P Please see Global Response No. 2 and 3.

22-Q Please see Global Response No. 3 and 4

22-R Please see Global Response No. 3.

22-S Please see Response No. 22-E
Comments from Windel Wesley, Jr.

22-T Please see Response No. 3-BD. The location of the Heavy Maintenance Facility is outside the scope of this EIR.

22-U The location of the Heavy Maintenance Facility is not within the scope of this EIR.

Comments from Heather Cisneros

22-V Please see Global Response No. 4.

22-W Please see Global Response No. 2, 3 and 4, and Response 22-E

22-X The EIR addresses Land Use and Planning in Section 5.9 (pg. 179), Noise in Section 5.10 (pg. 213), Population and Housing in Section 5.11 (pg. 213), and transportation in Section 5.13 on pg. 233.

22-Y Please see Response No. 22-F

22-Z Please see Global Response No. 2, 3 and 4, and Response 22-E

Comments from Bill Dechery.

22-AA Please see Global Response No. 3.

Comments from Carol Bender.

22-AB Please see Global Response No. 3.

Comments from John Garns.

22-AC Please see Global Response No. 3 and 4.

22-AD The selection of the heavy maintenance facility is outside the scope of this EIR.

Comments from Commissioner Cater.

22-AE Please also see Global Response No.5.

Comments from Commissioner Koman.

22-AF Transportation impacts are addressed in in Section 5.13 on pg. 233.
Significant transit investments are proposed to induce higher quality transit services. The Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan seeks to coordinate projects identified in the GET Long-Range Transit Plan, including upgrades to the California and Chester Avenue routes to Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). Funding for implementation of BRT has not been fully identified and there are no funding commitments for a fully operational BRT system. It is likely that implementation would occur in phases, which would affect the funding strategy for the project. Additional local revenues are needed to support expanded transit service. There is uncertainty relative to potential future federal and state funding and large capital projects may need to rely heavily on local funds for implementation. Given the current fiscally constrained environment in the near future and possibly longer-term and the competitiveness of discretionary capital funds, it is not realistic to expect that government funding alone will be sufficient. GET, working collaboratively with the City of Bakersfield, Kern County, and other jurisdictions will need to generate local revenue sources, such as a countywide half-cent sales tax, vehicle registration fees, or developer impact fees for transportation improvements with a percentage of the revenues dedicated for transit.

Additional local revenues are needed to support expanded transit service, such as the proposed circulator shuttle. The California Transportation Development Act funds (TDA) are the largest single source of operating revenue for GET. Since this funding is tied directly to tax revenues that fluctuate with the state of the economy, TDA allocations have not been growing as rapidly in recent years. It is challenging for GET to meet the required operating ratios for TDA funding for GET’s operations and planned capital improvements.

The Plan also recommends the creation of two new mobility hubs in Downtown, in addition to an upgraded GET Downtown Transit Center that would function as the third mobility hub. As noted in the Plan, both proposed HSR station sites are at the periphery of the downtown core, so first/last mile access will be a key element for transit connectivity. The Plan also notes that to effectively connect either site to the core of downtown will require “first/last mile” improvements to multimodal access (e.g. shuttle, circulator, and feeder routes, bike share programs, improved pedestrian pathways, and partnerships with Transportation Network Companies). GET is currently conducting a study of best practices regarding alternatives to traditional fixed route transit service. An important component of this study is to address first and last mile challenges and identify a variety of ways to improve how GET can improve connectivity for its riders.

The project’s transit-supportive policies are consistent with GET’s Long Range Transit Plan, which outlines the following principles and policies:
• Support transit use at the local level and on a regional scale.
• Focus development and infrastructure on key cores and corridors.
• Design streets and new developments to foster street activity and encourage transit use.
• Land uses should be mixed both horizontally and vertically.
• Support and enhance major activity centers.
• Land use intensities should be at levels that will encourage use of transit and support pedestrian and bicycle activity.
• Parking requirements (and parking provision) should be compatible with compact, pedestrian and transit-supportive design and development.
• The transportation and circulation framework should define compact districts and corridors.
• New residential developments should include streets that provide connectivity.
• Transit improvement projects should be targeted at areas with transit-supportive land uses.
• Streets should be designed to support use by multiple modes.
• Buildings should be human scaled.
• The impact of parking on the public realm should be minimized.

The projections for the second phase of implementation (2025-2035) coincide with the first few years of HSR operations. The projections for this time period assume HSR service will be in operation north to San Francisco and expand into the Los Angeles basin by 2029. The Plan cautions that there be a commitment to the envisioned level of development. As is noted, “The biggest mistake would be to allow for large-scale, automobile-oriented development on a potential redevelopment parcel adjacent to the HSR station that was planned for high-density transit-oriented development. Such ill-conceived projects would deter development that is more in line with the community’s vision of a compact, mixed-use and livable transit-oriented community both adjacent to the site and throughout Downtown.” Significant investments are proposed to increase the infrastructure for transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities and circulation in the project area would be improved. GET is committed to all policies that promote a livable transit-oriented community and will work with the community at achieving the project objectives.
Letter No. 23: Golden Empire Transit

23-A The Lead Agency thanks GET for their comments and acknowledges GET’s conclusion that the Project’s transit-supportive polices are consistent with GET’s Long Range Transit Plan. The Lead Agency intends to work closely with GET in seeking funding opportunities for transit and transportation infrastructure and plan for transit oriented development consistent with the vision plan.
February 6, 2018

Cecelia Griego
City of Bakersfield
1715 Chester Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Dear Ms. Griego:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan. The project establishes a strategic vision for the future development of the area surrounding the future High Speed Rail (HSR) Station in Downtown Bakersfield, including but not limited to: land use patterns, urban design and infrastructure, multi-modal transportation services and circulation, parking, pedestrian and bicycle access, open space and recreation, and arts and culture. The project establishes a conceptual phased approach to future physical development, including a long-term (30-year) development projection, which includes up to 2,005,000 square feet of office space, 8,570 residential units, 906,988 square feet of retail, and 2,413 hotel rooms. The project encompasses 2.3 square miles (1,472 acres) surrounding the Bakersfield HSR Station site, which is located along Golden State Avenue near the intersections with Chester Avenue and F Street. The project area is bound by 38th Street and the Kern River to the north, Union Avenue to the east, California Avenue to the South, and F Street to the west.

The mission of Caltrans is to provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability. The Local Development -Intergovernmental Review (LD-IGR) Program reviews land use projects and plans through the lenses of our mission and state planning priorities of infill, conservation, and travel-efficient development. To ensure a safe and efficient transportation system, we encourage early consultation and coordination with local jurisdictions and project proponents on all development projects that utilize the multimodal transportation network.

Based on the information provided, Caltrans has the following comments consistent with the State’s smart mobility goals that support a vibrant economy and sustainable communities:

- As stated in Caltrans’ comment letter dated September 19th 2016, Caltrans encourages the City to integrate transportation and land use in a way that reduces Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by facilitating the provision of more proximate goods and services to shorten trip lengths and achieve a high level of

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
non-motorized travel and transit use. As such, we encourage the City to evaluate the potential of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) applications to better manage the transportation network. The Department also seeks to reduce serious injuries and fatalities, as well as provide equitable mobility options for users who are economically, socially, or physically disadvantaged. Therefore, we ask the City to evaluate the plan for access or service issues that may need to be addressed.

• As the Vision plan is implemented in the future, specific traffic studies should be prepared and submitted to Caltrans for each development that potentially impacts the State Highway System.

• This project has potential to impact State Routes 14, 58, 99, 178, and especially 204, to which F Street is adjacent. Caltrans is currently updating the Transportation Concept Reports for the aforementioned routes, including the Corridor System Management Plan for SR 99. Please keep Caltrans informed as the environmental process for the HSR Station Vision Plan and subsequent projects using the environmental document move forward.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Kevin Lum, Transportation Planner, at (559) 488-4260.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL NAVARRO, Acting Chief
Transportation Planning - South

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
The Vision Plan supports the integration of transportation and land use to reduce VMT and GHG emissions. Each of the following goals of the Vision Plan listed below directly or indirectly supports this concept:

- Increase population and economic density in the urban core;
- Support residential and commercial activity;
- Develop under-utilized or vacant properties;
- Connect existing activity and cultural centers;
- Create an efficient, reliable, and effective multi-modal transportation system;
- Enhance sustainability, livability and a sense of place; and,
- Secure funding for identified implementation actions. (Vision Plan, pg. 4)

In addition, the Mass Transit Vision for the plan is as follows:

“A further concentration of transit lines supported by multi-modal options will make Downtown Bakersfield the regional mobility hub, which will lead to increased densities around transit, reduced parking demands, and a walkable urban environment. This Vision Plan identifies upgrades and interventions to induce transit-oriented development and prepare Downtown to accommodate projected development through high-quality transit service” (Vision Plan, pg. 42)

Mitigation Measure T-1.3 addresses this issue by requiring the development of a TDM plan. Copied below:

**T-1.3 Transportation Demand Management Plan**

Prior to “Opening Day” of the High Speed Rail Station Facility, the City of Bakersfield shall develop a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan for the Project Area. The Plan may include a variety of strategies to ensure development of a cohesive and efficient multi-modal transportation network, both in and around the Station area. The Plan may include, but is not limited to, strategies to:

- Incorporate improvements into future Capital Improvement Programs (CIPs), which facilitate transit-oriented development at and near the High-speed rail station. The improvements will enhance connectivity of the “first/last mile” access to the station; and may include, but are not limited to: bus bays, pick-up/drop-off areas, taxi/e-hailing stands, secured bicycle parking, dedicated parking for carshare/vanpools/electric vehicles near building entrances, EV charging stations, transit pass sales outlets, interactive travel kiosks, etc.

- Introduce car-share and bike-share programs to the Project Area; including reserved parking spaces outside of the station for car-share and bike-share vehicles, and subsidized membership in car-share programs.

- Work with Public Transportation Operators to develop programs to incentivize reduced parking and use of carpooling/public transit; such as:
  1. Identify necessary improvements to area bus stops (e.g., seating and shelters) and pedestrian pathways (e.g. new or improved crosswalks).
  2. Offer subsidized transit passes for employees in the Project area.
3. Implement an “Employer Pass Program” where operators offer bulk passes to employers at a discounted rate for employee use.

h. Work with Employers to develop programs to incentivize reduced parking and use of carpooling/public transit; such as:
3. “Parking cash-out” program for employees to avoid use of on-site parking.
4. “Guaranteed ride home” program in which employees who took transit or other alternative modes to work are offered a limited number of fully-subsidized taxi, rideshare, or Transportation Network Company (i.e. Uber, or Lyft) rides home after hours.
5. Telecommuting program
6. Employer-sponsored vanpool or rideshare-matching program.
7. On-site childcare programs, cafeterias and other measures to reduce driving trips.
8. Shuttle service to the GET Transit Center and future high-speed rail station hub.

24-B The purpose of the Vision Plan, as described in the plan’s Foreword is as follows:

“The purpose of this Vision Plan is to illustrate the Community’s vision for revitalization of Downtown Bakersfield and provide a blueprint for future decisions. Most importantly, this Vision Plan is intended to spark interest, inspire deeper conversations, and to show the City’s support for progress and investment in Downtown Bakersfield.” (Vision Plan Foreword)

Specific details regarding access or service issues would be addressed during the implementation phase of the project and as individual projects are proposed for development. In addition, project details, including transportation improvement details, do not exist at this time to address these issues. Mitigation measure T-1.1 requires submittal of a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for projects generating more than 50 trips, and mitigation measure T-1.2 requires all construction activity within the public right-of-way to be approved by the City’s Public Works Department which will assess access and service issues of that proposed project.

24-C As the Vision Plan is implemented, Caltrans will be forwarded each TIS that identifies a potential impact to the State Highway System. In addition, the Lead Agency will continue to collaborate with Caltrans in the implementation of the Vision Plan.

24-D The Lead Agency recognizes the potential impact from the implementation of the Vision Plan on the identified State Routes and acknowledges that Caltrans is updating the Transportation Concept Reports for those routes and the Corridor System Management Plan for SR 99. The Lead Agency will continue to provide information to Caltrans as requested.
February 9, 2018

Cecelia Griego
City of Bakersfield
1715 Chester Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Dear Ms. Griego:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan. In addition to the letter dated February 6, 2018, Caltrans has the following supplemental comments based on the Appendix B Traffic Impact Study (TIS):

- Figures 8-10, years 2025, 2035 and 2045, with Project Scenario respectively: These trip assignment diagrams appear to represent only traffic volumes that will be generated by a City of Bakersfield concept development plan for six “cluster” areas near the proposed “F” Street HST Station. The heading for Figures 8-10 does not make this clear. Please revise these Figure headings to clarify what these trip diagrams represent.

- Figures 8-10, Intersection 2: Although the lane configuration in Figure 8 appears correct for 2025, the lane configurations shown in Figures 9 & 10, years 2035 & 2045, respectively, reflect a standard intersection and not the interchange configuration that will be present in those years. Please revise accordingly.

- ‘Future Conditions’ Section: The first paragraph contains a sentence stating “The ‘No Project’ and ‘with Project’ intersection turning movement counts for 2025, 2035 and 2045....” The turning volumes for these future years are not from counts, they are from forecasts and possibly Turns 32 software. Please revise this sentence accordingly.

- SR 204 at “F” Street turning movement volumes, Existing and Forecasted years: The NB SR 204 Mainline after the “F” Street intersection is about 15% lower than Caltrans 2015 peak hour data at this location. The “Existing” reciprocal AM & PM SR 204 traffic volumes on both sides of “F” Street appear reasonable, but adjusting the NB Mainline peak hour after “F” Street would produce more balanced reciprocal movements.

- The forecasted AM & PM reciprocal movement volumes for SR 204 on both sides of the “F” Street/SR 204 intersection do not appear accurate. This is likely due to the fact that the growth rates used in this forecast are substantially lower for the NB SR 204 PM approach and departure

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"
volumes at "F" Street compared to all other direction AM & PM growth rates used at this location. Caltrans suggests using a 2.0% growth rate for SR 204 where the growth rate used was less than this value.

- The Existing counts on "F" Street, south of the SR 204/"F" Street intersection (Figure 5), do not appear balanced for the AM NB and the PM SB reciprocal movements (215 & 785, respectively). However, the PM NB & AM SB reciprocal movements show a good reciprocal movement correlation (592 & 625, respectively). Please review and provide justification since the AM NB directional volume on "F" Street appears unexpectedly low.

- The 2035 'without project' PM NB 204 LT onto SB "F" Street volume appears low at 186, when compared to the 2015 existing value of 505. Please review the turning movement diagram data at all intersections and provide appropriately revised turning movement diagrams pursuant to these comments. The new diagrams should indicate where turning movement values have been modified and show the original and changed values on the same sheet.

- Caltrans may have additional comments on State Highway System (SHS) intersections/interchanges evaluated in the Appendix B traffic study during the next submittal after 1) higher resolution diagrams are submitted for turning movements/forecasting, 2) existing count data entry is rechecked, 3) AM/PM reciprocal movements are re-valuated and 4) annualized growth rates are adjusted where necessary.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Kevin Lum, Transportation Planner, at (559) 488-4260.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL NAVARRO, Acting Chief
Transportation Planning - South

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
**Letter No. 25: Caltrans, February 9, 2018** (Please note: attached TIS reflects these changes)

25-A The title of the diagrams has been updated to better reflect what they represent.

25-B Figures 9 and 10 have been updated to match the figure shown here. Please note, the through movements on Golden State Highway are on the freeway mainline and not modeled at the surface level in all scenarios.

![Figure 9](image1)

![Figure 10](image2)

25-C The sentence has been revised to state that the 2025-2045 volumes are forecast volumes instead of “counts”.

25-D The intersection turning movement count data was taken from the CHSR Fresno to Bakersfield EIR/EIS, and to maintain consistency no adjustments to the counts were made.

25-E The growth rate was fixed for the entire project to maintain consistency throughout the report. This approach was approved by the City and after consideration will stay with the existing assumptions.

25-F There was an error in the diagram for Figure 5. Figure 5 Intersection 2 PM has been corrected to reflect the correct volumes. The revised diagram is shown below:

![Figure 5](image3)

25-G The Lead Agency notes that the traffic study was conducted to provide a general understanding of potential traffic issue in the future years with implementation of the Vision Plan. During implementation of the Vision Plan, as required by mitigation measure T-1.1, submittal of a project-specific Traffic Impact Study (TIS) is required for projects generating more than 50 trips within the project area. These future traffic studies will provide updated traffic volumes and movements.

25-H The Lead Agency acknowledges that Caltrans may have additional comments on the State Highway System as evaluated in the traffic study. As discussed above, future traffic studies will further refine what was studied in this traffic study as this study was to provide a general understanding of traffic based on anticipated development in the Vision Plan.
February 16, 2018

Ms. Cecelia Griego, Principal Planner
City of Bakersfield Community Development Department – Planning Division
1715 Chester Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Subject: High Speed Rail Station Area Plan Vision Plan ("Making Downtown Bakersfield")
SCH #2016081071

Dear Ms. Griego:

The Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (Division) has received and reviewed the above Notice of Availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and Notice of Public Hearing and submits the following evaluation.

The project is located in Kern County, outside of any of the Division's oil field administrative boundaries. Division records indicate there is one known abandoned oil and gas well located within the project boundaries. Well R. B. Jackson & C. H. Chamberlain 1, API No. 029-30992, is currently near or under a residence. The Division makes general recommendations regarding construction on or near oil, gas, and geothermal wells (Comments 3.a. and 3.b. in the attached Well Review Report). Re-entry/re-abandonment of this well is not recommended at the present time. Should the parcel on which the well is located be redeveloped in the future, the Division recommends re-abandonment at that time. Please see the enclosed Well Review Report for additional information about this well.

The developer/project owner is required to consult with the Division prior to the commencement of any work to uncover a known abandoned well.

If during development activities, any wells are encountered that were not part of this review, the property owner/developer shall immediately notify the Division's construction site well review engineer in the Bakersfield district office. The district office will send a follow-up well evaluation letter to the property owner and local permitting agency. Remedial plugging and abandonment operations may be required.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. Should any questions arise, please contact me in the Bakersfield district office at (661) 334-3662.

Sincerely,

Michael Toland
Senior Oil and Gas Engineer
Environmental Unit Supervisor
WELL REVIEW REPORT

The Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (Division) possesses records regarding oil and gas wells drilled and operated in the State of California. (Cal. Public Res. Code, §§ 3215, 3126.) Based on the Division’s records and expertise, the Division has undertaken review of the well(s) referenced below at the request of a party either having jurisdiction over the use of the parcel referenced above, or a party having control over, or an interest in, the use of the parcel. This request is considered by the Division as voluntary participation in the Division’s Well Review Program. The Division provides the information below to facilitate local permitting agencies’ exercise of local land-use authority regarding use of land where oil and gas wells are situated. In contrast, the Division does not possess local land-use decision authority, but alternatively has authority for permitting any necessary work on any well in the state. (Cal. Public Res. Code, §§ 3106 and 3203.)

The Division has conducted a record review of the known well(s) located on the above-referenced parcel(s). The record review process consists of determining the possible location, last known operator, and abandonment status of any known well on the property by examining records previously submitted to the Division, and then comparing the abandonment status with current abandonment standards.

In general, a well may be considered adequately abandoned when both the record review and on-site evaluation process reflect that steps have been taken to isolate all oil-bearing or gas-bearing strata encountered in the well, and to protect underground or surface water suitable for irrigation or farm or domestic purposes from the infiltration or addition of any detrimental substance, and to prevent damage to life, health, property, and other resources. (Cal. Public Res. Code, § 3208.)

