

Submission I001 (Ramon and Angela, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #384 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 1/17/2018
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 1/16/2018
Submission Method : Project Email
First Name : Ramon and Angela
Last Name :
Professional Title :
Business/Organization :
Address :
Apt./Suite No. :
City :
State :
Zip Code :
Telephone :
Email : amoreno17@att.net
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I001-1

Hello,
Just wanted to send this message regarding the location of the high speed train depot in Bakersfield, 1st,
Don't really want the train ... but if its happens, the best location for the depot in Bakersfield, is by the existing
train depot on Truxtun Ave. This makes the most sensible location for downtown, the other location is on the
outskirts and its not in a very nice neighborhood...

Sincerely,

Ramon and Angela

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I001 (Ramon and Angela, January 16, 2018)

I001-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

Submission I002 (Kyle A, December 20, 2017)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #202 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 12/20/2017
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 12/20/2017
Submission Method : Project Email
First Name : Kyle
Last Name : A
Professional Title :
Business/Organization :
Address :
Apt./Suite No. :
City :
State :
Zip Code :
Telephone :
Email : kamidon74@gmail.com
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I002-1 | We need to completely stop this nonsense, the train will not be economical nor profitable, so long as it's ran by the government.
 I002-2 | We here in california have enough to deal with to last several lifetimes, including ridiculous regulations with red tape murdering businesses, to our extremely high taxes that are still not enough to pay for the pensions of government employees...
 To think I was a liberal a month ago...We need a significant reduction in government here in California, not to mention the elimination of this ridiculously costly project.
 I002-3 | Please please stop wasting our money and get rid of the high speed rail, it's just going to be a money pit and again will never be profitable.
 Thank you and have a nice day
EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I002 (Kyle A, December 20, 2017)

I002-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

I002-2

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

I002-3

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-09: Oppose HSR Project (e.g., Cost; Funding; Impacts on Cities, Counties, Communities, Farmland, Agriculture, Natural Environment, Wildlife and Habitat, Air Quality, Business, Land Access, and Residential).

Submission I003 (Charles Aguilera, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #317 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 1/16/2018
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 1/16/2018
Submission Method : Project Email
First Name : Charles
Last Name : Aguilera
Professional Title :
Business/Organization :
Address :
Apt./Suite No. :
City :
State :
Zip Code :
Telephone :
Email : caguilera2120@gmail.com
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I003-1

I think the station going through Bakersfield should be placed on Truxtun Ave. Thank you.
EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I003 (Charles Aguilera, January 16, 2018)

I003-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

Submission I004 (Pam Angel, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #424 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	1/19/2018
Response Requested :	No
Affiliation Type :	Individual
Interest As :	Individual
Submission Date :	1/16/2018
Submission Method :	Program Info Line
First Name :	Pam
Last Name :	Angel
Professional Title :	
Business/Organization :	
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	
State :	CA
Zip Code :	
Telephone :	661-301-5049
Email :	
Email Subscription :	
Cell Phone :	
Add to Mailing List :	No
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :	

I004-1 | Hi, my name is Pam Angel I'm uh, a person that lives in Bakersfield, California and I'm concerned about the placement of the High-Speed Rail Train station in Bakersfield. I do not want it where our City Council said to put it, I want it downtown on Truxtun Avenue and my phone number is area code 661-301-5049. That's again, I do not want it where the City of Bakersfield has said they want it, uh, by the council because they did not give us, as public members an opportunity like you're giving us an opportunity they did not give us that kind of an opportunity to express our opinions in an open forum during the day wh- or evening or more than one time. The way they did it was not a very good way to do it. So, I want you to know I want it to be put on Bakersfield downtown on Truxtun Avenue, thank you.

EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
 Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I004 (Pam Angel, January 16, 2018)

I004-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

Submission I005 (Anthony Ansolabehere, December 19, 2017)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #193 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	12/19/2017
Response Requested :	
Affiliation Type :	Individual
Interest As :	Individual
Submission Date :	12/19/2017
Submission Method :	Website
First Name :	Anthony
Last Name :	Ansolabehere
Professional Title :	
Business/Organization :	
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	Bakersfield
State :	CA
Zip Code :	93301
Telephone :	6613230468
Email :	ansolabehere@yahoo.com
Email Subscription :	Bakersfield to Palmdale , Central Valley, Locally Generated Alternative (Bakersfield)
Cell Phone :	
Add to Mailing List :	Yes
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :	

- I005-1 | Our family has been in Bakersfield for over 100 years and we want to see this city thrive for many years to come. Throughout my career I have been active in local government and politics. I managed the County Assessor's office for 12 years before my retirement.
- One thing I have learned over the years, is that Bakersfield City Council positions are more like a hobby than a job. Council members are only paid \$100/month. The positions don't attract people that are interested in thoroughly analyzing the issues. Most of the time the City Council just rubber stamps the recommendations of the City Manager. When you leave complex decisions in the hands of just one person it's a recipe for disaster.
- This approach has led Bakersfield to financial ruin. Bakersfield has been spending way too much money on capital projects and has been ignoring their ballooning pension debt. This has placed Bakersfield in a severe financial crisis which is affecting their judgement. They are desperately trying to get a sales tax increase to bail them out. It appears that the City Council is favoring the F Street location because it will provide a much needed interchange at 204 and F Street. An interchange that the city can't afford to build themselves.
- I005-2 | Some serious deficiencies have been pointed out in the LGR EIR. Bakersfield has a history of creating EIRs to achieve a predetermined outcome. Currently Bakersfield has two major road construction projects bogged down in litigation because of this approach to creating EIRs. Ironically, since the city is out of money, they don't have the funds to complete these road projects anyway. These projects will remain fenced off, unfinished, eyesores for many years to come.
- I005-3 |
- I005-4 | There has been very little public discussion about the LGR EIR. There aren't many people interested in