The following is a summary of the current status of all known wells located on the above development site property:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. B. Jackson &amp; C. H. Chamberlain 1 029-30992</td>
<td>The record review process shows that the subject well is not abandoned to current Division standards as of January 22, 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 19, T. 29S, R. 28E., MD B&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on well records:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The well does not meet any plugging and abandonment requirements for cement plugs. <strong>CCR 1723 (a)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The well does not meet any plugging and abandonment requirements for hole fluid. <strong>CCR 1723 (b)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please refer to the Division’s online Well Finder map for well location at <a href="http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dog/Pages/Wellfinder.aspx">http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dog/Pages/Wellfinder.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California Code of Regulations (CCR) may be found at ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/oil/laws/PRC10.pdf CCReq accessed on January 22, 2018 for this review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of wells: 1

The local permitting agency, property owner, and/or developer should be aware of, and fully understand, that significant and potentially dangerous issues may be associated with development near oil and gas wells. These issues are non-exhaustively identified in the following comments, and are provided by the Division for consideration by the local permitting agency, in conjunction with the property owner and/or developer, on a parcel-by-parcel or well-by-well basis. **As stated above, the Division provides the above well review information solely to facilitate decisions made by the local permitting agency regarding potential development near oil or gas wells.**

1. The Division recommends that access to any well located on the property be maintained in the event abandonment or re-abandonment of the well becomes necessary in the future. Impeding access to a well could result in the need to remove any structure or obstacle that prevents or impedes access. This includes, but is not limited to, buildings, housing, fencing, landscaping, trees, pools, patios, sidewalks, and decking.
2. Nothing guarantees that wells abandoned to current standards will not start leaking oil, gas, and/or water in the future. It always remains a possibility that any well may start to leak oil, gas, and/or water after abandonment, no matter how thoroughly the well was plugged and abandoned. The Division acknowledges wells that are presently abandoned to current standards have a lower probability of leaking oil, gas, and/or water in the future, but makes no guarantees as to the adequacy of the abandonment or the potential need for future re-abandonment.

3. Based on comments 1 and 2 above, the Division makes the following general recommendations:

a. Maintain physical access to all oil and gas wells.

b. Ensure that the abandonment of all oil and gas wells is to current standards.

If the local permitting agency, property owner, and/or developer chooses not to follow recommendation b for each well located on the development site property, the Division believes that the importance of following recommendation a for each well located on the subject property increases. If recommendation a cannot be followed for each well located on the subject property, then the Division advises the local permitting agency, property owner, and/or developer to consider any and all alternatives to proposed construction or development on the site (see comment 4 below).

4. Sections 3208 and 3255(a)(3) of the Public Resources Code give the Division the authority to order the re-abandonment of any well that is hazardous, or that poses a danger to life, health, or natural resources. Responsibility for re-abandonment costs for any well may be affected by the choices made by the local permitting agency, property owner, and/or developer in considering the general recommendations set forth in this letter. (Cal. Public Res. Code, § 3208.1.)

5. Maintaining sufficient access to an oil or gas well may be generally described as maintaining “rig access” to the well. Rig access allows a well servicing rig and associated necessary equipment to reach the well from a public street or access way, solely over the parcel on which the well is located. A well servicing rig, and any necessary equipment, should be able to pass unimpeded along and over the route, and should be able to access the well without disturbing the integrity of surrounding infrastructure.

6. The Division recommends that a local permitting agency consider the use of surface mitigation measures as a condition for project approval, if and when appropriate. Examples of surface mitigation measures include venting systems for wells, venting systems for parking lots, patios, and other hardscape, methane barriers for building foundations, methane detection systems, and collection cellars for well fluids. The Division does not regulate the design, installation, operation, or adequacy of such measures. The Division recommends that such surface mitigation measures are designed, installed, and operated by qualified engineers. The permitting of surface mitigation measures falls under the jurisdiction of the local permitting agency.
7. If during the course of development of a parcel any unknown wells are discovered, the Division should be notified immediately so that the newly discovered well(s) can be incorporated into the Well Review processes.

8. The Division recommends that any soil containing significant amounts of hydrocarbons be disposed of in accordance with local, state, and federal laws. Please notify the appropriate authorities if soil containing significant amounts of hydrocarbons is discovered during development.

9. The Division recommends that the information contained in this Well Review Report, and any pertinent information obtained after the issuance of this report, be communicated to the appropriate county recorder for inclusion in the title information of the subject real property. This is to ensure that present and future property owners are aware of (1) the wells located on the property, and (2) potentially significant issues associated with any improvements near oil or gas wells.

No well work may be performed on any oil or gas well without written approval from the Division in the form of an appropriate permit. This includes, but is not limited to, mitigating leaking fluids or gas from abandoned wells, modifications to well casings, and/or any other re-abandonment work. NOTE: The Division regulates the depth of any well below final grade (depth below the surface of the ground). Title 14, Section 1723.5 of the California Code of Regulations states that all well casings shall be cut off at least 5 feet but no more than 10 feet below grade. If any well needs to be lowered or raised (i.e. casing cut down or casing riser added) to meet this grade regulation, a permit from the Division is required before work can start.

To reiterate, the local permitting agency, property owner, and/or developer should be aware of, and fully understand, that the above comments are made by the Division with the intent to encourage full consideration of significant and potentially dangerous issues associated with development near oil or gas wells.
Letter No. 26: DOGGR

26-A  Thank you for the information regarding the abandoned well R. B. Jackson & C. H. Chamberlain 1, API No. 029-30992. The Vision Plan does not apply to parcel specific development. Upon future development affecting this well, the Division will be contacted and consulted with as appropriate and required.
FEB 20 2018

Jacquelyn R. Kitchen
City of Bakersfield
Community Development Department
1715 Chester Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Project: Draft Environmental Impact Report - Making Downtown Bakersfield Project

District CEQA Reference No: 20180012

Dear Ms. Kitchen:

The San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (District) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the Downtown Bakersfield High Speed Rail Station Area Plan (Area Plan). The proposed Downtown Bakersfield High Speed Rail Station Area Plan consists of a phased approach to future physical development, including a long-term (30-year) development projection which envisions: up to 2,005,000 square feet of office, up to 8,570 residential units, up to 906,000 square feet of retail, and up to 2,400 hotel rooms (Project), the District offers the following comments:

1. **Emissions Estimate Construction**

   The District recommends that the DEIR identify and quantify the annual criteria pollutant emissions from construction.

   The DEIR determined that the Project would have a less than significant impact for construction with only Mitigation Measure AQ-1 because future development projects within the Area Plan would have to comply with this Measure. The Measure states "Prior to the issuance of grading/building permits for individual projects, project proponents shall demonstrate to the City of Bakersfield that they have obtained all required permits from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD); and that all construction activities will continuously comply with applicable regulatory standards; including, but not limited to SJVAPCD Regulation VIII, Control Measures for Construction Emissions of PM10". However, the District would like to clarify that although compliance with District Rules and Regulations (i.e. District Regulation VIII and District Rule 9510, etc.) reduces project specific...
construction emissions, it may not be sufficient to reduce project specific emissions to less than significant levels.

Based on information provided to the District, Project specific annual emissions of criteria pollutants may exceed the following thresholds of significance for criteria pollutant emissions: 100 tons per year of carbon monoxide (CO), 10 tons per year of oxides of nitrogen (NOx), 10 tons per year of reactive organic gases (ROG), 27 tons per year of oxides of sulfur (SOx), 15 tons per year of particulate matter of 10 microns or less in size (PM10), or 15 tons per year of particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less in size (PM2.5). As such, the District recommends that a more detailed review of the Project be conducted and Project related criteria pollutant construction emissions should be identified and quantified.

2. **Emissions Estimate Operational (Mobile Sources)**

   *The District recommends that the DEIR identify and quantify the annual criteria pollutant emissions from operation.*

The Draft EIR determined that there will be a less than significant Impact for Impact AQ-2 (i.e. Operational). Page 72 of the Draft EIR states “future development projects in the Project area must comply with SJVAPCD rules and requirements during construction. Moreover, the Project's potential to reduce reliance on single-occupancy vehicle use would reduce program-level impacts to regional air quality from operational emissions to a less than significant level; therefore, no mitigation measures are required”. However, the District would like to clarify that although compliance with District Rules and Regulations (i.e. District Regulation VIII and District Rule 9510, etc.) substantially reduces project specific operational emissions, it may not be sufficient to reduce project specific emissions to less than significant levels.

Based on information provided to the District, Project specific annual emissions of criteria pollutants may exceed the following thresholds of significance for criteria pollutant emissions: 100 tons per year of carbon monoxide (CO), 10 tons per year of oxides of nitrogen (NOx), 10 tons per year of reactive organic gases (ROG), 27 tons per year of oxides of sulfur (SOx), 15 tons per year of particulate matter of 10 microns or less in size (PM10), or 15 tons per year of particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less in size (PM2.5). Therefore, the District recommends that a more detailed review of the Project be conducted and Project related criteria pollutant operational emissions should be identified and quantified.
3. **Voluntary Emissions Reduction Agreement (VERA)**

Should quantification for future development project(s) demonstrate that project criteria pollutant emissions are significant, the District recommends that the Draft EIR be clarified to also guide the project proponent(s) to have a VERA entered into prior to generating emissions associated with the project(s).

The DEIR discusses the potential use of a VERA for future development projects when impacts for those are found to be significant after complying with District Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review) and Rule 9410 (Employer Based Trip Reduction). The District believes that mitigation through a VERA is feasible in many cases, and recommends the DEIR be revised to include future discussion of implementing a VERA as a mitigation measure to mitigate project specific impacts to less than significant level for future development projects.

In addition, the District recommends that the discussion on VERA’s be clarified to direct the Project proponent to have the VERA be entered into prior to the start of the first activity generating emissions (including but not limited to demolition, grading, etc.), whichever occurs first. This will ensure the VERA is in place in a timely manner to achieve emissions reductions contemporaneously to the Project emissions.

4. **Toxic Air Contaminants**

*The District recommends the Project be evaluated for potential health impacts to surrounding receptors resulting from Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) emissions.*

It is important to note that Health Risk Assessments must consider project specific receptors. A Health Risk Screening/Assessment identifies potential TAC’s impact on surrounding sensitive receptors such as hospitals, daycare centers, schools, worksites, and residences. TAC’s are air pollutants identified by OEHHA/ARB (https://www.arb.ca.gov/toxics/healthval/healthval.htm) that pose a present or potential hazard to human health. A common source of TACs can be attributed to diesel exhaust emitted from both mobile and stationary sources. Industry specific TACs generated must also be identified and quantified.

The District recommends the Project be evaluated for potential health impacts to surrounding receptors (on-site and off-site) resulting from operational and multi-year construction TAC emissions.

i. The District recommends conducting a screening analysis that includes all sources of emissions. A screening analysis is used to identify projects which may have a significant health impact. A prioritization, using CAPCOA’s updated methodology, is the recommended screening method. A prioritization score of 10 or greater is considered to be significant and an
HRA should be performed. The prioritization calculator can be found at: http://www.valleyair.org/busind/pto/emission_factors/Criteria/Toxics/Utilities/PRIORITY%20RMR%202016.XLS.

ii. The District recommends a refined HRA for projects that result in a prioritization score of 10 or greater. It is recommended that the Project proponent contact the District to review the proposed modeling protocol. The Project would be considered to have a significant health risk if the HRA demonstrates that the Project related health impacts would exceed the Districts significance threshold of 20 in a million for carcinogenic risk and 1.0 for the Acute and Chronic Hazard Indices.

More information on toxic emission factors, prioritizations and HRAs can be obtained by:

- E-Mailing inquiries to: hramodeler@valleyair.org; or
- The District can be contacted at (559) 230-6000 for assistance; or
- Visiting the Districts website (Modeling Guidance) at http://www.valleyair.org/busind/pto/Tox_Resources/AirQualityMonitoring.htm

5. Indirect Source Review

**Individual development projects would be subject to District Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review) if upon full build-out the project would include but not limited to any one of the following thresholds:**

- 50 dwelling units
- 2,000 square feet of commercial space;
- 25,000 square feet of light industrial space;
- 100,000 square feet of heavy industrial space;
- 20,000 square feet of medical office space;
- 39,000 square feet of general office space; or
- 9,000 square feet of educational space; or
- 10,000 square feet of government space; or
- 20,000 square feet of recreational space; or
- 9,000 square feet of space not identified above; or
- Transit and transportation development projects equaling or exceeding 2 tons of emissions

Any applicant subject to District Rule 9510 is required to submit an Air Impact Assessment (AIA) application to the District no later than applying for final discretionary approval. If approval of the subject Project constitutes the last discretionary approval by your agency, the District recommends that demonstration of compliance with District Rule 9510, including payment of all applicable fees before issuance of the first building permit, be made a condition of project approval. District Rule 9510 and information about how to comply with District Rule 9510 can be found online at: http://www.valleyair.org/ISR/ISRHome.htm.
6. **Other District Rules**

Individual development projects may also be subject to the following District rules: Regulation VIII, (Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions), Rule 4102 (Nuisance), Rule 4601 (Architectural Coatings), and Rule 4641 (Cutback, Slow Cure, and Emulsified Asphalt, Paving and Maintenance Operations). In the event an existing building will be renovated, partially demolished or removed, the project may be subject to District Rule 4002 (National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants).

The above list of rules is neither exhaustive nor exclusive. To identify other District rules or regulations that apply to this project or to obtain information about District permit requirements, the applicant is strongly encouraged to contact the District’s Small Business Assistance Office at (559) 230-5888. Current District rules can be found online at: [www.valleyair.org/rules/1ruleslist.htm](http://www.valleyair.org/rules/1ruleslist.htm).

If you have any questions or require further information, please call Eric McLaughlin at (559) 230-5808.

Sincerely,

Arnaud Marjollet  
Director of Permit Services

[Signature]

Brian Clements  
Program Manager

AM: em
Letter No. 27: SJVAPCD

27-A  See Global Response No. 1 and 5.

Additionally, the Lead Agency has reviewed the District’s recommendation and has concluded that it would be premature at this time to identify and quantify the annual criteria pollutant emissions from construction activities because the purpose of the Vision Plan, as described in the plan’s Foreword is as follows:

“The purpose of this Vision Plan is to illustrate the Community’s vision for revitalization of Downtown Bakersfield and provide a blueprint for future decisions. Most importantly, this Vision Plan is intended to spark interest, inspire deeper conversations, and to show the City’s support for progress and investment in Downtown Bakersfield.” (Vision Plan Foreword)

Specific details regarding annual criteria pollutant emissions from construction are not known at this time and would be speculative as full-build-out of the project is to occur over a 30-year period and the type, size, and timing of construction is not known at this time. In addition, the Vision Plan does not provide any approvals for construction. Any future projects proposed within the plan area will have to go through its own CEQA review process whereby construction emissions impacts will be assessed to determine the significance of project specific emissions, even with adherence to Air District rules.

27-B  Please see response to 27-A.

27-C  The Lead Agency has reviewed the District’s recommendation and has concluded that it would be appropriate to include discussion of guiding project proponents to enter into a Voluntary Emissions Reduction Agreement (VERA) when impact are found to be significant after complying with District Rules 9510 and 9410. Mitigation Measure AQ-1 has been updated to read as follows:

AQ-1 Control Measures for Construction Emissions

Prior to the issuance of grading/building permits for individual projects, project proponents shall demonstrate to the City of Bakersfield that they have obtained all required permits from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD); and that all construction activities will continuously comply with applicable regulatory standards; including, but not limited to SJVAPCD Regulation VIII, Control Measures for Construction Emissions of PM10. If it is determined that air quality impacts are found to be significant even after complying with District Rules 9510 and 9410, project proponents shall be directed to enter into a VERA or other equal and feasible mitigation prior to the start of the first project activity generating emissions.

27-D  The Lead Agency has reviewed the District’s recommendation regarding potential health impacts to surrounding receptors resulting from Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) Emissions. Please see response to 27-A. Additionally, Impact AQ-3, starting on page 74 of the DEIR, assessed whether the project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and concluded that the impact would be potentially significant without incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-3 which requires future individual projects to prepare a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) for any project siting new occupants within 500 feet of a freeway or urban road with 100,000 vehicles/day, or near a stationary source polluter.
27-E  It is acknowledged that individual projects would be subject to all District rules, including 9510, 4601, 4641, 4002, and Regulation VIII. Mitigation Measure AQ-1 requires project proponents to demonstrate compliance with all District permitting prior to the issuance of grading/building permits.

27-F  See response 27-E.
Hi Cecilia,

Based on our review of the Draft EIR, and our discussion on our work group call yesterday, 2/21/2018, we offer the following comments:

In general, we suggest clarifying how the DEIR will help implement the Vision Plan. As you described on our call yesterday, the development potential envisioned in the Vision Plan is currently supported by existing zoning, and the DEIR will help identify more specifically where the desired growth would occur.

Taking that into consideration, we found some areas that could use clarity on the relationship between the Vision Plan and DEIR. Specific actions recommended in the Vision Plan being covered by this DEIR could include the following:

1. Tiering is mentioned in a number of places throughout the DEIR, but it is not clear if local projects that come along to implement the Vision Plan will be granted special expediency or reduced CEQA requirements if they comply with the Vision Plan and the thresholds established in the Program DEIR.

Can the document be more explicit about what local projects can expect from CEQA requirements within the specific plan area? Section 3.4.2 on page 39 says "Any project
consistent with the Project and this Program DEIR can take advantage of more streamlined environmental review," but it does not provide certainty to potential developers what that streamlined process would entail.

2. According to Section 3.4.2, there is "No specific land use and development standards are included in the Project," but the Vision Plan proposes to increase density and change land uses in the study area.

3. In Section 3.4.3: Will these transportation improvements be given "project level" approval in this DEIR, or will they require further study/approval? Also update Section 5.

4. According to Section 3.5: Given the development potential envisioned in the Vision Plan, it would be helpful to note what, if any, zoning requirements or specific infrastructure improvements are required.

We found the following sections with data that should be edited for consistency with Authority documents:

1. Appendix B, Page 1. HSR daily boardings in Bakersfield in 2035 were projected to be 9,200, see Table 2-13 in Chapter 2 of Fresno to Bakersfield Final EIR/EIS. Please update your numbers. It is best that the number from the 2012 Business Plan not be used.

2. Appendix B, Page 2. Please update the parking description at the top of page 2 to be consistent with the parking description from page 2-80 of the Fresno to Bakersfield Final EIR/EIS:

"The entire site would be approximately 24 acres, with 15 acres designated for the station, bus transit center, short-term parking, and kiss-and-ride areas. Approximately 4.5 of the 24 acres would support three parking structures with a total capacity of approximately 4,500 cars. Each parking structure would be seven levels; one with a planned capacity of 1,750 cars, another with a capacity of 1,315 cars, and the third with a planned capacity of 1,435 cars. An additional 460 parking spaces would be provided in surface lots covering a total of approximately 4.5 acres of the station site. As with the Bakersfield Station–North and Bakersfield Station–South alternatives, the balance of the supply needed to accommodate the full 2035 parking demand (8,100 total spaces) would be identified as a part of a comprehensive parking strategy developed in coordination with the City of Bakersfield."

Other noted edits/clarifications would be appreciated:

1. Page 14, Typo, add a period between "project" and "Traffic" in the N-2 impact description. Also update Section 5.

2. Page 14-15, N-2 and N-3 seem to contradict each other. N-2 says traffic would make things too loud and be in excess of General Plan standards, but mitigation says they will comply with General Plan standards yet still be significant and unavoidable, while N-3 says traffic will increase noise, but compliance with General Plan will reduce impacts to less than significant. Please confirm if N-2 really is significant and unavoidable. Also update Section 5.

3. Page 16, T-1.2 says that proposed street improvements shall be required to adhere to the City’s adopted performance criteria. Is the Project revisiting the City’s transportation
performance criteria and realigning them with the goals of the Vision Plan? Same question in Section 5.

4. Page 17, T-1.3.d.2 could include guaranteed ride home via rideshare/TNC, not just taxi. Also update Section 5.

5. Page 17, T-1.4: Are there specific projects from the 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan that should be included as mitigation? "Key improvement recommendations" are mentioned, but no specific capital projects are mentioned. Also noted in Section 5.

6. Page 18, Typo, add "not" between "would" and "Conflict" in first sentence of T-5. Mention the Project would create a benefit, not an impact. Also update Section 5.

7. Page 19, U-2: Does Treatment Plant No. 2 have existing capacity to serve the projected increase in wastewater from the Project? It is not clear from the impact statement and mitigation if improvements are necessary or not. Please consider rephrasing/rewording the impact statement. Language in U-3 is much clearer. Also update Section 5.