- I005-4 | attending this public hearing a week before Christmas. The City Council decided to adopt this station in closed session with no public comment.
- I005-5 | Please look at the data and base your decision on the facts. Don't let a handful of part time people have undue influence over the decision making process. Having the station located on a larger site, next to Amtrak, and in the core of downtown just makes more sense.
- For these reasons I oppose the F Street alignment and support the hybrid (Truxtun) alignment.
- EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
- Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I005 (Anthony Ansolabehere, December 19, 2017)

I005-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

I005-2

The commenter does not provide specificity regarding the deficiencies in the Supplemental EIR/EIS; therefore, no further response to this comment can be provided.

I005-3

The commenter states that the City of Bakersfield releases EIRs with predetermined outcomes. It should be noted that the Authority is the CEQA Lead Agency for the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS; the City of Bakersfield did not fund or author any portion of the Final Supplemental EIR or the Final Supplemental EIS.

As noted by the commenter, the City of Bakersfield would be required to complete the CEQA process before implementing planned projects.

I005-4

The commenter suggests that the Supplemental EIR/EIS has elicited little public discussion and that few people were interested in attending the Public Hearing. The Notice of Availability was distributed to more than 15,000 recipients: owners/occupants within 300 feet of the F-B LGA and May 2014 Project footprints; members of the public who have requested to be on the project distribution list; federal, state, and local agency representatives with an interest in the project; tribal representatives who have requested consultation; and schools within 0.25 mile of the construction footprint.

The commenter suggested that during closed session, the Bakersfield City Council adopted a resolution identifying the F Street Station as the preferred station site. The City Council hosted a public workshop on December 13, 2017 after which, the City Council voted unanimously to adopt a resolution in support of the F-B LGA.

I005-5

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

Submission I006 (Dwayne Anthony, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #388 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	1/17/2018
Response Requested :	
Affiliation Type :	Individual
Interest As :	Individual
Submission Date :	1/16/2018
Submission Method :	Project Email
First Name :	Dwayne
Last Name :	Anthony
Professional Title :	
Business/Organization :	
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	
State :	
Zip Code :	
Telephone :	
Email :	dekkanthony@aol.com
Email Subscription :	
Cell Phone :	
Add to Mailing List :	
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :	

I006-1 | I believe that consideration be given to making Truxtun as the preferred choice for the Bakersfield Station location. It would tie in with the Amtrak Station. GET Buses and Greyhound could be provided space creating a true multi-modal hub. It is in walking distance of Rabobank Arena, Marriott Hotel, Government Facilities, Downtown Amenities, and has existing surface roads to gain access to. The F Street/ Golden State Site is away from downtown requiring the use of vehicles to gain access to downtown instead of walking reducing carbon footprints. It would displace the Bakersfield Homeless Center which provides services to those in need. For these reasons I feel that Truxtun is the preferred location for HSR. Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

EIR/EIS Comment : Yes

Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I006 (Dwayne Anthony, January 16, 2018)

I006-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-05: Proximity of F Street Station to Downtown and Amtrak Station, FB-LGA-Response-General-08: Support of/Opposition to the Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated and May 2014 Project Alternatives.

Both alignment alternatives displace the Bakersfield Homeless Center.

Submission I007 (John Antonino, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #401 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 1/17/2018
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 1/16/2018
Submission Method : Project Email
First Name : John
Last Name : Antonino
Professional Title :
Business/Organization :
Address :
Apt./Suite No. :
City :
State :
Zip Code :
Telephone :
Email : johncantonino@gmail.com
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I007-1 | I would like to voice my opinion on the location of the HSR station for Bakersfield. I would suggest the location in downtown Bakersfield off of Truxtun Ave.

Sent from my iPhone
EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I007 (John Antonino, January 16, 2018)

I007-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

Submission I008 (Stephanie Arellano, SEIU 521, December 22, 2017)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #226 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	12/22/2017
Response Requested :	No
Affiliation Type :	Individual
Interest As :	Individual
Submission Date :	12/22/2017
Submission Method :	Website
First Name :	Stephanie
Last Name :	Arellano
Professional Title :	
Business/Organization :	SEIU 521
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	Bakersfield
State :	CA
Zip Code :	93306
Telephone :	6617428331
Email :	srka909@gmail.com
Email Subscription :	
Cell Phone :	
Add to Mailing List :	No
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :	
I008-1	<p>This high speed rail project needs to come through Bakersfield CA. Our city is growing and is always a mid-point between Los Angeles, Fresno, and San Francisco. Bringing this rail system here will not only help to modernize this town, it will bring in more tourists and opportunities to the community as a whole.</p> <p>EIR/EIS Comment : Yes</p> <p>Official Comment Period : Yes</p>

Response to Submission I008 (Stephanie Arellano, SEIU 521, December 22, 2017)

I008-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-General-07: General Support of HSR.