8. Page 19, Typo, change "insufficient" to "sufficient" in first sentence of U-3. Also update Section 5.

9. Page 39, Section 3.4.2, This sentence appears to be an incomplete sentence or missing words. "Future changes in land use and/or zoning that may be completed, such as a specific plan or a development project, for the City to implement the Project as discussed in the Vision Plan for Downtown Bakersfield."

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the City of Bakersfield, Draft EIR for the Station Area Plan. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Stuart Mori
Letter No. 28: California High-Speed Rail Authority

28-A See Global Response No. 1.

28-B See Global Response No. 5.

28-C See Global Response No. 1 and 5.

28-D See Global Response No. 1 and 5.

28-E Appendix B has been updated to reference the CHSRA’s Draft 2016 Business Plan and not using the 2012 Business Plan as requested, and refers to the Fresno to Bakersfield Final EIR/EIS as requested. It has been included as Attachment C.

28-F Appendix B, in reference to station parking, has been updated as follows, “The EIR/EIS also indicates that Bakersfield Station would feature 2,300 parking spaces on-site, sufficient to accommodate demand in the year 2035 (page 3.2-104). However, the Transportation Analysis Technical Report accompanying the EIR/EIS includes an annotated site plan for the Truxtun Avenue site (on page 2-18, excerpted here on the following page) featuring three seven-level garages and four surface lots with a total of 4,960 spaces.”

28-G The provided edits and clarifications have been addressed in the Final EIR. Impact N-2 was determined to be significant and unavoidable due to existing older buildings having the potential to have interior levels above applicable local standards due to the increased ambient noise levels anticipated with the project and no feasible mitigation available to fully reduce this impact below a level of significance. Project generated noise (Impact N-3) would not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, and therefore is a less than significant impact. See Section 9.2 Revisions to the Draft EIR. The City is not revisiting its transportation performance criteria as part of this project.
February 21, 2018

Cecelia Griego
City of Bakersfield
1715 Chester Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Subject: Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan EIR
SCH#: 2016081071

Dear Cecelia Griego:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on February 20, 2018, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project’s ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

"A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency
Document Details Report  
State Clearinghouse Data Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCH#</th>
<th>2016081071</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>Bakersfield, City of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type | EIR  
Description | The plan was establish a strategic vision of the future development of the high speed rail station and the surrounding areas. The plan will address key factors affecting future development within the plan area, including but not limited to: land use patterns in the context of the metropolitan Bakersfield general plan, architecture and urban design, infrastructure, multi-modal transportation services and circulation, parking, pedestrian and bicycle access, open space and recreation, arts and culture, and other principal factors. The plan envisions a phased approach to future physical development, including a long term (30 year) development projection which envisions the following development statistics: up to 2,005,000 sf of office; up to 8,570 residential units; up to 906,988 sf of retail; and up to 2,413 hotel rooms. 

Lead Agency Contact
| Name       | Cecelia Griego  
| Agency     | City of Bakersfield  
| Phone      | (661) 326-3788  
| Email      | Fax  
| Address    | 1715 Chester Avenue  
| City       | Bakersfield  
| State      | CA  
| Zip        | 93301  

Project Location
| County    | Kern  
| City      | Bakersfield  
| Region    |  
| Lat / Long| 35° 23' 15" N / 119° 52' 26" W  
| Cross Streets | Golden State Ave, Chester Ave, California Ave, Union Ave, 38th St, F St  
| Parcel No. |  
| Township  |  

Proximity to:
| Highways | 204, 178, 99, 58  
| Airports | Bakersfield Municipal  
| Railways | BNSF, UPRR  
| Waterways| Kern River  
| Schools  | BHS, Stella Hills ES  
| Land Use | GPD: P, PS, HR, HMR, LMR, LI, SR, GC, OC, MUC, OS-P, PT  

Project Issues
| Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Drainage/Absorption; Flood Plain/Flooding; Geologic/Seismic; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Septic System; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Cumulative Effects; Aesthetic/Visual  

Reviewing Agencies
| Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 4; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 6; Office of Emergency Services, California; Department of Housing and Community Development; Air Resources Board, Transportation Projects; Regional Water Quality Control Bd., Region 5 (Fresno); Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission; Department of Conservation  

Date Received | 01/05/2018  
Start of Review | 01/05/2018  
End of Review | 02/20/2018
Letter No. 29: State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research

29-A The Lead Agency thanks the commenter for acknowledgement of compliance with State Clearinghouse review requirements for the DEIR prepared for the project.
February 15, 2018

Cecelia Griego, Principal Planner
City of Bakersfield
Community Development Department – Planning Division
1715 Chester Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Subject: Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for High Speed Rail Station Area Plan Vision Plan (“Making Downtown Bakersfield”)

Dear Ms. Griego,

This Department has reviewed section 5.13 Transportation for the subject project and the Traffic Impact Analysis by Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates (dated October 13, 2017). Although we concur with the mitigation measures, MM T-1.1, MM T-2.1 and MM T-3.1, we have the following comments:

1) Page 4, Table 1: Future Traffic Volume Scenarios. The column “Scenario” and “Base Traffic Volume Source” is confusing. Please clarify.

2) Page 9, Figure 4: Future Lane Configurations and Traffic Control Devices (2035 “with project” Scenario and later). Yield sign is missing from Legend and Intersections 2 and 3. Please revise.

3) Page 9, Figure 4: Future Lane Configurations and Traffic Control Devices (2035 “with project” Scenario and later). Intersections 11 and 12, California Avenue is missing the 3rd westbound thru lane. Please revise.

4) Page 12, Kern County Congestion Management Plan (CMP). First bullet reads SR178/24th Street – Oak Street to N Street. Is “N” supposed to be “M”? Please Clarify.

5) Page 19, Table 5: Land Use Breakdown for Full Vision Plan Buildout, by Scenario. It is unclear if the 20-Year and 30-Year Scenarios are inclusive of or they are in addition to the prior years. For example, 10-year states, 365,000 SF of office space is needed. The 20-year states, 720,000 SF of office space is needed. Does this 720,000 SF include the 365,000 SF or is it in addition to 10-year scenario? Please clarify.

6) Page 20, Table 6: Net Trip Generation by Scenario (Net Trip Assignment, SAP minus Background). Please clarify which Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Code was used for “Retail”.
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7) Page 20, Table 6: Net Trip Generation by Scenario (Net Trip Assignment, SAP minus Background). Please revise “Office” to use the equation given for ITE 710. It shows to be more conservative.

8) Pages 24-26, Figures 8-10, Intersection 3; all show Chester Avenue at 34th Street. The site map shows Chester Avenue at Garces Circle. Please revise.

9) Pages 29-31, Figures 11-13, Intersection 3; all show Chester Avenue at 34th Street. The site map shows an unknown intersection. Please revise.

10) Pages 35-40, Tables 7-12, “Project”, “No Project” Scenarios; Please explain how study intersections in which the average intersection delay improves through timing changes to optimize green times based on forecast traffic demand for Project conditions isn’t used for No Project conditions to achieve a better LOS?

11) Please have Nelson\Nygaard submit a signed and stamped traffic study.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. Please submit the final EIR once it is available to this Department. If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (661) 862-8869 or paulc@kerncounty.com.

Sincerely,

Paul Candelaria
31-A The term “Scenario” in Table 1 refers to the different traffic model runs done for the project to correspond with the three project phases: Phase 1 (0-10 years), Phase 2 (10-20 years), and Phase 3 (20-30 years) with and without the project. The term “Base Traffic Volume Source” refers to the traffic volumes used for the analysis, which was the 2016 CHSRA Fresno to Bakersfield traffic volumes.

31-B Figure 4 of the TIA has been revised as indicated.

31-C Please see page 7, bullet #4 regarding project changes to California, “California Avenue: One general-purpose lane in each direction would be converted to a transit-only lane.”

31-D Page 12, Kern County Congestion Management Plan, first bullet, has been revised as indicate M Street and not N Street.

31-E These figures are inclusive of previous years. The introductory text on page 18 has been edited to better clarify the numbers are inclusive of previous years, “Figures for years 2035 and 2045 are inclusive, not additive.”

31-F The ITE code of Shopping Center (820) was used for “Retail”.

31-G Average rates were used to maintain consistency with trip generation rates for all land uses, and are known to be conservative in general. From Project Trips text: “The ITE cautions that average ITE trip generation rates are not appropriate or accurate for assessing land use projects located in downtowns, mixed-use projects, places served by public transit, or with transportation demand management (TDM) programs.” (Trip Generation Handbook: An ITE Recommended Practice (June 2004). Page 15: “If the site is located in a downtown setting, served by significant public transportation, or is the site of an extensive transportation demand management program, the site is not consistent with the ITE data…”

31-H Figures 8-10 should read “30th Street” rather than “34th Street.” These figures have been revised as indicated.

31-I Figures 11-13 should read “30th Street” rather than “34th Street.” These figures have been revised as indicated.

31-J It was assumed as part of the study that traffic signal timing changes would be determined by individual “Project” based development, and under the responsibility of future developer agreements. Under No Project Scenarios from Mitigation Measures section it states: “However, signal timings may be adjusted to increase throughput, fees might be paid by a project’s developer into a municipality’s traffic in-lieu program…”

31-K Nelson\Nygaard prepared the Traffic Impact Analysis and is not established by the California BPELG and cannot stamp documents in California, nor is it standard industry practice to stamp a program level traffic analysis.
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City of Bakersfield Agreement No. 15-189
STANDARD AGREEMENT

15-189
AUG 1 2 2015

1. This Agreement is entered into between the State Agency and the Contractor named below:

STATE AGENCY'S NAME
CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY

CONTRACTOR'S NAME
CITY OF BAKERSFIELD

2. The term of this Agreement is:


Or upon approval by the Dept. of General Services, whichever is later.

3. The maximum amount of this Agreement is:

$750,000.00

Seven Hundred Fifty Thousand dollars and Zero cents

4. The parties agree to comply with the terms and conditions of the following exhibits which are by this reference made a part of the Agreement:

Exhibit A—Scope of Work
Exhibit B—Budget Detail and Payment Provisions
Exhibit C—GTC 510 General Terms and Conditions
Exhibit D—Special Terms and Conditions
Exhibit E—Federal Terms and Conditions
Attachment 1—Budget Cost Proposal
Attachment 2—Partnership Program
Attachment 3—Station Area Planning Boundary Map
Attachment 4—Project Schedule

Items shown with an Asterisk (*), are hereby incorporated by reference and made part of this agreement as if attached hereto.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement has been executed by the parties hereto.

CONTRACTOR

CITY OF BAKERSFIELD

BY (Authorized Signature)

DATE SIGNED 8/24/15

PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF PERSON SIGNING

Alan Tandy, City Manager

ADDRESS

1600 Truxtun Ave, 5th Floor

Bakersfield, CA 93301

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

AGENCY NAME
CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY

BY (Authorized Signature)

DATE SIGNED 9/9/15

PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF PERSON SIGNING

Scott Jarvis, Chief Engineer

ADDRESS

770 L Street, Suite 620, MS 1, Sacramento, CA 95814
1 BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

1.1 The California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) is responsible for the planning, designing, building and operation of the first high-speed rail system in the nation. The California High-Speed Rail System (System) will connect the mega-regions of the State, contribute to economic development and a cleaner environment, create jobs and preserve agricultural and protected lands. By 2029, the System will run from San Francisco to the Los Angeles basin in under three hours at speeds capable of over 200 miles per hour. The System will eventually extend to Sacramento and San Diego, totaling 800 miles with up to 24 stations.

1.2 In partnership with the Authority, the City of Bakersfield (the City or Contractor) will undertake a Station Area Planning effort (the Project) in the area of the planned High-Speed Rail station in Downtown Bakersfield. This effort will inform the design of the High-Speed Rail Station and surrounding area; as well as enable the City to promote economic development, encourage revitalization, facilitate new growth in the station area, and enhance multi-modal access connections between the High-Speed Rail Station and the rest of the City. The Project will include an evaluation of economic development and sustainability opportunities, and define how the proposed High-Speed Rail station will be best integrated in terms of the transit facility design and surrounding land uses.

1.3 The purpose of this Agreement is to provide funding assistance to High-Speed Rail station cities to prepare for the economic development and land use changes that will result from the addition of a High-Speed Rail station within the City. Planning for this type of development is important to the ridership success and development of the High-Speed Rail system. These Station Area Planning funds provided through the Authority are intended to support local governments to initiate station area planning and partnering with the Authority. The local government shall complete or cause to be a complete station area plan. The work will support and guide environmental and design efforts associated with development of the High-Speed Rail system.

1.4 This Project shall result in a High-Speed Rail station area plan that is consistent with and supportive of the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) grant guidelines; regional planning efforts required by Senate Bill (SB) 375; the Authority’s programmatic and, as available, project environmental documents; and adopted Station Area Development Policies. It is intended that this process include public participation to involve the local community and interested stakeholders in the planning process.

1.5 All inquiries during the term of this Agreement will be directed to the project representatives, or their designees, as identified below:
EXHIBIT A
SCOPE OF WORK

AUTHORITY
Contract Manager: Stuart Mori
Address: 770 L Street, Suite 620, MS 2
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 669-6632
Fax: (916) 322-0827
e-mail: Stuart.Mori@hsr.ca.gov

CITY OF BAKERSFIELD
Project Manager: Jacqui Kitchen, Planning Director
Address: 1715 Chester Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301
Phone: (661) 326-3754
Fax: (661) 852-2136
e-mail: jkitchen@bakersfieldcity.us

The Contract Manager may be changed without amendment (as specified in Exhibit D, Section 1.2).

2 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED STATION AREA PLANNING PROJECT

2.1 This effort will guide the design of the station and station area as well as enable the City to promote economic development and sustainability, encourage station area development and enhance multimodal access connections between the station and the City. The Project will include extensive public outreach with the public, business leaders and stakeholders, other agencies, and the local community. When complete, the plan will act as a vision document that will guide the development of the High-Speed Rail station and its surrounding area. Short and long term goals and a series of action items will be included as project deliverables.

2.2 The Project will include a significant level of public outreach and the City will work with the Authority, other State and Local Agencies, local stakeholders, the residents of the community, business leaders, members of the development community, and others to generate a High-Speed Rail Station Area Plan that complements the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan, serves a foundation for a future Downtown Bakersfield Specific Plan, and supports other on-going development efforts.

2.3 High-Speed Rail Station Area Plan Contents

2.3.1 The Project will analyze the following components: land use in the context of the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan (to the extent not already covered by other projects), existing infrastructure within the plan area, transportation, regionalism, public outreach/participation, transit-oriented and multi-modal development, housing, and infill development. The Project will also address pedestrian and bicycle access, jobs, shopping, dining, entertainment, recreation, art, cultural, amenities, lighting, signage, open space, architecture and building design, parking, landscaping, environment and human impacts, and other principal issues specified by the Authority’s General Principles and Guidelines, and FRA’s Station Area Planning Guidelines and City’s General Plan.

2.3.2 The Project will also build upon the July 2015, Kern Council of Governments Metropolitan Bakersfield Transit Center Study. This study identified locations for transit centers due to
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anticipated growth, higher demand for transit service and connectivity of existing and future transit connections.

2.4 High-Speed Rail Station Location

2.4.1 The project area will cover the High-Speed Rail Station located in the general area of F Street and Golden State Avenue, also referred to as State Route 204 (SR-204) at the northern edge of Downtown Bakersfield; as well as the surrounding area of Downtown Bakersfield (see Attachment C, City Site Map).

2.4.2 The location of the High-Speed Rail Station at F Street is consistent with the Locally Generated Alternative (LGA) alignment and will directly connect the High-Speed Rail Station to the rest of Downtown Bakersfield and existing regional transportation networks.

2.4.3 SR-204 connects to State Route 99 (SR-99). This is a main highway through the San Joaquin Valley. SR-204 also connects to State Route 178 (SR-178) which connects Bakersfield to the Kern River Valley, the Mojave Desert area. In addition, SR-204 connects to State Route 14 and State Route 58 (SR-14 and SR-58). SR-58 is a regionally important east-west highway that connects the California Central Coast to Barstow in the Mojave Desert, via Bakersfield.

2.4.4 To help facilitate the development of the High-Speed Rail Station Area Planning effort, the City of Bakersfield may hire a consultant to perform some of the tasks described in this Scope of Work. The City will present the study and its findings to the Bakersfield City Council in accordance with required legal mandates.

3 ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES WHICH MEET/EXCEED MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS DESCRIBED IN APPLICATION PACKAGE FOR STATION AREA PLANNING FUNDS

3.1 The plans for the future High-Speed Rail/multi-modal station will consider the integration of Golden Empire Transit (GET), Kern Regional Transit, Amtrak, intercity bus operators, including Greyhound, Orange Bell Stages, Airport Bus of Bakersfield and para-transit plans and services. The plans will consider the integration of the Golden Empire Transit District and Kern Council of Governments’ Metropolitan Bakersfield Transit System Long-Range Plan. The site is currently served by the northwest/southeast alignment of the BNSF Railway Company (BNSF) and Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) track; a network of regionally connected streets and SR-204 and is generally located on the northern part of the City of Bakersfield. The station plan will consider GET’s improved new express routes, timed transfers at centralized Transit Centers, bus-rapid transit, dial-a-ride service, transit-supportive land use policies and patterns, amenities for passengers, and transportation demand management programs. The plan will also consider integration of the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan and the Bikeway Master Plan to access the regional bicycle system.
EXHIBIT A
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3.2 The Bakersfield High-Speed Rail Station should significantly enhance economic development and opportunity in and around the station. Development of the market feasibility and financial studies will explore use of public and private investments to support the High-Speed Rail facilities and adjacent areas in order to develop an attractive and thriving station area. It will promote transit-oriented development and establish opportunities for economic development, mixed-use and pedestrian engagement in the businesses and amenities that comprise the Station Area.

3.3 Senate Bill 375 requires the region to significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions through a combination of land use and transportation strategies. The High-Speed Rail Station will provide substantial opportunities for Downtown infill development, revitalization of existing large buildings, new job creation, and development of the types of transit-oriented housing. The High-Speed Rail station will also provide alternative transportation options for the region’s workforce, including the City, with improved access to jobs, goods and services. According to Kern Regional Blueprint, vehicle miles traveled will nearly triple by the year 2050. In 2008, Kern county residents logged 19,400,000 miles. This number is expected to go up to 34,000,000 miles in 2030 and 60,000,000 miles in 2050. It is important to note that the Kern County Regional Transportation Plan assumes a very conservative reduction in through county trips by 2040 due to an increase in passenger rail use by Amtrak and/or High-Speed Rail.

4 DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT CONDITIONS/LAND USE DESIGNATIONS IN STATION AREA

4.1 The study area is approximately one and a quarter mile by one and three quarter mile rectangle around the proposed High-Speed Rail station (see Attachment C, Station Area Planning Boundary Map). It encompasses roughly from 38th Street to the north to California Avenue to the south, and from Union Avenue in the east to parcels fronting both sides of F Street in the west. The area includes the parallel alignments of the UPRR and SR-204, GET bus facilities and other transit-oriented amenities.

4.2 It also contains a variety of land uses to include single-family and multi-family residential, office and general commercial uses, light industrial, medical offices and hospitals, regional parks, schools, governmental facilities and vacant parcels.

4.3 The majority of the study areas is included in the Downtown Core Area identified in the City of Bakersfield Zoning Ordinance and the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan.

4.4 The land within the Station study area is mostly developed with some vacant parcels. The area to the southwest of the proposed station is many single-family homes located west of F Street and east of the Kern River. South of the proposed station site from F Street east is the northern part of Downtown Bakersfield. North of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks commercial and industrial developments front Chester Avenue and 34th Street, and are west of Jewett Avenue.
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4.5 High-Speed Rail Station Area Plan Contents

The final plan will be organized in the following manner:

1. Existing Conditions in Downtown Bakersfield
2. Project Description for High-Speed Rail Station in Downtown Bakersfield
3. Goals and objectives of High-Speed Rail Station Area Plan
4. Community Outreach and Stakeholder Education
5. Vision Statement and Development Scenarios
6. Multimodal Connectivity, Access, and Parking Planning
7. Economic, Real Estate, Fiscal and Financial Planning
8. Preferred Vision and Implementation Strategy and Next Steps

5 PROJECT TASKS

Task 1: Work Plan - Project Management and Project Organization

Develop a Project Work Plan (WP), which sets forth the project team organization, detailed work scope, schedule and budget. The WP shall include the Contract Deliverables Requirements List (CDRL) and Project Milestones as the basis for status reporting and invoice preparation. Goals and measures for success for the planning process are included in this WP.

The City shall, with the Authority and Project Consultant selected by the City, clarify the roles and responsibilities, and reaffirm the project purpose, schedule, and anticipated deliverables.

Within one month from the approval of this agreement, the City will issue a Request for Proposal/Request for Qualifications for the project. A consultant will be selected within three months from the City Council approval date.

The WP will extend beyond specific High-Speed Rail Station Area Plan tasks, to put those items in the context of the broader Downtown Bakersfield planning and implementation. The WP will lay out a roadmap for the implementation of the plan developed as part of the High-Speed Rail station area planning and other on-going or previous plans.

The WP will establish a Work Planning Team (WPT) consisting of City and Authority personnel. The team would manage work plan issues, provide oversight for the work, and coordinate planning for the station area with concurrent planning projects by both parties in vicinity of the Project.

Within the first month following the issuance of the Notice to Proceed to the Project Consultant, a kick off meeting will be held with the key stakeholders.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 1 Deliverables</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hire project consultant</td>
<td>Within four months from the Station Area Planning Contract approval date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Work Planning Team (WPT)</td>
<td>Within the first month following the issuance of the Notice to Proceed to the Project Consultant. Regular WPT meetings to continue thereafter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Kick-Off Meeting</td>
<td>Within the first month following the issuance of the Notice to Proceed to the Project Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Work Plan — including a detailed scope/schedule/budget and Project Milestones.</td>
<td>Within the second month following the issuance of the Notice to Proceed to the Project Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 2: Community Outreach and Stakeholder Education

Community Outreach. Develop a community outreach and stakeholder education/engagement strategy that includes identification of stakeholders, a process for outreach, methods of involvement, and goals of the Community Outreach Strategy. The strategy will be coordinated with other on-going outreach efforts associated with significant transportation projects throughout the City.

A critical part of the outreach will be with stakeholders (such as private development, transit agencies, Caltrans, Kern COG, etc.) to coordinate efforts and assure that all parties are working toward implementation of the envisioned outcomes. A stakeholders' coordination group or technical working group must be identified to provide coordination and oversight of implementation.

The Community Outreach Strategy will include, but is not limited to:

1. Identification of stakeholders and strategies to communicate with the stakeholders
2. Communication tools
3. Communication forums (workshops, charrettes, open houses, stakeholder interviews, etc.)
4. Creation of a stakeholder group and/or technical working group
5. Notice and presentation materials
6. Web and social media communications
7. Visualization strategies for concept design and community engagement

Community and Stakeholder Education. The educational component of this strategy will emphasize best practices in numerous areas such as active transportation and complete streets ideologies, first mile/last mile concepts, pedestrian-scale design, Transit-Oriented Development (TOD), multimodal
connectivity, economic development, marketing, infrastructure development, access, and sustainability. The consultant will evaluate and research areas similar to Bakersfield's that have, or plan on, integrating High-Speed Rail into their respective city plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 2 Deliverables</th>
<th>Timeline (Following the Issuance of the Notice to Proceed to the Project Consultant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Outreach Strategy and Education Strategy</td>
<td>Within three months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemble a High-Speed Rail stakeholder group and/or technical working group</td>
<td>Within three months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 3: High-Speed Rail Station Area Vision Plan

A Vision Plan will be developed for the Station Area. The Vision Plan will consist of several components:

1. Vision Statement – Overall Community vision for the development of the station area including the goals of the area regarding: community development objectives, urban design, sustainability, leveraging off of and encourage High-Speed Rail related foot traffic
2. Existing Conditions Analysis – Review of current state of infrastructure (including utilities, roads, etc.), land use, and transportation, and concurrent city efforts in the station area
3. Potential development/design/transportation scenarios
4. Preferred Vision Plan for the Station Area

The Scenarios will integrate urban form, transportation and infrastructure. They will include design options that embrace the City of Bakersfield's identity and define the station's function as a gateway. These could include sketch-level visualizations of the station area design concepts for stakeholder input and feedback. Attention will also be paid to design Scenarios so they enhance the existing area, account for existing constraints, and mitigate negative impacts to the extent feasible.

The development of the Vision Plan will be closely linked with the other Tasks in the Scope of Work. Extensive community outreach and engagement (Task 2) will be used to develop the Vision Statement and goals and the draft Scenarios. Task 4 and 5 will undertake transportation and economic analysis of the draft Scenarios developed. Community outreach will engage stakeholders in the evaluation and ranking of scenarios based on meeting project goals, criteria and reducing environmental impacts. This will lead to the selection of a preferred Scenario and accompanying strategies for the Vision Plan.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 3 Deliverables</th>
<th>Timeline (Following the issuance of the Notice to Proceed to the Project Consultant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Speed Rail Station Area Vision Statement (include community goals for the High-Speed Rail Station Area)</td>
<td>Within four months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Conditions Report (infrastructure, land use, transportation, etc.)</td>
<td>Within five months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Station High-Speed Rail Station Area Scenarios, including: development, transportation, and urban design</td>
<td>Within six months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Plan including selection of preferred Scenario</td>
<td>Within twelve months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 4: Multimodal Connectivity Station Access and Parking Planning

A multi-modal connectivity plan to the High-Speed Rail Station will be created. It will follow the best practices for multimodal infrastructure planning found Federal Rail Administration guidelines, and/or similar guidance, as identified by the City or City's consultant. This plan will be consistent with and supportive of the Authority's station access guidance and modal hierarchy. It will also address improved access from all directions and all modes with the highest consideration for safety of vulnerable travelers.

Station area transportation and station access will be analyzed for the Vision Plan Scenarios identified in Task 3.

Analysis of the scenarios will incorporate the interrelationship between active transportation access, transit access and automobile access (including parking), to determine a balance of movement and access that can best leverage the High-Speed Rail investment for Bakersfield. Conceptual forecasts for transit fares, driving costs, and parking costs may be considered in the analysis of scenarios.

Among the components of the analysis and plan will be:

1. Complete Streets analysis, designations, and streetscape improvements
2. Examine potential regional transit connectivity improvements
3. Define future transportation needs and provide recommendations for updates to Bakersfield transportation policies, including circulation and parking
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### Task 4 Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Timeline (Following the issuance of the Notice to Proceed to the Project Consultant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal access, circulation and connectivity analysis</td>
<td>Within six months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and Demand Management Analysis</td>
<td>Within eight months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation and Parking Recommendations Report</td>
<td>Within twelve months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task 5 Deliverables

**TASK 5: Economic, Real Estate, Fiscal and Financial Planning**

Prepare an Economic Development Strategy for the High-Speed Rail station area in Downtown Bakersfield to attract new industries, businesses and employment near and adjacent to the City of Bakersfield High-Speed Rail Station area. Provide up to five (5) best-practice case studies that apply to the City, including a financing and marketing strategy. This includes development of districting and linkage concepts and a branding and Way-finding Campaign.

Provide recommendations for real estate development strategies to attract desired development to the High-Speed Rail station focus area to achieve desirable economic development and TOD goals and value capture plan. Identify value capture strategies and estimate potential value capture for potential development scenarios. Prepare a value capture and fiscal impact analysis of up to three (3) station area development scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Timeline (Following the issuance of the Notice to Proceed to the Project Consultant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Bakersfield Economic Development Plan (including development of Districting and Linkage Concepts and a Branding &amp; Way-finding Campaign)</td>
<td>Within 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Market Analysis to include Best Practice Case Studies and Finance and Marketing Strategies</td>
<td>Within 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Capture and Fiscal Impact Analysis for station area development scenarios</td>
<td>Within 12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Task 6: Implementation Strategy and Next Steps

Develop a framework and strategy for the implementation of the High-Speed Rail Station Area Vision Plan. These will include planning and legislative actions, infrastructure needs, and near term actions. The Implementation Strategy and Next Steps can include but are not limited to:

1. A Downtown Bakersfield Specific Plan which identifies specific goals and policies for Downtown Bakersfield development, potential architectural standards, incentives for development within the Plan area, and necessary land use changes and zoning amendments.

2. Ways the existing Bakersfield Zoning Ordinance (Title 17) can be amended to streamline Downtown development that is consistent and compatible with the Downtown Bakersfield Specific plan.

3. TOD overlay zone district; including mapping and ordinance text.

4. Environmental review and clearances and General Plan Amendment support documents, as needed

5. Infrastructure Needs Analysis: A list of short-term infrastructure needs and capital improvement projects to support the development around the High-Speed Rail Station Area; as well as documentation of supporting preliminary costs, funding sources potential phasing strategies.

In order to track progress on next steps a monitoring program will be developed to measure progress towards realizing the Station Area Vision Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 6 Deliverables</th>
<th>Timeline (Following the issuance of the Notice to Proceed to the Project Consultant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation and Next Steps Strategy Outline and Support Documents</td>
<td>Within 14 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Program (for Implementation of High-Speed Rail Station Area Plan Goals and Objectives)</td>
<td>Within 18 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BUDGET DETAIL AND PAYMENT PROVISIONS

1 BUDGET CONTINGENCY CLAUSE

1.1 It is mutually agreed that this Agreement shall be of no further force and effect if the Budget Act
of the current year and/or any subsequent years covered under this Agreement does not
appropriate sufficient funds for the work identified in Attachment 1. In this event, the Authority
shall have no liability to pay any funds whatsoever to the successful Contractor or to furnish any
other considerations under this Agreement and the Contractor shall not be obligated to perform
any provision of this Agreement.

1.2 After execution or commencement of this Agreement, if the funding for any fiscal year is
reduced or deleted by the Budget Act for purposes of this project, the Authority shall have the
option to either: 1) cancel this Agreement with no further liability occurring to the Authority; or
2) offer an Agreement amendment to the Contractor to reflect the reduced amount.

1.3 This Agreement is valid and enforceable only if sufficient funds are made available to the State
by the United States Government or the California State Legislature for the purpose of this
program. In addition, this Agreement is subject to any additional restrictions, limitations,
conditions, or any statute enacted by the Congress or State Legislature that may affect the
provisions, terms or funding of this Agreement in any manner.

2 INVOICING AND PAYMENT

2.1 For services satisfactorily rendered in accordance with the terms of this Agreement, and upon
receipt and approval of the invoices by the Authority Contract Manager, the Authority agrees to
reimburse the City of Bakersfield for actual hours worked on an actual cost basis (direct hourly
wage plus overhead). The Contractor agrees to compensate all subcontractors with the same
payment structure. The rates in the Budget Cost Proposal are rate caps, or the maximum allowed
to be billed over the duration of this agreement.

2.1.1 Time is of the essence with regard to completing tasks and using ARRA funding. Because of
federal funding eligibility restrictions, by March 1, 2017 the City must submit to the Authority
invoices with total eligible costs of $550,000 to draw down the ARRA funds. For invoices
submitted after March 1, 2017 the Authority cannot guarantee ARRA funds availability, thus the
City will be liable to make-up the funding shortfall. No payment shall be made in advance of
services rendered.

2.1.2 The following certification shall be included on each invoice and signed by the authorized
official of the Contractor:

"I certify that this invoice is correct and proper for payment, and reimbursement for these costs
has not and will not be received from any other sources, included but not limited to a
Government Entity contract, subcontract, or other procurement method."
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2.1.3 The total amount payable by the Authority for this agreement shall not exceed $750,000.00. It is understood and agreed that this total is an estimate.

2.1.4 To the extent the City uses in-kind match, the Authority cannot pay/reimburse services without a valid contract and, therefore, cannot pay/reimburse a contractor for services performed prior to contract execution. If a contractor chooses to perform work prior to contract execution, they do so at their own risk. Contractors may file a claim with the California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board (formerly Board of Control) if they believe they have incurred expenses for which the Authority must pay.

2.1.5 Provide one original and two copies of the Invoice for Payment. Invoices shall be submitted no more than monthly in arrears and no later than 45 calendar days after completion of each billing period or upon completion of a task to:

Financial Operations Section
California High-Speed Rail Authority
770 L Street, Suite 620 MS3
Sacramento, CA 95814
accountings@hsr.ca.gov

(1 original and 1 copy)

AND

The Contractor shall also submit (electronically) one additional copy of invoice and supporting documentation to the Contract Manager or designee at the address identified in Exhibit A.

3 PAYMENT REQUEST FORMAT

3.1 The Authority will accept computer generated or electronically transmitted invoices. The date of "invoice receipt" shall be the date the Authority receives the paper copy.

3.2 A request for payment consist of, but not be limited to, the following:

3.2.1 Agreement number, task number, date prepared, and billing period.

3.2.2 The Contractor’s loaded hourly labor rates by individual, inclusive of fees. Each invoice shall include actual hours incurred, cumulative hours incurred to date and budgeted hours.

3.2.3 Other direct costs, including special equipment if requested by the Authority, travel, miscellaneous, and materials.

3.2.4 Backup documentation for audit purposes, and the Contractor shall retain back-up documentation for audit purposes available to the Authority upon request. The Contractor shall
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include appropriate provisions in each of its subcontracts to secure adequate backup
documentation to verify all subcontractor services and expenses invoiced for payment under this
Agreement.

3.2.5 Receipts for travel, including departure and return times.

4 TRAVEL AND PER DIEM RATES

4.1 The Contractor shall be reimbursed for approved travel and per diem expenses using the same
rates provided to non-represented state employees. The Contractor must pay for travel in excess
of these rates. The Contractor may obtain current rates at the following website:

4.2 All travel not specified in the Project Work Plan requires written authorization from the
Authority's Contract Manager prior to travel departure.

4.3 The Contractor must retain documentation of travel expense in its financial records. The
documentation must be listed by trip and include dates and times for departure and return.

5 COST PRINCIPLES

5.1 The Contractor agrees to comply with procedures in accordance with OMB A-87, as amended,
Cost Principles for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments.

5.2 The Contractor agrees to comply with Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 18, Uniform
Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local
Governments.

5.3 Any costs for which payment has been made to the Contractor that are determined by subsequent
audit to be unallowable under OMB A-87, as amended, or 49 C.F.R. Part 18, are subject to
repayment by the Contractor to the Authority.

5.4 Any subagreement in excess of $25,000 entered into as a result of this Agreement, shall contain
all the provisions of this clause.

6 PROMPT PAYMENT ACT

6.1 Payment will be made in accordance with, and within the time specified in, Government Code
Chapter 4.5, commencing with Section 927.
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7 EXCISE TAX

7.1 The State of California is exempt from federal excise taxes, and no payment will be made for any federal excise taxes levied on the Contractor. The Authority will only pay for any state or local sales or use taxes on the services rendered to the Authority pursuant to this Agreement. For clarification on excise tax exemptions, refer to the State Administrative Manual section 3585.

8 INVOICE DISPUTES

8.1 Payments shall be made to the Contractor for undisputed invoices. An undisputed invoice is an invoice submitted by the Contractor for services rendered and for which additional evidence is not required to determine its validity. The invoice will be disputed if all deliverables due for the billing period have not been received and approved, if the invoice is inaccurate, or if it does not comply with the terms of the Agreement. If the invoice is disputed, the Contractor will be notified via a Dispute Notification Form, or with other written notification within 15 working days of receipt of the invoice; the Contractor will be paid the undisputed portion of the invoice.
Under the California High-Speed Rail Authority’s standardized agreement process, a hardcopy of Exhibit C, GTC 610, is not included in the standard agreement package. As indicated on the Std. 213, a copy of Exhibit C can be found at the internet site: http://www.dgs.ca.gov/ols/Resources/StandardContractLanguage.aspx

If you do not have internet access, or otherwise cannot access the GTC 610, please contact the Office of Procurement and Contracts below to receive a copy:

OPAC
(916) 324-1541
770 L Street, Suite 620 MS3
Sacramento, California 95814

{THE REST OF THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK}
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1 CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

1.1 The Contractor's Project Manager is responsible for the day-to-day project status, decisions and communications with the Authority's Contract Manager. The Contractor may change its Project Manager by giving written notice to the Authority, but the Authority reserves the right to approve any substitution of the Project Manager. This approval shall not be unreasonably withheld.

1.2 The Authority may change its Contract Manager at any time by giving written notice to the Contractor.

2 SUBCONTRACTS

2.1 Nothing contained in this Agreement or otherwise, shall create any contractual relation between the Authority and any subcontractors, and no subcontract shall relieve the Contractor of his or her responsibilities and obligations under this Agreement. The Contractor agrees to be as fully responsible to the Authority for the acts and omissions of its subcontractors and of persons either directly or indirectly employed by any of them as it is for the acts and omissions of its subcontractors and of persons either directly or indirectly employed by the Contractor. The Contractor's obligation to pay its subcontractor is an independent obligation from the Authority's obligation to make payment to the Contractor. As a result, the Authority shall have no obligation to pay or enforce the payment of any moneys to any subcontract.

2.2 The Contractor shall perform the work contemplated with resources available within its own organization and no portion of the work shall be contracted without written authorization by the Authority's Contract Manager, with shall not be reasonably withheld.

2.3 Unless specifically noted otherwise, any subagreement in excess of $25,000 entered into as a result of this Agreement shall contain all the applicable provisions stipulated in this Agreement.

2.4 The Contractor shall pay its subcontractors within ten (10) calendar days from receipt of each payment made to the Contractor by the State.

2.5 Any substitution of subcontractors must be approved in writing by the Authority's Contract Manager in advance of assigning work to a substitute subcontractor.
3 CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA

3.1 All financial, statistical, personal, technical, or other data and information relative to the Authority's operations, which is designated confidential by the Authority and made available to the Contractor in order to carry out this Agreement, shall be protected by the Contractor from unauthorized use and disclosure.

3.2 Permission to disclose information on one occasion or public hearing held by the Authority relating to this Agreement shall not authorize the Contractor further disclose such information or disseminate the same on any other occasion.

3.3 The Contractor shall not comment publicly to the press nor any other media regarding this Agreement or the Authority's actions on the same, except to the Authority's staff, Contractor's own personnel, including subcontractors, affiliates, and vendors, involved in the performance of this Agreement, at public hearings, or in response to questions from a Legislative Committee.

3.4 The Contractor shall not issue any news release or public relations item of any nature whatsoever regarding work performed or to be performed under this Agreement without prior review of the contents thereof by the Authority and receipt of the Authority's written permission.

3.5 All information related to any construction estimate is confidential and shall not be disclosed by the Contractor to any entity, other than the Authority.

3.6 Any subagreement entered into as a result of this Agreement shall contain all of the provisions of the Confidentiality of Data clause.

4 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

4.1 The Contractor and its employees, and all of its subcontractors and employees, shall comply with the Authority's Conflict of Interest Code and Organizational Conflict of Interest Policy.

4.2 The Contractor may be required to submit an Economic Interest Statement (Fair Political Practices Commission's Form 700) from each employee or subcontractor whom the Authority's Legal Department, in consultation with the Contract Manager or its designee, determines is a designated employee under the Political Reform Act subject to the requirements and restrictions of the Act. Such determination will be based on the nature of the work to be performed by the employee or subcontractor. Each employee and subcontractor determined to be a designated employee under the Political Reform Act shall be subject to the same disclosure category or categories applicable to the Authority's staff that performed the same nature and scope of work as the Contractor.
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5 SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

5.1 The parties agree to use their best efforts to resolve disputes concerning a question of fact arising under this Agreement in an informal fashion through consultation and communication, or other forms of non-binding alternative dispute resolution mutually acceptable to the parties.

5.2 To the extent not inconsistent with law, rules, and regulations, any dispute that is not disposed of by mutual agreement in section 5.1 above will be decided by the Authority's Chief Program Manager, who may consider any written or verbal evidence submitted by the Contractor. The decision of the Chief Program Manager, issued in writing will be the final decision of the Authority. The final decision of Authority is not binding on the Contractor.

5.3 In the event of a dispute, the language contained within this Agreement shall prevail over any other language including that of the bid proposal.

5.4 Neither the pendency of a dispute nor its consideration by the Authority's Chief Program Manager will excuse the Contractor from full and timely performance in accordance with the terms of this Agreement.