Submission I009 (Carolyn Armstrong, November 26, 2017)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #158 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	11/26/2017
Response Requested :	
Affiliation Type :	Individual
Interest As :	Individual
Submission Date :	11/26/2017
Submission Method :	Website
First Name :	Carolyn
Last Name :	Armstrong
Professional Title :	
Business/Organization :	
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	Bakersfield
State :	CA
Zip Code :	93301
Telephone :	
Email :	spikechic@outlook.com
Email Subscription :	
Cell Phone :	
Add to Mailing List :	No
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :	
I009-1	<p>Bakersfield city is trying to force the the High Speed Rail station to be located at F Street and Golden State Ave., while completely ignoring their previous approval of the recommended location on Truxtun Ave. near the current Amtrak station. This will destroy the surrounding residential communities and will not benefit downtown Bakersfield at all. The Truxtun location for the station is better for all.</p> <p>EIR/EIS Comment : Yes</p> <p>Official Comment Period : Yes</p>

Response to Submission I009 (Carolyn Armstrong, November 26, 2017)

I009-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

Submission I010 (Carolyn Armstrong, November 27, 2017)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #184 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 12/15/2017
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 11/27/2017
Submission Method : Project Email
First Name : Carolyn
Last Name : Armstrong
Professional Title :
Business/Organization :
Address :
Apt./Suite No. :
City :
State :
Zip Code :
Telephone :
Email : spikechic@outlook.com
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I010-1 | Bakersfield city is trying to force the the High Speed Rail station to be located at F Street and Golden State Ave., while completely ignoring their previous approval of the recommended location on Truxtun Ave. near the current Amtrak station. This will destroy the surrounding residential communities, landmark businesses, and an excellent school. It will not benefit downtown Bakersfield at all. The Truxtun Avenue location for the station is better for all.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Armstrong, A Concerned Citizen

EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I010 (Carolyn Armstrong, November 27, 2017)

I010-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

Submission I011 (Richard Armstrong, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #352 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 1/16/2018
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 1/16/2018
Submission Method : Website
First Name : Richard
Last Name : Armstrong
Professional Title :
Business/Organization :
Address :
Apt./Suite No. :
City : Bakersfield
State : CA
Zip Code : 93309
Telephone :
Email : richarmstrong@email.com
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List : No
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I011-1

I am a lifelong resident of Bakersfield who has witnessed several poor transportation decisions in Bakersfield's past. I feel that the F street location for the HSR terminal is another poor choice. I recommend the Truxtun Avenue location, as it will serve the Bakersfield community better than the other. Thank you.
EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I011 (Richard Armstrong, January 16, 2018)

I011-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

Submission I012 (Ken Ballou, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #392 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 1/17/2018
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 1/16/2018
Submission Method : Project Email
First Name : Ken
Last Name : Ballou
Professional Title :
Business/Organization :
Address :
Apt./Suite No. :
City :
State :
Zip Code :
Telephone :
Email : kballou68@icloud.com
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I012-1

The high speed rail and the community of Bakersfield would be best served if the station is located at Truxtun Ave. F street and Golden State would make it less convenient for visitors traveling to Bakersfield.
Ken Ballou

Sent from my iPhone
EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I012 (Ken Ballou, January 16, 2018)

I012-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

Submission I013 (Baynes Bank, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #345 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 1/16/2018
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 1/16/2018
Submission Method : Project Email
First Name : Baynes
Last Name : Bank
Professional Title :
Business/Organization :
Address :
Apt./Suite No. :
City : Bakersfield
State : CA
Zip Code :
Telephone : 661-333-3881
Email : bbank@bak.rr.com
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I013-1 | This message is to support a downtown station on Truxtun Avenue and NOT "F" Street.

Thank you,
Baynes Bank
Bakersfield, CA
661-333-3881

Sent from my iPhone
EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I013 (Baynes Bank, January 16, 2018)

I013-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

Submission I014 (Alexander Barber, November 10, 2017)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #188 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 12/15/2017
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 11/10/2017
Submission Method : Project Email
First Name : Alexander
Last Name : Barber
Professional Title :
Business/Organization :
Address : 2408 S GRAND AVE APT 2
Apt./Suite No. :
City : Los Angeles
State : CA
Zip Code : 90007
Telephone :
Email : lastmillerr@gmail.com
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Hi,

I014-1 | I think it is an enormous mistake not to use the existing, walkable downtown Bakersfield Amtrak station for high-speed rail.

I014-2 | The northern option which looks to be the one HSR is leaning towards is clearly only better from a politically motivated standpoint.

On the merits, the existing station is the clear choice, and we will end up regretting it if we leave ourselves with an unnecessary transit gap.

Kind Regards,

?? Alex Barber
 2408 S GRAND AVE APT 2
 LOS ANGELES CA 90007

I014-3 | P.S. The southern leg of HSR should terminate in Santa Ana, not in Anaheim.

If the train stops short in Anaheim (as is the unfortunate current

I014-3 |

plan) it can not offer a direct connection to either Metrolink's Inland Empire/Orange County line or to Santa Ana's planned and funded OC Streetcar to Garden Grove.

The electrified HSR tracks should be extended the short distance south from Anaheim to the existing Santa Ana depot.

Santa Ana is the county seat and the most densely populated city in Orange County.

EIR/EIS Comment : Yes

Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I014 (Alexander Barber, November 10, 2017)

I014-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-05: Proximity of F Street Station to Downtown and Amtrak Station.

I014-2

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

I014-3

Comment noted. The Statewide Program EIR/EIS (Authority and FRA 2005), available on the Authority's website, describes the evaluation of alternatives that determined the station locations. The commenter's input has been shared with the Southern California HSR Team.