6 TERMINATION

6.1 This Agreement can be terminated at any time by mutual agreement of the Parties.

6.2 Termination for Cause: In accordance with section 7 of the GTC 610, the Authority reserves the right to terminate this Agreement immediately in the event of breach or failure of performance by the Contractor.

6.3 Termination for Convenience: The Authority reserves the right to terminate this Agreement upon thirty (30) calendar day's written notice to the Contractor if terminated for convenience of the Authority.

6.4 Termination Issues for Subcontractors, Suppliers, and Service Providers: The Contractor shall notify any subcontractor and service or supply vendor providing services under this Agreement of the early termination date of this Agreement. Failure to notify any subcontractor and service or supply vendor shall result in the Contractor being liable for the termination costs incurred by any subcontractor and service or supply vendor for work performed under this Agreement, except those specifically agreed to by the Authority in writing.

7 NON-WAIVER

7.1 No waiver of any breach of this Agreement shall be held to be a waiver of any other or subsequent breach. No remedy available in this Agreement is intended to be exclusive of any other remedy, and every remedy shall be cumulative and shall be in addition to every other remedy provided therein or available at law or in equity. The failure of the Authority to enforce
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any provision of this Agreement or require performance by the Contractor of any provision shall in no way be construed to be a waiver of those provisions, affect the validity of this Agreement in whole or in part, or the right of the Authority to subsequently enforce any such provision.

8 CAPTIONS

8.1 The clause headings appearing in this contract have been inserted for the purpose of convenience and ready reference and do not define, limit, or extend the scope or intent of the clauses.

9 STOP WORK

9.1 The Authority’s Contract Manager may, at any time, by written notice to the Contractor, require the Contractor to stop all or any part of the work tasks in this Agreement.

9.2 Upon receipt of such stop work order, the Contractor shall immediately take all necessary steps to comply therewith and to minimize the incurrence of costs allocable to work stopped.

9.3 The Contractor shall resume the stopped work only upon receipt of written instruction from the Authority Contract Officer canceling the stop work order.

9.4 An equitable adjustment shall be made by the Authority based upon a written request by the Contractor for an equitable adjustment. Such adjustment request must be made by the Contractor within 30 days from the date of receipt of the stop work notice.

10 STANDARD OF CARE

10.1 The Contractor, in performing its professional services under this Agreement, owes the Authority the following duties of care (The Contractor’s “Standard of Care”):

10.1.1 The duty to have that degree of learning and skill ordinarily possessed by reputable professionals practicing in the same or a similar locality and under similar circumstances;

10.1.2 The duty to use the care and skill ordinarily possessed by reputable members of the professions practicing in the same or similar locality under similar circumstances; and

10.1.3 The duty to use reasonable diligence and his or her best judgment in the exercise of skill and the application of learning.

11 COMPUTER SOFTWARE:

11.1 For contracts in which software usage is an essential element of performance under this Contract, the Contractor certifies that it has appropriate systems and controls in place to ensure that state funds will not be used in the performance of this contract for the acquisition, operation or maintenance of computer software in violation of copyright laws.
12 CONTINGENT FEE

12.1 The Contractor warrants by execution of this Contract, that no person or selling agency has been employed or retained to solicit or secure this Contract upon contract or understanding for a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee, excepting bona fide employees or bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by the Contractor for the purpose of securing business. For breach or violation of this warranty, the State shall, in addition to other remedies provided by law, have the right to annul this Contract without liability, paying only for the value of the work actually performed, or otherwise recover the full amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee.
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1 FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

1.1 The Contractor understands that the Authority has received Federal funding from the Federal Rail Administration (FRA) for the Project and acknowledges that it is required to comply with all applicable federal laws, regulations, policies and related administrative practices, whether or not they are specifically referenced herein. The Contractor acknowledges that federal laws, regulations, policies, and related administrative practices may change and that such changed requirements will apply to the Project. The Contractor shall ensure compliance by its subcontractors and include appropriate flow down provisions in each of its lower-tier subcontracts as required by applicable federal laws, regulations, policies and related administrative practices, whether or not specifically referenced herein.

1.2 Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in this Agreement, all FRA mandated terms shall be deemed to control in the event of a conflict with other provisions contained in this Agreement. The Contractor shall not perform any act, fail to perform any act, or refuse to comply with any Authority requests, which would cause the Authority to be in violation of FRA requirements.

2 COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

2.1 The Contractor's failure to comply with Federal Requirements shall constitute a breach of this Agreement.

3 FEDERAL PROCUREMENT STANDARDS

3.1 The Contractor agrees to comply with the Procurement Standards requirements set forth at 49 C.F.R. § 18.36 or 49 C.F.R. §§ 19.40 through 19.48 inclusive, whichever may be applicable, and with applicable supplementary U.S. Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) or FRA directives or regulations. If determined necessary for proper Project administration, FRA reserves the right to review the Contractor's technical specifications and requirements.

4 FEDERAL LOBBYING ACTIVITIES CERTIFICATION

The Contractor certifies, to the best of its knowledge and belief, that:

4.1 No state or federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the Contractor, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any state or Federal agency, a member of the State Legislature or United States Congress, an officer or employee of the Legislature or Congress, or any employee of a member of the Legislature or Congress in connection with the awarding of any State or Federal agreement, the making of any State or Federal grant, the making of any State or Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any State or Federal agreement, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.
4.2 If any funds other than federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any federal agency, a member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress in connection with this agreement, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the Contractor shall complete and submit Standard Form LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions.

4.3 This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by 31 U.S.C. § 1352. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each failure.

4.4 The Contractor also agrees that by signing this document, it shall require that the language of this certification be included in all lower-tier subcontracts, which exceed $100,000, and that all such subcontractors shall certify and disclose accordingly.

5 DEBARMENT AND SUSPENSION

5.1 This Agreement is a covered transaction for purposes of 2 C.F.R. Part 1200. As such, the Contractor is required to comply with applicable provisions of Executive Orders Nos. 12549 and 12689; “Debarment and Suspension,” 31 U.S.C. § 6101 note; and U.S. DOT regulations, “Non-procurement Suspension and Debarment,” 2 C.F.R. Part 1200, which adopt and supplement the provisions of U.S. Office of Management and Budget (U.S. OMB) “Guidelines to Agencies on Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Non-procurement),” 2 C.F.R. Part 180.

5.2 To the extent required by the aforementioned U.S. DOT regulations and U.S. OMB guidance, the Contractor must verify that each subcontractor is not excluded or disqualified in accordance with said regulations by reviewing the “Excluded Parties Listing System” at http://www.sam.gov/portal/public/SAM/. The Contractor shall obtain appropriate certifications from each such subcontractor and provide such certifications to the Authority.

5.3 The Contractor's signature affixed herein shall also constitute a certification under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the Contractor or any person associated therewith in the capacity of owner, partner, director, officer or manager:

5.3.1 Is not currently under suspension, debarment, voluntary exclusion, or determination of ineligibility by any federal agency;

5.3.2 Have not had one or more public transactions (federal, state, and local) terminated within the preceding three years for cause or default;
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5.3.3 Has not been convicted within the preceding three years of any of the offenses listed in 2 C.F.R. § 180.800(a) or had a civil judgment rendered against it for one of those offenses within that time period; and

5.3.4 Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a government entity (federal, state or local) with commission of any of the offenses listed in 2 C.F.R. § 180.800.

5.4 Should the Contractor or any subcontractor become excluded or disqualified as defined in this section during the life of the Agreement, the Contractor shall immediately inform the Authority of this exclusion or disqualification.

5.5 The Contractor shall include a term or condition in the contract documents for each lower-tier covered transaction, assuring that, to the extent required by the U.S. DOT regulations and U.S. OMB guidance, each subcontractor will review the “Excluded Parties Listing System,” will obtain certifications from lower-tier subcontractors, and will include a similar term or condition in each of its lower-tier covered transactions.

6 SITE VISITS

6.1 The Contractor agrees that FRA, through its authorized representatives, has the right, at all reasonable times, to make site visits to review Project accomplishments and for other reasons. If any site visit is made by FRA on the premises of the Contractor or any of its subcontractors under this Agreement, the Contractor shall provide and shall require its subcontractors to provide, all reasonable facilities and assistance for the safety and convenience of FRA representatives in the performance of their duties. All site visits and evaluations shall be performed in such a manner as will not unduly delay work being conducted by the Contractor or subcontractor.

7 SAFETY OVERSIGHT

7.1 To the extent applicable, the Contractor agrees to comply with any Federal regulations, laws, or policies and other guidance that FRA or U.S. DOT may issue pertaining to safety oversight in general, and in the performance of this Agreement, in particular.

8 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

The Contractor and any subcontractor under this Agreement shall comply with all applicable environmental requirements and regulations, including any amendments, as follows:

8.1 Clean Air: The Contractor agrees to comply with all applicable standards, orders or regulations issued pursuant to the Clean Air Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 7401 et seq. The Contractor agrees to report each violation to the Authority, and understands and agrees that the Authority shall, in turn, report each violation as required to assure notification to the FRA and the appropriate Environmental Protection Agency Regional Office.
8.2 **Clean Water:** The Contractor agrees to comply with all applicable standards, orders or regulations issued pursuant to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, 33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq. The Contractor agrees to report each violation to the Authority, and understands and agrees that the Authority shall, in turn, report each violation as required to assure notification to the FRA and the appropriate EPA Regional Office.

8.3 **Energy Conservation:** The Contractor agrees to comply with mandatory standards and policies relating to energy efficiency which are contained in the State energy conservation plan issued in compliance with the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6421 et seq.)

8.4 **Agreement Not To Use Violating Facilities:** The Contractor agrees not to use any facility to perform work hereunder that is listed on the List of Violating Facilities maintained by the EPA. The Contractor shall promptly notify the Authority if the Contractor or any subcontractor receives any communication from the EPA indicating that any facility which will be used to perform work pursuant to this Agreement is under consideration to be listed on the EPA’s List of Violating Facilities; provided, however, that the Contractor’s duty of notification hereunder shall extend only to those communications of which it is aware, or should reasonably have been aware.

8.5 **Environmental Protection:** The Contractor shall comply with all applicable requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 et seq.

8.6 **Incorporation of Provisions:** The Contractor shall include the above provisions (A) through (F) in every subcontract hereunder exceeding $50,000 financed in whole or in part with federal assistance provided by the FRA.

9 **CIVIL RIGHTS**

The following requirements apply to this Agreement:

9.1 **Nondiscrimination:** In accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d; Section 303 of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 6102; Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12132; and 49 U.S.C. § 306, the Contractor agrees that it will not discriminate against any individual because of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age or disability in any activities leading up to or in performance of this Agreement. In addition, the Contractor agrees to comply with applicable federal implementing regulations and other implementing requirements that FRA may issue.

9.2 **Equal Employment Opportunity:** The following equal employment opportunity requirements apply to this Agreement:

9.2.1 **Race, Color, Religion, National Origin, Sex:** In accordance with Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, the Contractor agrees to comply with all applicable equal opportunity requirements of U.S. Department of Labor (U.S. DOL) regulations, “Office of
EXHIBIT E
FEDERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Equal Employment Opportunity, Department of Labor, including 41 C.F.R. 60 et seq. (which implements Executive Order No. 11246, "Equal Employment Opportunity," as amended by Executive Order No. 11375, "Amending Executive Order 11246 Relating to Equal Employment Opportunity," 42 U.S.C. § 2000e note), and with any applicable federal statutes, executive orders, regulations, and federal policies that may in the future affect construction activities undertaken in the course of the Project. The Contractor agrees to take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, color, religion, national origin, sex, or age. Such action shall include the following: employment, upgrading, demotion or transfer, recruitment or recruitment advertising, layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship. In addition, the Contractor agrees to comply with any implementing requirements FRA may issue.

9.2.2 Age: In accordance with Section 4 of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 623, the Contractor agrees to refrain from discrimination against present and prospective employees for reason of age. In addition, the Contractor agrees to comply with any implementing requirements FRA may issue.

9.2.3 Disabilities: In accordance with Section 102 of the Americans with Disabilities Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 12112, the Contractor agrees that it will comply with the requirements of U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, "Regulations to Implement the Equal Employment Provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act," 29 C.F.R Part 1630, pertaining to employment of persons with disabilities. Further, in accordance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 794, the Contractor also agrees that it will comply with the requirements of U.S. Department of Transportation, "Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability in Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance," 49 C.F.R. Part 27, pertaining to persons with disabilities. In addition, the Contractor agrees to comply with any implementing requirements FRA may issue.

The Contractor also agrees not to discriminate on the basis of drug abuse, in accordance with the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, alcohol abuse, in accordance with the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, and to comply with Sections 523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§ 290 dd-3 and 290 ee-3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records. In addition, the Contractor agrees to comply with applicable federal implementing regulations and other implementing requirements that FRA may issue.

9.3 The Contractor also agrees to include these requirements in each subcontract financed in whole or in part with federal assistance provided by FRA, modified only if necessary to identify the affected parties.
10  ARRANGEMENT OF PROJECT

10.1  Funding for this Agreement has been provided through the America Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009, Pub. L. 111-5. All Contractors, including both prime and subcontractors, are subject to audit by appropriate federal or State of California (State) entities. The State has the right to cancel, terminate, or suspend the Agreement if any Contractor or subcontractor fails to comply with the reporting and operational requirements contained herein.

11  ENFORCEABILITY

11.1 Contractor agrees that if the Contractor or one of its subcontractors fails to comply with all applicable federal and State requirements governing the use of ARRA funds, the State may withhold or suspend, in whole or in part, funds awarded under the program, or recover misspent funds allowing an audit. This provision is in addition to all other remedies available to the State under all applicable State and federal laws.

12  PROHIBITION ON USE OF ARRA FUNDS

12.1 Contractor agrees in accordance with ARRA, Section 1604, that none of the funds made available under this Agreement may be used for any casino or other gambling establishment, aquarium, zoo, golf course, or swimming pool.

13  ACCESS AND INSPECTION OF RECORDS

13.1 In accordance with ARRA Sections 902, 1514, and 1515, the Contractor agrees that it shall permit the State of California, the United States Comptroller General, the United States Department of Transportation Secretory, or their representatives or the appropriate Inspector General appointed under Section 3 or 8G of the United States Inspector General Act of 1978 or his representative to:

13.1.1 Access and reproduce any books, documents, papers and records of the Contractor that directly pertain to, and involve transactions relating to, this Agreement for the purposes of making audits, examinations, excerpts and transcriptions; and

13.1.2 Interview any officer or employee of the Contractor or any of its subcontractors regarding the activities funded with funds appropriated or otherwise made available by ARRA.

13.2 Pursuant to 49 C.F.R. § 18.26(i)(11), 49 C.F.R. § 19.26, or A-133 (whichever applicable), the Contractor agrees to maintain all books, records, accounts and reports required under this Agreement for a period of not less than three years after the date of termination or expiration of this Agreement, except in the event of litigation or settlement of claims arising from the performance of this contract, in which case the Contractor agrees to maintain same until the Authority, the FRA Administrator, the Comptroller General, or any of their duly authorized representatives, have disposed of all such litigation, appeals, claims, or exceptions related thereto.
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The Contractor shall notify the Authority not less than six months prior to disposal of any books, records, accounts and reports required under this Agreement.

13.3 The Contractor agrees to comply with, and assures the compliance of its employees with, the information restrictions and other applicable requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a).

13.4 The Contractor shall include this provision in all lower-tier subcontracts.

14 WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION

14.1 The Contractor agrees that both it and its subcontractors shall comply with Section 1553 of the ARRA, which prohibits all non-federal contractors, including the state, and all contractors of the State, from discharging, demoting or otherwise discriminating against an employee for disclosures by the employee that the employee reasonably believes are evidence of:

14.1.1 Gross mismanagement of a contract relating to ARRA funds;
14.1.2 Gross waste of ARRA funds;
14.1.3 A substantial and specific danger to the public health or safety related to the implementation or use of ARRA funds;
14.1.4 An abuse of authority related to implementation or use of ARRA funds; or
14.1.5 A violation of law, rule, or regulation related to an agency contract (including the competition for or negotiation of a contractor) awarded or issued relating to ARRA funds.

14.2 The Contractor agrees that it and its subcontractors shall post notice of the rights and remedies available to employees under Section 1553 of Title XV of Division A of the ARRA.

15 FRAUD AND FALSE CLAIMS ACT

15.1 The Contractor acknowledges that the provisions of the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act of 1986 (6 C.F.R. Part 13), as amended, 31 U.S.C. § 3801 et seq., and the U.S. DOT regulations Program Fraud Civil Remedies (49 C.F.R. Part 31), apply to its actions pertaining to this Project. Upon execution of this Agreement, the Contractor certifies or affirms the truthfulness and accuracy of any statement it has made, it makes, it may make, or causes to be made, pertaining to this Agreement or the FRA assisted project, for which Work is being performed under this Agreement. In addition to other penalties that may be applicable, the Contractor further acknowledges that if it makes or causes to be made, a false, fictitious or fraudulent claim, statement, submission, or certification, the Federal Government reserves the right to impose the penalties of the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act of 1986 as cited above on the Contractor to the extent the Federal Government deems appropriate.
15.2 The Contractor also acknowledges that if it makes, or causes to be made, a false, fictitious, or fraudulent claim, statement, submission, or certification to the federal government under a contract connected with a project that is financed in whole or in part with Federal assistance originally awarded by the FRA, the federal government reserves the right to impose the penalties of 18 U.S.C. § 1001 and 49 U.S.C. § 5307(n)(1) on the Contractor, to the extent the federal government deems appropriate.

15.3 The Contractor agrees that it shall promptly notify the Authority and shall refer to an appropriate federal inspector general any credible evidence that a principal, employee, agent, subcontractor, or other person has committed a false claim under the False Claims Act or has committed a criminal or civil violation of laws pertaining to fraud, conflict of interest, bribery, gratuity, or similar misconduct involving ARRA funds.

15.4 The Contractor agrees to include the above paragraphs in each subcontract financed in whole or in part with Federal assistance provided by the IRA. It is further agreed that the paragraphs shall not be modified, except to identify the subcontractor who will be subject to the provisions.

16 REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Contractor agrees, if requested by the Authority in writing, to provide the Authority with the following information:

16.1 The total amount of funds received by the Contractor during the time period defined in the Authority’s request;

16.2 The amount of funds actually expended or obligated during the time period requested;

16.3 A detailed list of all projects or activities for which funds were expended or obligated, including:
   16.3.1 The name of the project or activity;
   16.3.2 A description of the project activity;
   16.3.3 An evaluation of the completion status of the project or activity; and
   16.3.4 An estimate of the number of jobs created and/or retained by the project or activity.

16.4 For any contracts or subcontracts equal to or greater than $25,000:
   16.4.1 The name of the entity receiving the contract;
   16.4.2 The amount of the contract;
   16.4.3 The transaction type;
16.4.4 The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code or Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number, if known;

16.4.5 The location of the entity receiving the contract;

16.4.6 The primary location of the contract, including city, state, congressional district, and county;

16.4.7 The DUNS number, or name and zip code for the entity headquarters, if known;

16.4.8 A unique identifier of the entity receiving the contract and the parent entity of Contractor, should the entity be owned by another; and

16.4.9 The names and total compensation of the five most highly compensated officers of the company if received:

16.4.9.1 80% or more of its annual gross revenues in Federal awards;

16.4.9.2 $25,000,000 or more in annual gross revenue from Federal awards and;

16.4.9.3 If the public does not have access to information about the compensation of senior executives through periodic reports filed under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 or section 6104 of Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

16.5 Any other information reasonably requested by the State of California or required by state or federal law or regulation.

16.6 Standard data elements and federal instruction for use in complying with reporting requirements under Section 1512 of the ARRA, are pending review by the federal government, and were published in the Federal Register on April 1, 2009 [74 FR 14824], and are to be provided online at www.FederalRegister.gov. The additional requirements will be added to this Agreement by amendment.

17 REPRINTS OF PUBLICATIONS

17.1 Whenever an employee of a Contractor-Related Entity writes an article regarding the Project or otherwise resulting from work under this Agreement that is published in a scientific, technical, or professional journal or publication, the Contractor shall ensure that the Authority is sent two reprints of the publication, clearly referenced with the appropriate identifying information.