Submission I015 (Joe Bariffi, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #314 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 1/16/2018
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 1/16/2018
Submission Method : Project Email
First Name : Joe
Last Name : Bariffi
Professional Title : CSP
Business/Organization :
Address :
Apt./Suite No. :
City :
State :
Zip Code :
Telephone :
Email : bmj2163@yahoo.com
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I015-1 |

My preference is to locate the new station on Truxton.

Joe Bariffi, CSP
EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I015 (Joe Bariffi, January 16, 2018)

I015-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

Submission I016 (Marsha Barnden, Care Delivery Adventist Health, January 18, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #416 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 1/19/2018
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 1/18/2018
Submission Method : Project Email
First Name : Marsha
Last Name : Barnden
Professional Title : Corporate Director Infection Prevention & Clinical Standards
Business/Organization : Care Delivery Adventist Health
Address : 1075 Creekside Ridge Drive
Apt./Suite No. : Suite 102
City : Roseville
State : CA
Zip Code : 95678
Telephone :
Email : BarndeMA@ah.org
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone : 661-301-4083
Add to Mailing List :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I016-1 | I am ADAMANTLY opposed to a station on F Street and Golden State. The station would be much better located at Amtrak on Truxtun. Additionally, the GET bus and Greyhound stations should also be relocated to Amtrak. In doing so, local law enforcement personnel can more easily patrol one area rather than locations spread out across downtown. The idea of putting this station on F Street and Golden State makes absolutely no sense whatsoever.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

Marsha Barnden | Corporate Director Infection Prevention & Clinical Standards | Care Delivery
 Adventist Health | 1075 Creekside Ridge Drive Suite 102 | Roseville, CA 95678
 C 661-301-4083 | marsha.barnden@org <mailto:661-301-4083|marsha.barnden@org>

EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : No

Response to Submission I016 (Marsha Barnden, Care Delivery Adventist Health, January 18, 2018)

I016-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-03: Response to Comments Received After the Close of the Public Comment Period, FB-LGA-Response-General-08: Support of/Opposition to the Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated and May 2014 Project Alternatives.

Submission I017 (Bettina Belter, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #282 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 1/16/2018
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 1/16/2018
Submission Method : Project Email
First Name : Bettina
Last Name : Belter
Professional Title :
Business/Organization :
Address :
Apt./Suite No. :
City :
State :
Zip Code :
Telephone :
Email : bettinabelter@gmail.com
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

 [-]----- Forwarded message -----
 From: Bettina Belter <bettinabelter@gmail.com>
 Date: Mon, Jan 15, 2018 at 6:36 PM
 Subject: Re: HSR Station location
 To: stephanie.perez@dot.gov

Dear Ms. Perez,

I017-1 There are MANY reasons the F STREET location for HSR is a TERRIBLE idea;

1. - The comfort and EASE for riders, F Street LOSES.
2. - Potential FOR Economic DEVELOPMENT, F Street LOSES.
3. - Traffic CONGESTION Concerns, way TOO CLOSE to neighborhoods. F Street LOSES.
4. - Intermodal CONNECTIVITY, F Street LOSES!
5. - Transportation studies SUPPORT the DOWNTOWN Location.
Shafter's heavy maintenance Facility is GREAT for Kern County and the

I017-1

BEST location for California, because it's donated land that Doesn't NEED TO BE remediated.

F STREET WOULD MAKE US MISS OUT ON THIS.

6. Poor Station access for lower income and minority residents of OUR CITY.
F Street LOSES as it's FARTHER AWAY from east and southeast Bakersfield.

Across the board, F STREET LOSES, and yet OUR CITY is trying to ram F street down our throats. WHY?????? WE THE PEOPLE, DON'T WANT IT THERE.

Gratefully,
Bettina and Gary Belter

On Fri, Jan 12, 2018 at 9:34 PM, Bettina Belter <bettinabelter@gmail.com> wrote:

>
>
>
>
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>

EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I017 (Bettina Belter, January 16, 2018)

I017-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-05: Proximity of F Street Station to Downtown and Amtrak Station, FB-LGA-Response-General-08: Support of/Opposition to the Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated and May 2014 Project Alternatives.

Submission I018 (Bettina and Gary Belter, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #298 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 1/16/2018
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 1/16/2018
Submission Method : Project Email
First Name : Bettina and Gary
Last Name : Belter
Professional Title :
Business/Organization :
Address : 2228 Beech Street
Apt./Suite No. :
City : Bakersfield
State : CA
Zip Code : 93302
Telephone :
Email : bettinabelter@gmail.com
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

To Whom it may concern,

I018-1

Wanting you to KNOW, the MAJORITY OF the people in Bakersfield, Ca. OPPOSE the F Street location for the HSR Station. It defies REASON. Clearly there's ANOTHER motivation here, and it's NOT what's GOOD for the good of our community, neighborhoods OR THE BUILDING OF OUR INFRASTRUCTURE.
 TRUXTUN IS A NO BRAINER. And, it's been APPROVED. Go with it, please. It's near our convention Center, our Amtrak, Hotels, restaurants..... what doesn't our city understand?
 I'm/we're praying, you DO.
 Best regards,
 Bettina & Gary Belter
 2228 Beech Street
 Bakersfield, Ca.
 93302

Sent from my iPhone
EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I018 (Bettina and Gary Belter, January 16, 2018)

I018-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

Submission I019 (Carol Bender, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #331 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 1/16/2018
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 1/16/2018
Submission Method : Project Email
First Name : Carol
Last Name : Bender
Professional Title : R.N, P.H.N.
Business/Organization :
Address : 13340 Smoke Creek Ave.
Apt./Suite No. :
City : Bakersfield
State : CA
Zip Code : 93314
Telephone :
Email : CLMCBENDER@aol.com
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I am submitting a scanned copy of my 3 page comment letter regarding the
 "Fresno to Bakersfield Project Section Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS and will
 also send a copy via mail.

Please contact me if there was any problem with the transmission of this
 document.

EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes
Attachments : Scan Fresno to Bakersfield Project supp EIR EIS Comment,.pdf (2 mb)
 331_Bender_email_011618_Attachment.pdf (2 mb)

I019-1

I would greatly appreciate it if you could e-mail me acknowledgement of its
 receipt.

Best regards,

Carol McMahon Bender

AKA Carol Bender

Submission I019 (Carol Bender, January 16, 2018) - Continued

January 14, 2018

"Fresno to Bakersfield Project Section Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS Comment,"

770 L Street,

Suite 620 MS-1, Sacramento, CA 95814

I am writing to comment on the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS: Fresno to Bakersfield Project Section and to state that the Locally Generated Alternative "F" Street Station is the best choice for our community.

I019-2 | I previously submitted letters/documentation that are included in the 2014 EIR/EIS: Fresno to Bakersfield Project file and would like those letters included with this supplemental review, as well as those supplemental comment letters submitted prior to the May 6 2014 meeting vote to approve the 2014 EIR. I note that this current supplemental EIR/EIS references the 2014 EIR/EIS document extensively and many of the issues I discussed previously are still relevant for this supplemental EIR/EIS.

I019-3 | One large concern that I discussed at that time had to do with the lack of mitigation required to protect workers and citizens from exposure to spores that cause Valley Fever (*coccidioidomycosis*). Although there were some mitigation measures added after these concerns were aired, I am still concerned that there are further measures that should be taken. I have discussed these concerns with Mark McLoughlin, Director of Environmental Services at length. These include the need to provide Valley Fever skin tests to workers on the project to help determine their immunity/prior exposure to the disease. It is well documented that there are specific high risk groups. Ignoring the measures that could prevent exposure to these groups would not only be detrimental to individual health, but it could create the potential for multiple liability lawsuits that could financially cripple the residents of California. We have seen that the prison system tests prisoners with Valley Fever skin tests and will not place them in Central Valley prisons if they are found to be at risk. Shouldn't workers on the High Speed Rail (HSR) project and Valley citizens be educated and protected as well?

There does not appear to be a specific plan to educate and protect the public about risks during the construction phase. There was to be coordination with the public health departments in each county to provide this education and outreach. To date, I have not received any verification that the California High Speed Rail Authority (CAHSRA) has allotted funds or required its contractors to be involved in any billboard/TV campaigns, or local information sessions for residents with regard to skin testing and protections (masks etc.). Since the project broke ground in the Central Valley, cases of Valley Fever have increased. Due to our natural geography and weather patterns, fugitive dust and spores released from this project will migrate to the southern end of the Valley (Kern County). A California solar project has been under fire in the media recently when it was found that contractors were not ensuring that Valley Fever protections/mitigations were in place or followed. As it stands now, it appears that the CAHSR project only "offers" face masks as protection for workers....it does not require them. My

I019-3 | question is: Are workers well informed enough, skin tested and knowledgeable enough to know what kind of risk they might be taking if they choose NOT to wear a mask?

What mitigation efforts are to be offered to citizens and high risk groups that reside or attend school/church in close proximity to ongoing construction? New measures need to be outlined in specific terms and put into place immediately. These measures should extend beyond basic mitigation for "fugitive dust", given the nature of how spores grow and are disseminated during projects with extensive soil disturbance, not to mention soil transport.

I019-4 | With regard to the location of the Locally Generated Alternative (LGA) "F" Street Station:

1. After extensive review, it is clear the LGA and "F" Street station alignment is the least detrimental to the citizens of Kern County. It affects fewer residents directly. It affects fewer homes, schools, hospitals and community assets. It is by no means a perfect location, as there will be some unavoidable impacts, but it is the better of the two choices that have been offered. Many of the current concerns voiced against the LGA alternative appear to be from people that did not participate in the extensive public review process in 2014. It is my opinion that if they had participated and reviewed the 2014 report impacts as extensively as those who were involved in the process at that time, they would also be choosing the LGA alternative.

I019-5 | 2. One concern that I do find valid is that there should be some funding available to relocate the Bakersfield Homeless Center ahead of the actual construction. This organization cannot continue to solicit donations or otherwise pour money into a location that will be destroyed. I strongly urge the CAHSRA to allot that money to help relocate this facility as soon as possible.

I019-6 | 3. Although the LGA route has fewer noise/vibration impacts to citizens, there are still some areas that will be VERY adversely impacted. One example in particular is the Free Will Baptist Church and School. It is obvious in looking at the EIR that the project will have some extreme impacts to both school children and church attendees, yet there is no offer to relocate the facilities either during construction or during future operation of the rail. Noise barriers, insulation and other attempts to muffle noise will not be enough. The point here is that the concerns from severely impacted locations are being largely ignored and given very little information regarding what truly will be done to mitigate their issues. A "wait and see" approach is not acceptable.