17.2 An acknowledgment of FRA support and a disclaimer must appear in any publication, whether copyrighted or not, based on or developed under the Agreement, in the following terms:

"This material is based upon work supported by the Federal Railroad Administration under a grant/cooperative agreement FR-HSR-0009-10-01-05, dated December 5, 2012. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do
EXHIBIT E
FEDERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

not necessarily reflect the view of the Federal Railroad Administration and/or U.S. DOT.”

18 FLY AMERICA

18.1 The Contractor agrees to comply with 49 U.S.C. § 40118 (the “Fly America” Act) in accordance with the General Services Administration’s regulations at 41 C.F.R. Part 301-10, which provide that recipients and sub-recipients of Federal funds and their contractors are required to use U.S. flag air carriers for U.S. Government-financed international air travel and transportation of their personal effects or property, to the extent such service is available, unless travel by foreign air carrier is a matter of necessity, as defined by the Fly America Act. If a foreign air carrier was used, the Contractor shall submit an appropriate certification or memorandum adequately explaining why service by a U.S. flag carrier was not available or why it was necessary to use a foreign air carrier, and shall, in any event, provide a certificate of compliance with the Fly America requirements. The Contractor agrees to include the requirements of this section in all subcontracts that may involve international air transportation.

19 RECYCLING CERTIFICATION

19.1 The Contractor shall comply with all applicable requirements of Section 6002 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), as amended (42 U.S.C. § 6962), including the regulatory provisions of 40 C.F.R. Part 247, and Executive Order 12873, as they apply to the procurement of the items designated in Subpart B of 40 C.F.R. Part 247.

20 EXISTING INTER-CITY RAIL

20.1 49 U.S.C. § 24405(d) requires any entity providing intercity passenger railroad transportation on an FRA-funded project to comply with certain requirements with respect to its employees and the employees of preexisting intercity rail passenger services. The Contractor shall comply with the applicable provision of 49 U.S.C. § 24405(d) to the extent it is or becomes a provider of intercity passenger railroad transportation. If it is not the operator or provider of the intercity passenger rail services benefitting from the Project funded under this Agreement, then it shall notify its selected operator of the requirements imposed by section 24405(d).

21 PATENT RIGHTS

21.1 If any invention, improvement, or discovery of the Contractor or any of its third party contractors is conceived or first actually reduced to practice in the course of or under this Project, and that invention, improvement, or discovery is patentable under the laws of the United States of America or any foreign country, the Contractor agrees to notify the Authority immediately and provide a detailed report. The rights and responsibilities of the FRA, third party contractors and the Authority with respect to such invention, improvement, or discovery will be determined in accordance with applicable Federal laws, regulations, policies, and any waiver thereof.
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21.2 If the Contractor secures a patent with respect to any invention, improvement, or discovery of the Contractor or any of its third party contractors conceived or first actually reduced to practice in the course of or under this Project, the Contractor agrees to grant the FRA a royalty-free, non-exclusive, and irrevocable license to use and authorize others to use the patented device or process for Federal Government purposes.

21.3 The Contractor agrees to include the requirements of the “Patent Rights” section of this Agreement in its third party contracts for planning, research, development, or demonstration under this Project.

21.4 “Proprietary data” is data that the Contractor has identified in a satisfactory manner as being under the Contractor’s control prior to commencement of performance of this Agreement, and that the Contractor has reasonably demonstrated as being of a proprietary nature by reason of copyright, patent, or trade secret doctrines in full force and effect at the time when performance of this Agreement is commenced. The title to “proprietary data” shall remain with the Contractor throughout the term of this Agreement and thereafter.

21.5 “Generated data” is data that the Contractor has collected, collated, recorded, deduced, read out, or postulated for utilization in the performance of this Agreement. “Generated data,” as defined herein, shall not include data developed solely from preexisting or proprietary data owned by the Contractor prior to the execution of this Agreement. Any electronic data processing program, model, or software system developed or substantially modified by the Contractor in the performance of this Agreement at the Authority’s expense, together with complete documentation thereof, shall be treated in the same manner as “generated data.” “Generated data” shall be the property of the Authority, unless and only to the extent that it is specifically provided otherwise in this Agreement.

22 RIGHTS IN DATA AND COPYRIGHT

22.1 The term “subject data” used in this section means recorded information, whether or not copyrighted, that is developed, delivered, or specified to be delivered under this Agreement. The term includes, but it not limited to, graphic or pictorial delineations in media such as drawings or photographs; text in specifications or related performance or design-type documents; machine forms such as punched cards, magnetic tape, or computer memory printouts; and information retained in computer memory. The term does not include financial reports, cost analyses, and similar information incidental to Project administration.

22.2 The following restrictions apply to all subject data first produced in the performance of this Agreement:

22.2.1 Except for its own internal use, the Contractor may not publish or reproduce such data in whole or in part, or in any manner or form, nor may the Contractor authorize others to do so, without the written consent of the FRA.
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22.2.2 As authorized by 49 C.F.R. § 18.34, or 49 C.F.R. § 19.36, as applicable, the FRA reserves a royalty-free, non-exclusive and irrevocable license to reproduce, publish, or otherwise use, and to authorize others to use, for federal government purposes:

22.2.2.1 Any work developed under a grant, cooperative agreement, sub-grant, sub-agreement, or other third party contract, irrespective of whether or not a copyright has been obtained; and

22.2.2.2 Any rights of copyright to which a Grantee, subgrantee, or a third party contractor purchases ownership with federal assistance.

22.3 The FRA may make available to any FRA Grantee, subgrantee, third party contractor, or third party subcontractor, either the FRA’s license in the copyright to the “subject data” derived under this Agreement or a copy of the “subject data” first produced under this Agreement. In the event that such a Project which is the subject of this Agreement is not completed, for any reason whatsoever, all data developed under that Project shall become subject data as defined herein and shall be delivered as the FRA may direct.

22.4 To the extent permitted by State law, the Contractor agrees to indemnify, save and hold harmless the FRA, its officers, agents, and employees acting within the scope of their official duties against any liability, including costs and expenses, resulting from any willful or intentional violation by the Contractor of proprietary rights, copyrights, or right of privacy, arising out of the publication, translation, reproduction, delivery, use or disposition of any data furnished under this Agreement. The Contractor shall not be required to indemnify the FRA for any such liability arising out of the wrongful acts of employees or agents of the FRA.

22.5 The Contractor agrees to include the requirements of this section in its lower-tier subcontracts for planning, research, development, or demonstration under the Project.
ATTACHMENT 1
BUDGET COST PROPOSAL

High Speed Rail Station Area Planning
City of Bakersfield - California High Speed Rail Authority
Budget Worksheet: Funding by Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Federal ARRA</th>
<th>State Prep IA</th>
<th>Non-Federal Match(1)</th>
<th>Bakersfield (In Kind)(2)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1 - Work Plan</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2 - Community Outreach</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3 - Defining High-Speed Rail Vision</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4 - Multimodal Connectivity, Parking Access</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5 - Economic, Financial Planning</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6 - Implementation</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,963</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total ARRA $550,000

Position                      | Full Hr (3) |
--------------------------------|-------------|
Comm. Dev Director             | $156.04     |
Planning Director              | $130.55     |
Principal Planner              | $99.26      |
Associate Planner              | $80.20      |
GIS Technician                 | $67.23      |
Totals:                       | $533.28     |

(1) Local Hard Match: Metro Bakersfield Transit Center Study Phase II - Bakersfield Agreement (KernCOG)
(2) Local Soft Match: City of Bakersfield Staff Time (CHSR to Verify)
(3) Coll Salaries Calculated using 01/12/2015 Fringe of 75% and Overhead Rates of 17% Applied to the “Full $/HR” Hourly Rates reflect the 09/25/2014 Salary Schedule

Hourly Rates reflect the 09/25/2014 Salary Schedule

$106.66 Average hourly wage
The purpose of this guidance-addendum is to clarify expectations for both the host city and the Authority with regard to collaborating in the planning of the station area.

Partnership
Planning of the station area will be a team-effort drawing upon the skills, insights, and ideas of local jurisdiction’s staff and consultants, the community, as well as the Authority’s staff and consultants with input from regional, state, and federal agencies. To ensure good communication and efficient flow of work a Working Group shall be formed to share work updates, collaborate, and coordinate. The Working Group shall consist of staff or consultants from both the City and the Authority as generally described below.

- The Authority’s Regional Director or designee
- The Authority’s Planning Director or designee
- The Authority’s Station Area Planning Manager
- A Authority TBD
- A Authority TBD
- The Host City Planning Manager
- The Host City Station Area Project Manager
- A Host City consultant
- A Host City TBD
- A Host City TBD

While the specific protocol of the Working Group will be established upon initiation of the partnership work, monthly meetings shall be the norm unless the Working Group determines otherwise. The Working Group will invite and incorporate a variety of perspectives as appropriate representing housing, economic development, sustainability, engineering, public works, etc.

Roles and Responsibilities
Attached is a Prototype List of Tasks and Responsibilities table. Though not necessarily all encompassing, this table identifies an array of station area planning tasks. Planning the station area will demand a team-effort for all tasks, however, lead-responsibility will be assigned to ensure tasks are managed and completed efficiently. The lead responsibility shown on the prototypical list are suggestions based on discussions with host jurisdictions and perception of strengths. The final assignments will be determined by the Working Group.

The Authority has a responsibility to deliver consistent information about the high-speed rail program to the public, as well as an equitable level of investment throughout the statewide system. Thus the Authority shall review work performed by the Host City and their representatives prior to public release. This includes but is not limited to press releases, media announcements, designs and descriptions of the station and station area facilities.
ATTACHMENT 2
PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

Station Area Vision
The Authority respects the responsibility of local jurisdictions to articulate their community vision. At the same time, the Authority, in planning, designing, and building high-speed rail system, must balance the requirements and desires of many stakeholders. In addition to basic operational goals including safety, service, ridership, and efficiency, high-speed rail is a long term investment addressing many public policy goals. The Authority created the station area planning partnership funding program to assist local communities in setting goals, policies, and procedures to help craft a station area that meets community values. The local vision will be knit together with that of other stakeholders.

Here are examples of detailed policies now in place:

- **Sustainability** – The Authority has adopted detailed objectives and commitments, including to plan collaboratively activities that promote transit-oriented development and sustainable land use decisions to achieve very high sustainability performance requirements.
- **Connectivity** – Per the Federal Rail Administration/Authority grant agreement, station areas will be crafted to achieve target percentage of riders accessing the station by transit as well as bicycle and pedestrian access.
- **New City Gateway** – The Authority aspires to help create active mixed-use places not simply a train station.
- **Safety and Security** – There are detailed requirements for creating operations in which customers can feel confident.

These and other foundational issues can be discussed in detail at the kick-off meeting (or anytime). In addition the Authority is happy to provide background documents that might help clarify expectations.
ATTACHMENT 3
STATION AREA PLANNING BOUNDARY MAP
### Bakrefield HSR Station Area Plan Schedule

**City of Bakersfield**
**HSR15-22**
**Page 1 of 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Activity/Work Scope Task #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Completion of Station Area Plan and Funding agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agreement on scope, budget and draft contract proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Task 1: Work Plan - Project Management and Project Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Task 2: Community Outreach and Stakeholder Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Task 3: Defining the HSR Station Area Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Task 4: Multimodal Connectivity Station Access and Parking Analysis Multi-modal access, circulation and connectivity analysis Parking and Demand Management Analysis Circulation and Parking Recommendations Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Task 5: Economic, Real Estate, Fiscal and Financial Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Task 6: Implementation Strategy and Next Steps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**City's consultant brought on-board (NTF)**
**Final ARRA invoicing date: March 1, 2017**

**Assumptions/Notes**

---

**CITY OF BAKERSFIELD**
**ORIGINAL**
Attachment C
Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan Transportation Impact Analysis; Revised, 3/16/2018
MEMORANDUM

To: Jasch Janowicz and Gunnar Hand
From: Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates
Date: March 16, 2018
Subject: Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan Transportation Impact Analysis; Revised

INTRODUCTION

This memorandum presents results of the traffic impact analysis conducted for the Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan, addressing the impacts of the proposed land use and roadway configuration changes on traffic congestion at key intersections. The intersection locations considered in this analysis were identified by City staff.

BACKGROUND

Planned High-Speed Rail Station

Service

Under current California High-Speed Rail Authority plans, high-speed rail service between Bakersfield and San Francisco could be introduced as soon as 2025¹, with service to Merced and Anaheim beginning in 2029.

Under CHSRA’s Draft 2016 Business Plan, initial service would consist of just one train per hour during the mid-day, and two trains per hour during peak periods. Service would also operate only to the north, with connecting bus service to the Los Angeles area.

Upon extension of rail service to the Los Angeles area and Merced, service levels would be increased to eight trains per hour peak and five per hour off-peak.

Estimated Ridership, Access by Mode and Parking

While station-level ridership estimates were not made public as part of the release of the Draft 2016 Business Plan, in 2012 the CHSRA projected total in the year 2030 was between 4,200 and 5,400 daily boardings at the Bakersfield Station if service were provided to San Francisco, Merced and Anaheim. Service levels of six peak and five off-peak trains per hour were assumed, and fares

¹ This would require additional funding. Without additional funding, service would initially operate between San Jose and Shafter, and would not be extended to Bakersfield until 2029.
were assumed to be equivalent to 83 percent of average airfare between San Francisco and Los Angeles (with lower fares for shorter distances).

According to CHSRA’s *Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS): Fresno to Bakersfield*, released in 2014, Bakersfield Station would generate 4,523 auto trips daily in the year 2035, including 878 in both the AM and PM peak hours. EIR/EIS analysis also found that 900 passengers per day would arrive or depart via transit, and that 500 per day would arrive or depart on foot or by bicycle.

The EIR/EIS also indicates that Bakersfield Station would feature 2,300 parking spaces on-site, sufficient to accommodate demand in the year 2035 (page 3.2-104). However, the *Transportation Analysis Technical Report* accompanying the EIR/EIS includes an annotated site plan for the Truxtun Avenue site (on page 2-18, excerpted here on the following page) featuring three seven-level garages and four surface lots with a total of 4,960 spaces.

**PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF STUDY**

The primary objective of this study is to analyze the existing and future circulation system within the study area. This study also intends to satisfy the requirements for the disclosure of potential program level traffic impacts and mitigation measures pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). It should be noted that this evaluation is a program level analysis to identify high level impacts and mitigation measures. More detailed, site-specific impacts at both regional and local intersections will be studied as future development projects are proposed within the Plan Area.

This study establishes acceptable levels of services (LOS) and, according to local criteria, recommends improvements and strategies to minimize impacts on LOS at major intersections within the Plan Area. To determine the intersection level of service (LOS), analysis was conducted at 12 intersections including:

- Chester Avenue at 34th Street
- F Street at Golden State Avenue/State Route 204
- Garces Circle or Chester Avenue/30th Street at State Route 204 South Frontage
- 24th Street at Oak Street/State Route 178
- F Street at 24th Street
- F Street at 23rd Street
- Chester Avenue at 24th Street
- Chester Avenue at 23rd Street
- Golden State Avenue/State Route 204 at 21st Street and Union Avenue
- Chester Avenue at Truxtun Avenue
- Chester Avenue at California Avenue
- Union Avenue at California Avenue

Figure 1 shows the locations of the 12 study intersections.
Figure 1  Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan Study Intersections

Legend:

- Study Intersection
ANALYSIS SCENARIOS

The Environmental Impact Report/Statement (EIR/EIS) was conducted by the California High-Speed Rail Authority, which focused on the City of Bakersfield and therefore its background traffic data was utilized to help inform the analysis scenarios for this study. Turning movement counts from that study were collected at the 12 study intersections identified for this study. These counts were collected in 2015 on August 25th, August 26th, and November 19th between the hours of 7 and 9 a.m. and 4 and 6 p.m.

Intersection operations were evaluated for the following scenarios:

- Existing Conditions (2015) without project
- Planning Horizon (2025) without project
- Planning Horizon (2025) with project
- Planning Horizon (2035) without project
- Planning Horizon (2035) with project
- Planning Horizon (2045) without project
- Planning Horizon (2045) with project

As described in a following section below, Project Trips, Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) trip generation rates were used. To generate the future year 2025, 2035, and 2045 traffic volumes, the following table describes the process through which traffic volumes were generated.

Table 1 Future Traffic Volume Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Base Traffic Volume Source</th>
<th>Background Growth Source</th>
<th>Project Site Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 2025 No Project</td>
<td>Interpolated traffic volumes between year 2015 and CHSRA Fresno to Bakersfield 2035 Volumes (No Build)</td>
<td>HR&amp;A Market Report “Low Baseline” Scenario, no HSR</td>
<td>Year 2025 Buildout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2025 With Project</td>
<td>Interpolated traffic volumes between year 2015 and CHSRA Fresno to Bakersfield 2035 Volumes (No Build)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2035 No Project</td>
<td>CHSRA 2035 Fresno to Bakersfield Volumes (Plus Project)</td>
<td>HR&amp;A Market Report “Low Baseline” Scenario, with HSR</td>
<td>Year 2035 Buildout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2035 With Project</td>
<td>CHSRA 2035 Fresno to Bakersfield Volumes (Plus Project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2045 No Project</td>
<td>Extrapolated CHSRA 2035 Fresno to Bakersfield Volumes (Plus Project)</td>
<td>HR&amp;A Market Report “Low Baseline” Scenario, with HSR</td>
<td>Year 2045 Buildout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2045 With Project</td>
<td>Extrapolated CHSRA 2035 Fresno to Bakersfield Volumes (Plus Project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 1, the 2016 CHSRA Fresno to Bakersfield traffic volumes were used as the foundation to perform this traffic impact analysis. The CHSRA Fresno to Bakersfield future
volumes were generated using model plots and the National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report (NCHRP) 255: Highway Traffic Data for Urbanized Area Project Planning and Design (Transportation Research Board, December 1982). The City of Bakersfield concluded that interpolation of the traffic volumes was the preferred method to generate year 2025 traffic volumes.

As further indicated by Table 1, the traffic impact analysis was also based on the land use growth projections described in the following section.

**Background Land Use Changes**

For the Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan, HR&A Advisors conducted market analysis of projected growth in land use categories (office, residential, retail and hotel). Nine scenarios were developed: Low (Baseline), Low (With High-Speed Rail) and High (With Downtown Revitalization and High-Speed Rail), for 10-, 20- and 30-year horizons. For this study, the “Low Baseline” growth projections were included in the No Project traffic scenarios. For 2025, when high-speed rail will not yet be in operation, the 10-year “Low (Baseline)” projections were included, while for 2035 and 2045, when high-speed rail will be in operation, the 20- and 30-year “Low (With High-Speed Rail)” projections were included. This was done in order to ensure that there would be the greatest difference between the No Project and Project scenarios, again representing the most conservative approach. These projections, along with the “High (With Downtown Revitalization and High-Speed Rail)” figures from the project’s recommended land use program used in the With Project traffic scenarios, can be found in Tables 5 and 6. Year 2045 Full Buildout figures are illustrated in Figure 2.
Figure 2  Proposed Land Use Changes, High (With Downtown Revitalization and High-Speed Rail) (2045)
Proposed Roadway Configuration Changes

In addition to changes to land use, the Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan calls for changes to the configuration/vehicular capacity of the following roadway segments and intersections:

- **State Route 204 (Golden State Avenue) and F Street**: This intersection is separately planned to be reconfigured as a grade-separated interchange.
- **23rd and 24th Streets**: An additional general-purpose lane is separately planned to be added to each street.
- **Chester Street**: One general-purpose lane in each direction would be converted to a business/access/transit lane in which through travel by private vehicles is prohibited, but right turns are allowed.
- **California Avenue**: One general-purpose lane in each direction would be converted to a transit-only lane.
- **F Street**: One general-purpose lane in each direction would be removed in order to provide space for Class II bicycle lanes and a continuous left-turn lane.
- **Garces Circle**: The northwestern segment of the circle would be closed to traffic and the remainder would be converted to a two-way roadway with intersections with 30th Street on its south and east sides. (The eastern segment would become part of Chester, and the southwestern segment would become part of 30th.)