4. Having the station located at the "F" Street location will revitalize a part of downtown that has been somewhat neglected in the past. There is a clear connection to Highway 99 from the Highway 204 connection that runs directly by the planned station. Its location is closer and more accessible to our Airport as well, which is a bonus for business travelers or those wishing to continue travel by flying to areas outside California. This closer connection could boost commercial airlines' interest in locating more flight services at the Bakersfield airport. There is opportunity for shuttle/Uber/bus transport. When the current project is fully complete, there will be seamless rail connection to the Los Angeles area for high speed rail travelers. If the project is delayed or connection to the LA Basin is not realized in the future for any reason, impacts will be FAR less if the "end of the line" is the "F" Street station as opposed to one located at the Truxtun location.


Submission I019 (Carol Bender, January 16, 2018) - Continued

I019-6

I strongly urge the California High Speed Authority to choose the Locally Generated Alternative (LGA) and "F" Street station location as the preferred alignment through Kern County. I have personally worked long and hard for the past 8 years to be informed and thoroughly research the proposals and various EIRs that have been provided for public review. While I still have great doubts that this project is one that Californians can and should afford, that is not what is being decided now. What we have is two flawed choices for alternatives. Given that, the Locally Generated Alternative (LGA) and "F" Street station location is the very best alternative as it is the least detrimental to our citizens and the quality of life that we have come to know.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment today. I look forward to remaining involved in the public process going forward.

Best regards,



Carol McMahon Bender R.N., P.H.N.

13340 Smoke Creek Ave

Bakersfield, CA 93314

January 14, 2018

"Fresno to Bakersfield Project Section Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS Comment,"

770 L Street,

Suite 620 MS-1, Sacramento, CA 95814

I am writing to comment on the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS: Fresno to Bakersfield Project Section and to state that the Locally Generated Alternative "F" Street Station is the best choice for our community.

I previously submitted letters/documentation that are included in the 2014 EIR/EIS : Fresno to Bakersfield Project file and would like those letters included with this supplemental review, as well as those supplemental comment letters submitted prior to the May 6 2014 meeting vote to approve the 2014 EIR. I note that this current supplemental EIR/EIS references the 2014 EIR/EIS document extensively and many of the issues I discussed previously are still relevant for this supplemental EIR/EIS.

One large concern that I discussed at that time had to do with the lack of mitigation required to protect workers and citizens from exposure to spores that cause Valley Fever (coccidioidomycosis) . Although there were some mitigation measures added after these concerns were aired, I am still concerned that there are further measures that should be taken. I have discussed these concerns with Mark McLoughlin, Director of Environmental Services at length. These include the need to provide Valley Fever skin tests to workers on the project to help determine their immunity/prior exposure to the disease. It is well documented that there are specific high risk groups. Ignoring the measures that could prevent exposure to these groups would not only be detrimental to individual health, but it could create the potential for multiple liability lawsuits that could financially cripple the residents of California. We have seen that the prison system tests prisoners with Valley Fever skin tests and will not place them in Central Valley prisons if they are found to be at risk. Shouldn't workers on the High Speed Rail (HSR) project and Valley citizens be educated and protected as well?

There does not appear to be a specific plan to educate and protect the public about risks during the construction phase. There was to be coordination with the public health departments in each county to provide this education and outreach. To date, I have not received any verification that the California High Speed Rail Authority (CAHSRA) has allotted funds or required its contractors to be involved in any billboard/TV campaigns, or local information sessions for residents with regard to skin testing and protections (masks etc.). Since the project broke ground in the Central Valley, cases of Valley Fever have increased. Due to our natural geography and weather patterns, fugitive dust and spores released from this project will migrate to the southern end of the Valley (Kern County). A California solar project has been under fire in the media recently when it was found that contractors were not ensuring that Valley Fever protections/mitigations were in place or followed. As it stands now, it appears that the CAHSR project only "offers" face masks as protection for workers....it does not require them. My

Submission I019 (Carol Bender, January 16, 2018) - Continued

question is: Are workers well informed enough, skin tested and knowledgeable enough to know what kind of risk they might be taking if they choose NOT to wear a mask?

What mitigation efforts are to be offered to citizens and high risk groups that reside or attend school/church in close proximity to ongoing construction? New measures need to be outlined in specific terms and put into place immediately. These measures should extend beyond basic mitigation for "fugitive dust", given the nature of how spores grow and are disseminated during projects with extensive soil disturbance, not to mention soil transport.

With regard to the location of the Locally Generated Alternative (LGA) "F" Street Station:

1. After extensive review, it is clear the LGA and "F" Street station alignment is the least detrimental to the citizens of Kern County. It affects fewer residents directly. It affects fewer homes, schools, hospitals and community assets. It is by no means a perfect location, as there will be some unavoidable impacts, but it is the better of the two choices that have been offered. Many of the current concerns voiced against the LGA alternative appear to be from people that did not participate in the extensive public review process in 2014. It is my opinion that if they had participated and reviewed the 2014 report impacts as extensively as those who were involved in the process at that time, they would also be choosing the LGA alternative.

2. One concern that I do find valid is that there should be some funding available to relocate the Bakersfield Homeless Center ahead of the actual construction. This organization cannot continue to solicit donations or otherwise pour money into a location that will be destroyed. I strongly urge the CAHSRA to allot that money to help relocate this facility as soon as possible.