The changes in roadway configurations can be examined below by comparing the existing roadway configuration in Figure 3 to the proposed configuration in Figure 4. These changes are assumed to be implemented in 2035 for all 'with project' scenarios.
Figure 3: Existing Lane Configurations and Traffic Control Devices
Figure 4   Future Lane Configurations and Traffic Control Devices (2035 'with project' scenario and later)
ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

In California, transportation engineers commonly describe the operations of roadways, with respect to motor vehicle traffic delays, using the concept of “automobile level of service” (a.k.a. “level of service” or LOS). LOS is a qualitative description of motor vehicle traffic flow based on factors such as motor vehicle speeds, travel times, and levels of delay at intersections. Transportation engineers describe six levels of service ranging from LOS A (i.e., best operating conditions for motor vehicles) to LOS F (worst operating conditions for motor vehicles). Intersection levels of service for motor vehicles are based on the average amount of delay experienced by drivers traveling through the intersection. As described below, different methods are used to assess signalized and unsignalized (stop-controlled) intersections.

Peak hour levels of motor vehicle delay at signalized intersections were estimated using the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2010 method specified by the City of Bakersfield. For intersections consisting of five legs or roundabouts, the HCM 2000 method and SIDRA software were used, respectively. The signal operations analysis method uses various intersection characteristics (such as traffic volumes, lane geometry, and signal phasing) to estimate the average control delay experienced by motorists traveling through an intersection. Control delay incorporates delay associated with deceleration, acceleration, stopping, and moving up in the queue. Table 2 and Table 3 summarize the relationship between average control delay per vehicle and LOS for signalized intersections and roundabouts, respectively.

The intersections were also evaluated using vehicle capacity (V/C) ratio, which is a commonly used metric for traffic analysis. The V/C ratio, also referred to as the degree of saturation, represents the sufficiency of an intersection to accommodate vehicular demand. V/C ratios are presented in the results, but are not used to determine LOS as part of this analysis.

Table 2  Level of Service Definitions for Signalized Intersections Using Delay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Average Control Delay per Vehicle (Seconds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Signal progression is extremely favorable. Most vehicles arrive during the green phase and do not stop at all. Short cycle lengths may also contribute to the very low vehicle delay.</td>
<td>10.0 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Operations characterized by good signal progression and/or short cycle lengths. More vehicles stop than with LOS A, causing higher levels of average vehicle delay.</td>
<td>10.1 to 20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Higher delays may result from fair signal progression and/or longer cycle lengths. Individual cycle failures may begin to appear at this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant, though many still pass through the intersection without stopping.</td>
<td>20.1 to 35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable signal progression, long cycle lengths, or high volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratios. Many vehicles stop and individual cycle failures are noticeable.</td>
<td>35.1 to 55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>This is considered by most drivers to be the limit of acceptable delay. These high delay values generally indicate poor signal progression, long cycle lengths, and high</td>
<td>55.1 to 80.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3  Level of Service Definitions for Roundabouts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Average Control Delay per Vehicle (Seconds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10.0 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.1 to 15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.1 to 25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>25.1 to 35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>35.1 to 50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Greater than 50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

City of Bakersfield

The City of Bakersfield utilizes three performance criteria for determining whether a traffic forecast generated by a project would cause a significant impact and require mitigation. Significant impacts for projects include scenarios where:

- The addition of project traffic causes the level of service of an intersection or roadway segment to drop below LOS C,
- An intersection or roadway segment operates below LOS C in the base year prior to the addition of project traffic, and the added project traffic lowers the level of service below its pre-project LOS, or
- The addition of the project traffic creates an additional control or average delay of more than 5 seconds per vehicle to the existing or projected congestion at an intersection already or projected to operate at LOS D, E, or F

These performance criteria have been adopted by the City of Bakersfield, and are contained within the Circulation Element of the Metropolitan Bakersfield General Plan. These performance
criteria are the basis on which the City determines if a significant impact, or increase to the existing traffic load and the capacity of the street system, exists as a result of project traffic.

**Kern County**

The Kern County General Plan uses the *Highway Capacity Manual’s* LOS metric to correlate numerical traffic-volume data to subjective descriptions of traffic performance at intersections. Level of Service D is an accepted standard for planning of intensive urban facilities. This plan’s policies consider LOS D acceptable within the general plan area for County maintained roads unless the roads are part of an adopted Community Plan or Specific Plan that utilizes Smart Growth policies that encourage efficient multi-modal movements.

The Kern County General Plan contains additional policies, goals, and implementation measures that are more general in nature and are not specific to development such as the proposed program level project. The County should monitor development applications as they relate to traffic estimates developed for this plan. Mitigation is required if development causes affected roadways to fall below LOS D.

**Kern County Congestion Management Plan (CMP)**

Level of service E has been established as the minimum system-wide LOS traffic standard in the Kern Council of Government’s (COG) Congestion Management Plan. Those roads currently experiencing worse traffic congestion have been accepted at their existing traffic level of LOS F. Existing LOS F locations identified in the CMP that are also intersections the study area are listed below:

- SR 178/24th Street – Oak Street to M Street
  - 24th Street and Oak Street
  - 24th Street and F Street
  - 24th Street and Chester Avenue
  - 23rd Street and F Street
  - 23rd Street and Chester Avenue

Projects along one of the existing LOS F segments, with 1 or more peak-hour trips, shall include a deficiency plan for the affected corridor segments as part of the traffic study for the project’s environmental document or as a separate stand-alone deficiency plan for the affected corridor.

The COG also states that in addition to the LOS standards set forth within the CMP, some cities and the County of Kern have adopted policies to help maintain their own LOS standards. In most cases, and in the City of Bakersfield’s case, the local policies are aimed at maintaining LOS C. The CMP standards are not intended to replace local policies by allowing greater congestion; they serve a very different purpose. The locally adopted LOS standards are tied to the cities’ and County’s authority to approve or deny development, require mitigation measures, and construct roadway improvements.

**Caltrans**

Eight of the study intersections are located on state routes. All are signalized or uncontrolled freeway ramp intersections and are located on CA-178 (23rd and 24th Streets) and CA-204 (Golden State and Union Aves). As noted in the *Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies* (Caltrans, December 2002), Caltrans endeavors to maintain a target LOS at the transition
between LOS C and LOS D on State Highway facilities. However, Caltrans has not established specific traffic thresholds of significance.

Additionally, Caltrans is in the process of completing a comprehensive multimodal Transportation Analysis Guide and Transportation Impact Study Guide (TAG-TISG), in collaboration with the Governor’s Office of Planning & Research and a variety of external partners, industry stakeholders, and analysis experts. Caltrans had previously committed to creating these two key statewide guidance documents by the end of 2016, in order to (a) ensure that Caltrans’ guidance on conducting transportation impact studies reflects Caltrans’ recently revised mission statement (“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”); and (b) to assure proper implementation of Senate Bill 743 (SB 743), but as of this writing is still working to complete these new guides.

According to the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research:

Senate Bill 743 mandates a change in the way that public agencies evaluate transportation impacts of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act. Legislative findings in that bill plainly state that California’s foundational environmental law can no longer treat vibrant communities, transit and active transportation options as adverse environmental outcomes. On the contrary, aspects of project location and design that influence travel choices, and thereby improve or degrade our air quality, safety, and health, must be considered. The Legislature mandated that these changes occur in the Guidelines that implement CEQA.

Once finally adopted, these Guidelines should result in a better, more transparent evaluation of project impacts, and better environmental outcomes. Procedurally, traffic studies that accompany in-depth environmental review will now typically take days rather than weeks to prepare. Because models to estimate vehicle miles traveled are publicly available, decision-makers and the public will be better able to engage in the review process. Substantively, a focus on vehicle miles traveled will facilitate the production of badly-needed housing in urban locations. It will also facilitate transit projects and better uses of existing infrastructure as well as bicycle and pedestrian improvements. As a result, people will have better transportation options. It also means that CEQA will no longer mandate roadways that focus on automobiles to the exclusion of every other transportation option. It will no longer mandate excessive, and expensive, roadway capacity.

Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg, 2013) required changes to the Guidelines Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines) regarding the analysis of transportation impacts. Those proposed changes identify vehicle miles traveled as the most appropriate metric to evaluate a project’s transportation impacts. Those proposed changes also provide that the analysis of certain transportation projects must address the potential for induced travel. Once the Natural Resources Agency adopts these changes to the CEQA Guidelines, automobile delay, as measured by “level of service”

---


and other similar metrics, will no longer constitute a significant environmental effect under CEQA. 4

Caltrans forthcoming Transportation Analysis Guide and Transportation Impact Study Guide is therefore expected to, as required by SB 743, revise Caltrans’ guidance for transportation impact studies to state that “automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment” 5 under CEQA.

Thresholds of Significance

Since Caltrans has not established specific traffic thresholds of significance, and since the agency is currently revising its guidance for transportation impact studies to reflect the requirements of SB 743, this traffic analysis utilizes the following traffic threshold of significance:

- A significant project impact occurs at a Caltrans State Highway study intersection when the addition of project-generated trips causes the peak hour level of service of the study intersection to change from acceptable operation (LOS A, B, C) to deficient operation (LOS D, E or F) using the 6th Edition Highway Capacity Manual’s methodology.

This threshold of significance mirrors the level of service criteria which the City of Bakersfield has chosen to adopt for their streets.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Under guidance from the City of Bakersfield, existing intersection turning movement count data was extracted from the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) Fresno to Bakersfield EIR’s Existing Conditions (2015) scenario and used to model the existing conditions for this study. The intent was to ensure the Vision Plan’s land use change’s effect on intersection performance could be compared directly with the intersection performance characterized in the CHSRA EIR’s scenarios. The existing turning movement counts are detailed in Figure 5 for both the AM and PM peak hour analysis periods.

Existing intersection lane configurations, signal timings, and peak-hour turning movement volumes were used to calculate LOS for study intersections during each peak hour. The LOS analysis was conducted using Synchro Version 9 traffic analysis software. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 4. The table presents the calculated LOS of each intersection for both the AM and PM peak periods in addition to the v/c ratio. Appendix A contains the corresponding LOS calculation sheets. As shown, under existing conditions, one of the 12 intersections operates below LOS E, which is deemed deficient by CMP significance criteria guidelines:

- 24th Street at Oak Street/State Route 178 (CMP)
  - AM Peak Hour


http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201320140SB743&search_keywords=
In addition to the above intersection, the following intersections operate below LOS D, which is deemed deficient in the existing scenario under Kern County’s significance criteria:

4. 24th Street at Oak Street/State Route 178 (CMP)
   – PM Peak Hour
9. Golden State Avenue/State Route 204 at 21st Street and Union Avenue
   – AM Peak Hour
   – PM Peak Hour

In addition to the above intersections, the following intersections operate below LOS C, which is deemed deficient in the existing scenario under both City of Bakersfield and Caltrans significance criteria:

2. F Street at Golden State Avenue/State Route 204
   – PM Peak Hour
5. F Street at 24th Street (CMP)
   – AM Peak Hour
   – PM Peak Hour
8. Chester Avenue at 23rd Street (CMP)
   – PM Peak Hour
10. Chester Avenue at Truxtun Avenue
    – PM Peak Hour
12. Union Avenue at California Avenue
    – AM Peak Hour
Figure 5  Existing Traffic Volumes (AM and PM Peak Hour)

Legend:
- Study Intersection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>V/C Ratio</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Chester Avenue at 34th Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. F Street at Golden State Avenue/State Route 204</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Garces Circle</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 24th Street at Oak Street/State Route 178 (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>104.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. F Street at 24th Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. F Street at 23rd Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chester Avenue at 24th Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chester Avenue at 23rd Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Golden State Avenue/State Route 204 at 21st Street and Union Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Chester Avenue at Truxtun Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Chester Avenue at California Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Union Avenue at California Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT TRIPS

Trip generation refers to the process of estimating the amount of motor vehicle traffic that a project will add to (or subtract from) the surrounding roadway system. Estimates are made of future trips for the peak one-hour periods during the morning and evening commute periods when traffic volumes on the adjacent streets are highest.

The baseline trip generation estimates for the project were developed using the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition. The associated land uses of the Station Area Plan were assigned as closely as possible to categories represented in the manual, in order to estimate the baseline number of AM peak and PM peak hour trips (including hotels, offices, retail, and residential).

The ITE cautions that average ITE trip generation rates are not appropriate or accurate for assessing land use projects located in downtowns, mixed-use projects, places served by public transit, or with transportation demand management (TDM) programs. This is because ITE data is collected primarily at single-use, suburban land-use developments with plentiful free parking and little or no transit service.

The Vision Plan proposes denser development than much of what currently exists in Bakersfield, including mixed-use infill development in appropriate locations. The Vision Plan also includes projects, programs and policies designed to reduce impacts from development by making transit, walking and cycling more attractive alternatives to driving. The HSR station itself will be a major person-trip generator, and many people arriving and leaving via HSR will likely not be using an automobile. Because of all of these factors, the estimates for auto trip generation as part of this traffic study will likely be an overestimate of what could actually be experienced assuming full buildout of the Vision Plan.

Table 5 and Table 6 detail the land use inputs and trip generation outputs for the various scenarios. The inputs are based on the growth projections developed for this Plan described in the previous “Background Land Use Changes” section (the CHSRA future-year trip generation figures used as a baseline for this effort also assume a level of background growth, based on the Kern COG model). Varying by scenario, reuse of existing buildings is assumed to account for between 15 and 25 percent of the buildout of the project. The amount of reusable space was estimated based on analysis of existing vacant space and a market-informed assumption of overall underutilized space in the study area. The square footage and units for reuse of existing buildings was applied as a development re-use “credit,” which reduced the overall new square footage and number of units for retail, office, residential, and hotel. Table 5 includes the re-use credit applied for each development scenario, and the net trip generation for the Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan is included in Table 6. Figures for years 2035 and 2045 are inclusive, not additive.

6 ITE average rates used for the following land use codes: Apartment (220), Hotel (310), Office (710), Shopping Center (820)

7 Trip Generation Handbook: An ITE Recommended Practice (June 2004). Page 15: “If the site is located in a downtown setting, served by significant public transportation, or is the site of an extensive transportation demand management program, the site is not consistent with the ITE data...”
Table 5  Land Use Breakdown for Full Vision Plan Buildout, by Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross GFA sf</th>
<th>Target Units</th>
<th>Re-use GFA sf</th>
<th>Re-use Units</th>
<th>New Development GFA sf</th>
<th>New Development Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25% 75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Year Scenario</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>84,388</td>
<td></td>
<td>280,612</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1,210,000</td>
<td>297,716</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>912,284</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>150,223</td>
<td>40,813</td>
<td></td>
<td>109,410</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>35,847</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>90,153</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,851,223</td>
<td>458,764</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,392,459</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Target GFA sf</th>
<th>Target Units</th>
<th>Re-use GFA sf</th>
<th>Re-use Units</th>
<th>New Development GFA sf</th>
<th>New Development Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20% 80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Year Scenario</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>720,000</td>
<td>147,966</td>
<td></td>
<td>572,034</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>3,674,000</td>
<td>757,797</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>2,916,203</td>
<td>2,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>343,286</td>
<td>53,302</td>
<td></td>
<td>289,984</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>319,200</td>
<td>69,351</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>249,849</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,056,486</td>
<td>1,028,416</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,028,070</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Target GFA sf</th>
<th>Target Units</th>
<th>Re-use GFA sf</th>
<th>Re-use Units</th>
<th>New Development GFA sf</th>
<th>New Development Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16% 84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Year Scenario</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>920,000</td>
<td>222,256</td>
<td></td>
<td>697,744</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>4,543,000</td>
<td>687,879</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>3,855,121</td>
<td>3,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>412,479</td>
<td>47,605</td>
<td></td>
<td>364,874</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>399,350</td>
<td>62,688</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>336,662</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,274,829</td>
<td>1,020,428</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,254,401</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some square footage or unit values may show rounded calculations due to assumed unit area applied across the Station Area Plan.
### Table 6  Net Trip Generation by Scenario (Net Trip Assignment, SAP minus Background)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>10-Year Scenario</th>
<th>20-Year Scenario</th>
<th>30-Year Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>258 GFA/Units</td>
<td>714 GFA/Units</td>
<td>874 GFA/Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>832 GFA/Units</td>
<td>2,651 GFA/Units</td>
<td>3,424 GFA/Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>109,410 GFA/Units</td>
<td>364,874 GFA/Units</td>
<td>364,874 GFA/Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>280,612 GFA/Units</td>
<td>697,744 GFA/Units</td>
<td>697,744 GFA/Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,767 Generated Trips</td>
<td>7,894 Generated Trips</td>
<td>13,187 Generated Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak Hour</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,767</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak Hour</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>4,767</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>3,531</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,894</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some square footage, unit values, and trips show rounded values and the table may not show correct addition or subtraction calculations.

The trip distribution and assignment forecasts were developed based on existing citywide travel patterns, understanding of the circulation system, and known traffic controls. Trip assignment using vehicle routing was not feasible due to unknown circulation information such as driveway location and building footprint characteristics. As an alternative, project trips were applied to each studied intersection within the respective cluster in the study area. The number of project trips added to each turning movement was weighted based on the distribution percentages throughout the network.

To represent the Market Analysis Demand Summary spatially, the projections were translated into building masses placed on the project area, created through procedural georeferenced modeling. The building footprints are resultant of the parcel or parcel groups shapes chosen to host new development. To distribute the land use projections across the project area, this analysis considered that on the initial 10-years scenario, 75% of the projected land use would happen in the form of new development (building masses), whereas the remaining 25% would be “absorbed” by adaptive reuse in the Historic Core (not represented in the massing model). Similarly, on the 20-year scenario, 80% of the projected land use would happen in the form on new development,
whereas the remaining 20% would be “absorbed” by adaptive reuse along Chester Avenue. The same logic applies to the 30-year scenario, in which approximately 85% of the projected land use would happen in the form of new development, whereas the remaining 15% would be “absorbed” by adaptive reuse along Chester Avenue and 34th Street. This analysis assumed a mix of uses, in which a building can host multiple land uses. To obtain the number of units per building, we considered an estimate of 1100sqft per residential unit and 350sqft per hotel unit. To accurately estimate vehicle trips associated with these new land uses, the units for hotel and residential were input into the trip generation model along with office and retail square footage to obtain daily, AM peak, and PM peak vehicle trips for each cluster. Due to conversion of square footage to an integer of hotel and residential units, as well as utilizing trip generation formulas to obtain trips in each parcel and subsequent cluster as integers, some rounding discrepancies may appear in the trip generation summary tables.