3. Although the LGA route has fewer noise/vibration impacts to citizens, there are still some areas that will be VERY adversely impacted. One example in particular is the Free Will Baptist Church and School. It is obvious in looking at the EIR that the project will have some extreme impacts to both school children and church attendees, yet there is no offer to relocate the facilities either during construction or during future operation of the rail. Noise barriers, insulation and other attempts to muffle noise will not be enough. The point here is that the concerns from severely impacted locations are being largely ignored and given very little information regarding what truly will be done to mitigate their issues. A "wait and see" approach is not acceptable.

4. Having the station located at the "F" Street location will revitalize a part of downtown that has been somewhat neglected in the past. There is a clear connection to Highway 99 from the Highway 204 connection that runs directly by the planned station. Its location is closer and more accessible to our Airport as well, which is a bonus for business travelers or those wishing to continue travel by flying to areas outside California. This closer connection could boost commercial airlines' interest in locating more flight services at the Bakersfield airport. There is opportunity for shuttle/Uber/bus transport. When the current project is fully complete, there will be seamless rail connection to the Los Angeles area for high speed rail travelers. If the project is delayed or connection to the LA Basin is not realized in the future for any reason, impacts will be FAR less if the "end of the line" is the "F" Street station as opposed to one located at the Truxtun location.

I strongly urge the California High Speed Authority to choose the Locally Generated Alternative (LGA) and "F" Street station location as the preferred alignment through Kern County. I have personally worked long and hard for the past 8 years to be informed and thoroughly research the proposals and various EIRs that have been provided for public review. While I still have great doubts that this project is one that Californians can and should afford, that is not what is being decided now. What we have is two flawed choices for alternatives. Given that, the Locally Generated Alternative (LGA) and "F" Street station location is the very best alternative as it is the least detrimental to our citizens and the quality of life that we have come to know.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment today. I look forward to remaining involved in the public process going forward.

Best regards,



Carol McMahon Bender R.N., P.H.N.

13340 Smoke Creek Ave

Bakersfield, CA 93314

Response to Submission I019 (Carol Bender, January 16, 2018)

I019-1

The commenter requests an emailed acknowledgement that her comment has been received. Responses are not sent to commenters individually. All responses will be prepared and published as part of the Final Supplemental EIS.

The comment was submitted to the project email. Comments submitted to the project email address received automated responses stating: "Thank you for taking the time to contact the California High-Speed Rail Authority. Your views and comments are important to our team. We receive a large amount of letters, phone calls and emails, and because this email is not monitored 24 hours a day and generally not on the weekends, we may not be able to respond to you right away. However, our team works very hard to ensure that all comments/questions are read and responded to, when appropriate.

If you have any questions about working at the Authority, please visit our High-Speed Rail Careers page here: <http://hsr.ca.gov/About/Careers/index.html>.

Thank you again for your interest in the California High-Speed Rail Program.

California High-Speed Rail Authority"

I019-2

The commenter states that she previously submitted comments on the Fresno to Bakersfield Section EIR/EIS and prior to the May 6, 2014 meeting to approve the Fresno to Bakersfield Final EIR/EIS. The commenter requests that her previously submitted comments be included with the Final Supplemental EIS. The commenter notes that the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS refers to the Final EIR/EIS, and states that her previous comments are relevant to the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS.

The commenter's previous comments appear three times in the Final EIR/EIS documentation: in Volume IV, Response to Comments from Public Meetings and Hearings 9-22-2011, pages 29-374 through 29-377 (referred to below as Comment Set 1); in Volume V Response to Comments from Individuals Last Name A-C, pages 41-50 through 41-63 (referred to below as Comment Set 2); and Volume V Response to Comments from Public meetings and Hearings 8-27-2012, pages 48-28 through 48-43 (referred to below as Comment Set 3).

Comment Set 1 refers to noise and vibration impacts along the May 2014 Project's footprint. The locations and impacts discussed are not relevant to the F-B LGA; the responses to these comments provided in Volume IV are sufficient to address the issues the commenter has described.

Comment Set 2, a letter submitted in response to the Fresno to Bakersfield Revised Draft EIR/EIS, expresses concerns about a wide variety of issues and impacts. The responses to these comments provided in Volume V are sufficient to address the issues the commenter has described.

Comment Set 3 contains four individual submissions made at the August 27, 2012 public hearing. The first, Submission P002, expresses concerns that the Revised Draft EIR/EIS did not provide a broad enough set of alternatives. The F-B LGA directly responds to these last concerns, and along with the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, the responses to these comments provided in Volume V are sufficient to address the issues the commenter has described.

The second, Submission P003, expresses concerns about cumulative noise impacts, compares the number of impacts in Fresno to the number of impacts in Bakersfield, and states that the funding to complete the project has not been found. The responses to

Response to Submission I019 (Carol Bender, January 16, 2018) - Continued

I019-2

states that the funding to complete the project has not been found. The responses to these comments provided in Volume V are sufficient to address the issues the commenter has described.

The third, Submission P004, expresses concerns about design speeds and property tax loss. Again, the responses to these comments provided in Volume V are sufficient to address the issues the commenter has described.

The commenter's final submission in Comment Set 3, P005, asks that the HSR avoid Bakersfield altogether in favor of a corridor along Interstate-5, and expresses concerns about faults in Tehachapi. The responses to these comments provided in Volume V are sufficient to address the issues the commenter has described.

I019-3

The commenter states that they are concerned with the lack of mitigation required to protect workers and citizens from exposure to spores caused by Valley Fever.