Because of the large size of the study area, the trip distribution patterns are expected to vary among different development areas throughout the City. For purposes of analysis, development envisioned by the Plan has been grouped into six clusters so that their trip distribution can be more accurately distributed throughout the Plan Area roadway network. Each cluster contains varying amount of development, trip generation, and an individual origin node. For trip distribution, the clusters follow two separate patterns, generally bounded by ones in the north and ones to the south within the Station Area Plan. The two distributions for their respective clusters are shown below in Figure 6 and Figure 7. The resulting assignment of the trips at each study intersection location for all analyzed scenarios is found in Figure 8 through Figure 10.
Figure 6 Trip Distribution for Upper Downtown (Clusters 1-4)
Figure 7  Trip Distribution for Lower Downtown (Clusters 5-6)
Figure 8 Plan Area Project-only Trip Assignment at Year 2025
Figure 9  Plan Area Project-only Trip Assignment at Year 2035
Figure 10  Plan Area Project-only Trip Assignment at Year 2045
Level of service analysis was conducted of future traffic conditions with and without the proposed project. The years of analysis were 2025, 2035, and 2045, and all include different background and project trips for their respective scenarios. The ‘No Project’ and ‘with Project’ intersection turning movement forecast volumes for 2025, 2035, and 2045 scenarios are illustrated in Figure 11 through Figure 16. The potential impacts to traffic at each intersection are summarized in Table 7 through Table 12. A comparison between all of the analyzed scenarios is shown in Table 13.
Figure 11  2025 No Project Volumes
Figure 12  2025 with Project Volumes

Legend
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Figure 13  2035 No Project Volumes
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Figure 15  2045 No Project Volumes

Legend:
- Study Intersection
Figure 16  2045 with Project Volumes
Table 7  2025 No Project Scenario Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
<th>2025 No Project</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>V/C Ratio</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Chester Avenue at 34th Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. F Street at Golden State Avenue/State Route 204</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Garces Circle</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 24th Street at Oak Street/State Route 178 (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. F Street at 24th Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. F Street at 23rd Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chester Avenue at 24th Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chester Avenue at 23rd Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Golden State Avenue/State Route 204 at 21st Street and Union Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Chester Avenue at Truxtun Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Chester Avenue at California Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Union Avenue at California Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>V/C Ratio</td>
<td>Delay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Chester Avenue at 34th Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. F Street at Golden State Avenue/State Route 204</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Garces Circle</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 24th Street at Oak Street/State Route 178 (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. F Street at 24th Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. F Street at 23rd Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chester Avenue at 24th Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chester Avenue at 23rd Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Golden State Avenue/State Route 204 at 21st Street and Union Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Chester Avenue at Truxtun Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Chester Avenue at California Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Union Avenue at California Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Peak Hour</td>
<td>2035 No Project Scenario Conditions</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>V/C Ratio</td>
<td>Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Chester Avenue at 34th Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. F Street at Golden State Avenue/State Route 204</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>215.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>237.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Garces Circle</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>123.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 24th Street at Oak Street/State Route 178 (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>135.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>182.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. F Street at 24th Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>124.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. F Street at 23rd Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>112.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chester Avenue at 24th Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>103.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>130.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chester Avenue at 23rd Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>133.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Golden State Avenue/State Route 204 at 21st Street and Union Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Chester Avenue at Truxtun Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Chester Avenue at California Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Union Avenue at California Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Peak Hour</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>V/C Ratio</td>
<td>Delay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Chester Avenue at 34th Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. F Street at Golden State Avenue/State Route 204 (North)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. F Street at Golden State Avenue/State Route 204 (South)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chester Avenue/30th Street at State Route 204 South Frontage (East)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>215.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>122.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Chester Avenue/30th Street at State Route 204 South Frontage (West)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>153.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 24th Street at Oak Street/State Route 178 (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>135.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. F Street at 24th Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. F Street at 23rd Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chester Avenue at 24th Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>164.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>227.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chester Avenue at 23rd Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>191.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Golden State Avenue/State Route 204 at 21st Street and Union Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Chester Avenue at Truxtun Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>216.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Chester Avenue at California Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>125.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Union Avenue at California Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>113.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Peak Hour</td>
<td>2045 No Project Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>VIC Ratio</td>
<td>Delay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Avenue at 34th Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Street at Golden State Avenue/State Route 204</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>433.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>459.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garces Circle</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>191.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>356.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th Street at Oak Street/State Route 178 (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>208.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>315.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Street at 24th Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>244.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Street at 23rd Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>212.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Avenue at 24th Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>201.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>238.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Avenue at 23rd Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>228.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden State Avenue/State Route 204 at 21st Street and Union Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>180.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Avenue at Truxtun Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>172.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Avenue at California Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Avenue at California Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>120.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Peak Hour</td>
<td>2045 with Project Scenario Conditions</td>
<td>2045 with Project Scenario Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Chester Avenue at 34th Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. F Street at Golden State Avenue/State Route 204 (North)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. F Street at Golden State Avenue/State Route 204 (South)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chester Avenue/30th Street at State Route 204 South Frontage (East)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Chester Avenue/30th Street at State Route 204 South Frontage (West)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 24th Street at Oak Street/State Route 178 (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. F Street at 24th Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. F Street at 23rd Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chester Avenue at 24th Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chester Avenue at 23rd Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Golden State Avenue/State Route 204 at 21st Street and Union Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Chester Avenue at Truxtun Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Chester Avenue at California Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Union Avenue at California Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Comparison of Project Conditions LOS at Study Area Intersections
Existing Conditions

Intersection

2025 No Project

2025 with Project

2035 No Project

2035 with Project

2045 No Project

2045 with Project

Peak
Hour

LOS

V/C
Ratio

Delay

LOS

V/C
Ratio

Delay

LOS

V/C
Ratio

Delay

LOS

V/C
Ratio

Delay

LOS

V/C
Ratio

Delay

LOS

V/C
Ratio

Delay

LOS

V/C Ratio

Delay

1.

Chester Avenue at
34th Street

AM
PM

B
B

0.79
0.73

14.7
16.8

B
B

0.79
0.73

15.0
16.8

B
D

0.79
0.97

15.0
42.2

C
C

1.06
0.82

29.0
22.8

C
E

0.88
1.11

23.0
77.6

C
E

0.98
1.21

34.9
55.4

F
F

1.37
2.01

143.2
328.9

2.

F Street at Golden State
Avenue/State Route 204
(North)

AM
PM

C
D

1.0
0.92

29.8
36.4

F
F

0.83
1.33

86.4
98.2

F
F

1.30
1.34

89.3
101.0

F
F

1.80
1.86

215.9
237.4

E
E

0.40
0.41

67.0
65.4

F
F

2.54
2.64

433.3
459.8

F
F

0.70
0.62

215.2
202.1

AM
PM

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

D
D

0.81
0.82

45.0
46.9

-

-

-

F
F

1.20
1.21

157.1
163.6

AM
PM

C
C

0.81
0.80

15.9
18.6

C
C

0.79
0.71

15.2
16.8

C
C

0.81
0.72

15.8
17.1

F
F

1.33
1.61

90.9
123.2

F
F

1.48
1.31

215.6
122.4

F
F

1.60
2.30

191.7
356.3

F
F

2.33
2.47

681.1
800.4

3b. Chester Avenue/30th
Street at State Route 204
South Frontage (West)

AM
PM

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

F
F

1.29
1.49

112.5
153.7

-

-

-

F
F

2.43
2.98

489.4
677.3

4.

24th Street at Oak
Street/State Route
178 (CMP)

AM
PM

F
E

1.50
1.29

104.5
62.9

F
F

1.07
1.36

92.3
88.3

F
C

1.09
0.87

94.8
33.2

F
F

1.54
1.78

135.8
182.8

F
D

1.54
1.00

135.8
40.7

F
F

1.87
2.22

208.8
315.0

D
E

1.06
1.27

50.8
77.1

5.

F Street at 24th
Street (CMP)

AM
PM

D
D

0.84
0.88

35.7
36.2

C
D

0.87
1.0

33.2
36.3

D
C

0.94
0.98

35.4
32.5

C
F

0.99
1.22

31.9
124.8

C
F

1.01
1.22

29.3
115.5

F
F

1.16
1.57

97.4
244.8

E
F

1.13
1.51

58.0
230.9

6.

F Street at 23rd
Street (CMP)

AM
PM

C
C

0.81
0.82

24.3
28.0

C
D

0.94
1.03

30.1
49.4

C
D

0.95
0.93

31.1
36.3

D
F

1.03
1.27

54.6
112.0

D
F

1.01
1.15

52.2
101.8

F
F

1.21
1.60

99.1
212.7

F
F

1.18
1.51

95.7
224.6

7.

Chester Avenue at
24th Street (CMP)

AM
PM

C
C

0.84
0.85

23.3
23.3

C
D

0.95
1.10

32.6
42.1

C
E

0.98
1.17

35.0
59.6

F
F

1.36
1.56

103.2
130.9

F
F

1.48
1.57

164.4
227.2

F
F

1.75
2.06

201.2
238.5

F
F

2.0
2.30

330.1
464.9

8.

Chester Avenue at
23rd Street (CMP)

AM
PM

C
D

0.80
0.91

32.7
38.7

C
D

0.93
1.04

31.0
45.0

C
E

0.96
1.25

31.7
68.3

D
F

1.07
1.29

43.4
133.4

E
F

1.34
1.50

73.5
191.9

F
F

1.35
1.58

81.3
228.4

F
F

1.45
1.92

194.5
365.3

9.

Golden State
Avenue/State Route 204
at 21st Street and Union
Avenue

AM
PM

E
E

0.81
1.03

73.0
58.2

C
D

0.74
0.88

34.7
42.7

D
D

0.75
0.97

35.7
53.1

D
E

0.83
1.04

36.9
75.2

D
F

0.85
1.20

38.7
98.6

D
F

0.92
1.60

46.3
180.7

D
F

0.94
1.16

49.4
113.9

10. Chester Avenue at
Truxtun Avenue

AM
PM

C
D

0.83
1.14

33.5
50.5

C
D

1.03
1.08

33.2
49.0

C
F

0.88
1.33

33.3
93.2

D
F

0.94
1.40

38.3
92.4

F
F

1.30
1.76

104.9
216.7

D
F

1.02
1.68

51.7
172.1

F
F

1.57
2.34

166.7
360.7

11. Chester Avenue at
California Avenue

AM
PM

C
C

0.78
0.78

21.4
23.9

C
D

0.86
1.30

25.7
41.1

C
F

0.88
1.34

27.2
107.5

D
E

0.94
1.05

36.1
61.7

F
F

1.44
1.73

125.8
200.0

D
F

1.02
1.18

52.4
106.0

F
F

1.75
2.31

188.5
320.3

12. Union Avenue at
California Avenue

AM
PM

D
C

0.89
0.81

39.7
32.1

D
D

0.96
1.03

53.6
44.4

D
E

0.95
0.97

54.0
57.8

E
E

1.17
0.94

77.8
55.3

F
F

1.48
1.16

113.5
84.7

F
E

1.45
1.09

120.3
74.1

F
F

1.75
1.47

167.7
124.2

2b. F Street at Golden State
Avenue/State Route 204
(South)

3.

Garces Circle/ Chester
Avenue/30th Street at
State Route 204 South
Frontage (East)
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FINDINGS

For interim scenarios 2025 and 2035, the project buildout causes vehicle delay to increase at most of the study intersections. In the 2025 scenario, the project buildout causes 2 intersections to operate at LOS F in the PM peak period that were not already operating at that level of service in the ‘No Project’ scenario:

10. Chester Avenue at 23rd Street (PM Peak)
11. Chester Avenue at Truxtun Avenue (PM Peak)

There are other intersections that operate at LOS F in the ‘with Project’ scenarios; however those intersections already operate at LOS F in the ‘No Project’ scenario. There are considered impacts at these intersections, though, due to the number of trips increasing by at least 1 vehicle or there being any increase in vehicle delay. In some cases, the average intersection delay improves due to signal timing changes at the intersection that optimize green times based on forecast traffic demand.

Comparing the 2035 ‘No Project’ to the ‘with Project’ scenario, buildout causes 4 intersections to operate at LOS F during various time periods:

9. Golden State Avenue/State Route 204 at 21st Street and Union Avenue (PM Peak)
10. Chester Avenue at 23rd Street (AM Peak)
11. Chester Avenue at Truxtun Avenue (Both AM and PM Peak)
12. Union Avenue at California Avenue (Both AM and PM Peak)

There are other intersections and time periods in which the ‘with Project’ scenario operates at LOS F; however those intersections already operate at LOS F in the ‘No Project’ scenario. Similar to the 2025 scenario, the 2035 scenario contains study intersections in which the average intersection delay improves thought timing changes to optimize green times based on forecast traffic demand.

According to the analysis, in the buildout year (2045) with project scenario, there would be significant traffic impacts at all 12 intersection locations under one or more of the jurisdictional significance criteria used in this study. Table 14 summarizes impacts in the final 2045 analysis year comparing the ‘with Project’ with the ‘No Project’ scenarios, organized by each jurisdiction or agency’s significance criteria.

Some locations at which LOS would be F with project were found to be F in the ‘No Project’ scenario, and in some cases the new roadway configurations associated with the project buildout decreased overall intersection delay; thus, a significant impact does not exist under all of the agency’s guidelines except for CMP intersections. A significant impact exists under CMP guidelines for roadways in the CMP system itself, as the project would add any vehicle trips under a LOS F condition (see previous Significance Criteria section), even if the ‘with Project’ scenario decreases delay. Intersections within Caltrans jurisdiction where the LOS was F in the ‘No Project’ scenario were also listed as having an impact if their delay increased between the ‘No Project’ and ‘with Project’ scenarios. For evaluation under Kern County significance criteria, if the intersection was already performing at LOS E or worse in the ‘No Project’ scenario, any increase in intersection delay was noted as an impact for the ‘with Project’ scenario.
## Table 14 Significant Impacts in Final Buildout Year (2045)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
<th>Jurisdictional Impact Criteria Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Chester Avenue at 34th Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. F Street at Golden State Avenue/State Route 204 (North)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. F Street at Golden State Avenue/State Route 204 (South)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chester Avenue/30th Street at State Route 204 South Frontage (East)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Chester Avenue/30th Street at State Route 204 South Frontage (West)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 24th Street at Oak Street/State Route 178 (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. F Street at 24th Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. F Street at 23rd Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chester Avenue at 24th Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chester Avenue at 23rd Street (CMP)</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Golden State Avenue/State Route 204 at 21st Street and Union Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Chester Avenue at Truxtun Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Chester Avenue at California Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Union Avenue at California Avenue</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MITIGATION MEASURES

Significant impacts at these or other intersections found through future project-level traffic analysis could be mitigated in a number of ways. Historically, mitigation measures to reduce significant traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) have focused on physical changes to roadways to increase vehicular throughput and reduce delay. However, signal timings may be adjusted to increase throughput, fees might be paid by a project’s developer into a municipality’s traffic in-lieu program, or additional transportation demand management (TDM) measures may be required (see below). Additionally, capacity might be expanded not by providing additional turn lanes, or other typical measures, but by implementing measures designed to maintain throughput while improving safety and reducing impacts on pedestrians and other users, such as modern roundabouts.

Two additional issues related to traffic analysis, impacts and mitigation should be noted:

1. Under current CEQA guidelines, some future in-fill projects within the Vision Plan Area may be exempt from CEQA.

2. CEQA guidelines for traffic analysis are currently undergoing revision.

First, under California Senate Bill 375 (SB 375, Steinberg, 2008), in regions with an adopted Sustainable Communities Strategy or SCS there is an exemption from CEQA traffic analysis for “Transit Priority Projects,” or TPP’s. These are defined as projects with at least a 50 percent residential component (25 percent if FAR is greater than 0.75) and at least 20 net dwelling units per acre located within one-half mile of a “high quality transit corridor,” defined as “a corridor with fixed route bus service with intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours.” Golden Empire Transit (GET) service in the Chester, California, and 23/24th Street corridors meets this standard.

Second, as a result of passage of Senate Bill 743 (SB 743, Steinberg, 2013) the City will soon be required to update its significance criteria for traffic impacts, in order to remain consistent with state law. SB 743 created a process to change the way that transportation impacts are analyzed under CEQA: specifically, it required the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to amend the CEQA Guidelines to provide an alternative to LOS for evaluating transportation impacts. Per SB 743, auto delay can no longer be considered a significant impact under CEQA. More information on SB 743 can be found in the Significance Criteria - Caltrans section above.

The OPR proposal provides technical guidance on the implementation of vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, as the metric for determining transportation impacts under CEQA, including alternative analytical tools and methods and revised significance criteria. Under its section on “Screening Thresholds”, it recommends a “presumption of less than significant impact near transit stations” that would exempt from CEQA review all development (and not just primarily residential projects) within one-half mile of a stop on a “high quality transit corridor,” again defined as “a corridor with fixed route bus service with intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak
It also recommends presumption of less than significant impact for smaller projects generating fewer than 100 trips per day.

Finally, in its “Mitigation and Alternatives” section, the OPR proposal recommends mitigation strategies designed to reduce VMT rather than auto delay. These include a range of transportation demand management (TDM) measures as well as changes to the location and design of the project.

As previously noted, the proposed Guidelines have not yet been adopted, and the proposal recommends that analysis of VMT will remain voluntary for two years following adoption of the new Guidelines. However, a number of California cities have already begun to update their policies based on the proposed Guidelines, and in order to allow for development and roadway reconfigurations consistent with this General Plan Update, we recommend that Bakersfield similarly begin this process as soon as possible. At this time, VMT-based traffic impact thresholds have not been established in the City of Bakersfield.

**Transportation Recommendations in Plan**

The Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan recommends a number of improvements to the multimodal transportation system in the area of the future high-speed rail station, including new bus rapid transit lines, dedicated bicycle facilities and other measures. Implementation of these measures would serve to reduce vehicle miles traveled and resulting traffic delay and congestion. Therefore, the traffic impact mitigation measures listed below were developed for the purposes of achieving consistency with the transportation improvement strategies included in the Making Downtown Bakersfield Vision Plan.

**Transportation Demand Management Ordinance**

The City of Bakersfield Municipal Code currently lacks transportation demand management (TDM) requirements. TDM measures and programs incentivize alternatives to solo driving, including carpooling, vanpooling, and other modes such as transit and bicycling.

The City of Bakersfield shall consider adoption of zoning code amendments requiring the future development within the Plan Area to implement TDM strategies, including (but not limited to):

- Reserved parking spaces for high-occupancy/rideshare vehicles, including carpools and vanpools, in the most desirable locations (i.e., near building entrances).
- Bicycle parking, either in addition to or replacing vehicle parking. Ideally, such parking should be secure (e.g. in access-controlled rooms inside buildings).
- Showers and changing facilities for cyclists.
- Funding for improvements to nearby bus stops (e.g., seating and shelters).
- Funding for improvements to nearby pedestrian pathways (e.g. new or improved crosswalks).
- Federally authorized pre-tax deductions for transit passes, vanpools, and bicycle commuting costs.

---

8 The OPR proposal notes that the presumption might not apply if the project might still generate significant levels of VMT, for example by having a floor area ratio less than 0.75 or provides more parking than required by the jurisdiction.
- Subsidized transit passes for employees (note: Golden Empire Transit does not currently have an employer-based transit pass program, so the City would need to work with GET to create one).
- A “parking cash-out” program in which employees would be paid to avoid use of on-site parking.
- A “guaranteed ride home” program in which employees who took transit or other alternative modes to work would be offered a limited number of fully-subsidized taxi rides home after hours.
- A telecommuting program in which employees would be allowed to work from home one or more days per week.
- An employer-sponsored rideshare-matching program (potentially leveraging Kern COG’
- For downtown employers, shuttle service to the GET Transit Center and future high-speed rail station hub.
- Contingent on the introduction of a carshare program to Bakersfield, reserved parking spaces for carshare vehicles and/or subsidized membership in carshare programs.
- Contingent on the introduction of a bikeshare program to Bakersfield, an on-site bikeshare station.
- On-site childcare programs, cafeterias and other measures to reduce the need for non-commute driving trips.
- For property owners, a requirement to “unbundle” on-site parking, selling or leasing spaces separately from residential units or commercial space.
- For very large employers, a requirement to hire transportation coordinators and adopt TDM plans including performance targets (e.g., reductions in single-occupant vehicle mode share for commute trips by employees), ongoing monitoring and educational efforts.

**Employer Pass Programs**

Golden Empire Transit (GET) and/or Kern Transit shall develop and implement an employer pass program. Under such a program, the operator will offer bulk passes to employers at a discounted rate; employers, in turn, can then provide them to employees as a benefit and/or part of the company’s TDM program (see above).

**Kern COG Vanpool Program**

Kern COG currently operates a website, commutekern.org, designed to serve as a resource for individuals and organizations seeking to form vanpools. The City of Bakersfield shall work with Kern COG to develop a plan to expand this program within one year of adoption of the Vision Plan. Some ideas of how this program could be expanded include, but are not limited to, providing lease subsidies to companies providing vanpool service.

**Bike Plan**

The City of Bakersfield Bicycle Transportation Plan, completed in 2013, contains numerous recommendations to improve bicycle facilities and conditions and, in so doing, increase the utility of cycling as an alternative to driving for non-recreational trips. The City of Bakersfield shall
continue to implement the strategies included in this plan. In addition, the City shall require future developers within the Vision Plan Area to contribute their pro-rata share of funds toward bicycle transportation improvements identified in the City of Bakersfield Capital Improvement Program (or an equivalent impact fee program)

**Mobility Hub**

The City shall develop a formal plan to develop a “mobility hub” at the future high-speed rail station as part of a future CIP. This plan shall establish a timeframe for mobility hub development and the mobility hub shall provide a range of options for “first/last mile” access and connectivity to the station. Examples of physical improvements that should be considered include: bus bays, a pick-up/drop-off area, a taxi/e-hailing stand and bike parking. Examples of programmatic elements that should be included as part of the mobility hub include: a “bikestation” with secure parking repair and rental facilities, and potentially shower facilities; a bikeshare station (note: additional bikeshare stations would need to be provided in the area in order to provide a useful network); reserved parking for carshare vehicles as well as carpool, vanpools, and electric vehicles, with EV charging stations; a transit pass sales outlet; and an interactive kiosk with information on travel options.