Regarding worker exposure:

As stated in Section 3.11 of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, page 3.11-18, construction activities have the potential to generate exposure to the fungus spores that cause Valley Fever via inhalation of fugitive dust and soil. Valley Fever tends to infect people with jobs requiring digging in soil that contains the fungus. The Authority reviewed the potential of this occurring in the San Joaquin Valley, specifically in the area where HSR construction would occur. In response to comments concerning the risk of increased exposure to *Coccidioides* spores that cause Valley Fever, the FRA and the Authority, in coordination with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the California Department of Public Health, revised the avoidance and minimization measures in the Mitigation Monitoring and Enforcement Plan to incorporate additional best practices to minimize exposure to those at risk from construction activities disturbing these naturally occurring *Coccidioides* spores (Section 3.11.5 S&S-AMF #4b and S&S-AMF #4c).

S&S-AMF#4b. States that a qualified person dedicated to overseeing implementation of Valley Fever prevention measures to encourage a culture of safety of the construction contracts and subcontractors.

S&S-AMF#4c. Provides the addition of measures to the requirements of the Construction Safety and Health Plans regarding preventative measures to avoid Valley Fever exposure.

Regarding citizen exposure:

As described under 3.3.5.2, Impact AQ #1, construction emissions for particulate matter smaller than 2.5 and 10 microns (which includes spores from *Coccidioides*), would be below SJVAPCD thresholds with the incorporation of dust control minimization measures AQ-AM#1 through 4.

Response to Submission I019 (Carol Bender, January 16, 2018) - Continued

I019-4

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-General-08: Support of/Opposition to the Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated and May 2014 Project Alternatives.

I019-5

The commenter requests that funding be made available to relocate the Bakersfield Homeless Center before construction begins.

The Authority would acquire the land of property owners whose land is directly affected by the project in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. sec. 4601 et seq.) (Uniform Act). The Uniform Act establishes minimum standards for treatment and compensation of individuals whose real property is acquired for a federally funded project. For more information on the Uniform Act, see Appendix 3.12-A of the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS and FB-Response-SO-01 of the Fresno to Bakersfield Section Final EIR/EIS. Information about acquisition, compensation, and relocation assistance is also available on the Authority's website, please see, Your Property, Your High-Speed Rail Project (Authority 2013).

If the facility is acquired, coordination with Bakersfield Homeless Center will comply with SO-MM#3, found in Section 3.12.6.2 of the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS. The Measure states:

The Authority will minimize impacts resulting from the disruption to key community facilities. [...] The Authority will consult with the appropriate respective parties before land acquisition to assess potential opportunities to reconfigure land use and buildings and/or relocate affected facilities, as necessary, to minimize the disruption of facility activities and services, and also to ensure relocation that allows the community currently served to continue to access these services. Because many of these community facilities are located in Hispanic communities, the Authority will continue to implement a comprehensive Spanish-language outreach program for these communities as land acquisition begins. This program will facilitate the identification of approaches that would maintain continuity of operation and allow space and access for the types of services currently provided and planned for these facilities. Also, to avoid disruption to these community amenities, the Authority will ensure that all reconfiguring of land uses or buildings, or relocating of community facilities is completed before the demolition of any existing structures.

Response to Submission I019 (Carol Bender, January 16, 2018) - Continued

I019-6

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-General-08: Support of/Opposition to the Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated and May 2014 Project Alternatives.

The commenter notes that though the F-B LGA would have fewer noise and vibration impacts, there would still be impacts. The commenter calls attention to the First Free Will Baptist Church and [the Bethel Christian] School. The commenter states that school children and church attendees would be impacted. The commenter states that there has been no relocation offer from the Authority, and indicates that mitigations such as noise barriers and insulation would not be enough to reduce impacts. Contrary to the commenter's claims, the noise analyses for both the May 2014 Project in the Final EIR/EIS and F-B LGA in the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS found that the implementation of the Project warranted noise barriers to reduce noise impacts to First Free Will Baptist Church and the Bethel Christian School to a less-than-significant noise level. Neither alignment directly affects the church and school and therefore would not result in property acquisition and relocation.

Submission I020 (Lynn Bennett, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #333 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 1/16/2018
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 1/16/2018
Submission Method : Website
First Name : Lynn
Last Name : Bennett
Professional Title :
Business/Organization :
Address :
Apt./Suite No. :
City : Bakersfield
State : CA
Zip Code : 93301
Telephone : 661 328-0776
Email : lynnb2@bak.rr.com
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List : No
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I020-1

I am a born and raised Bakersfield, CA resident, homeowner of 43 years and I'm appalled at the selection of "F" Street as the HSR station. The traffic congestion in this part of Bakersfield is a MESS already! The widening of 24th Street, homes destroyed, traffic congestion and at times, the inability currently to even access 24th street going west from streets north of 24th street.

Please place the HSR station south, on Truxtun Avenue area near the existing Amtrak station.
EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I020 (Lynn Bennett, January 16, 2018)

I020-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-General-08: Support of/Opposition to the Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated and May 2014 Project Alternatives.

Submission I021 (GYSGT Wally Beville II, December 20, 2017)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #223 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	12/20/2017
Response Requested :	Yes
Affiliation Type :	Individual
Interest As :	Individual
Submission Date :	12/20/2017
Submission Method :	Website
First Name :	GYSGT Wally
Last Name :	Beville II
Professional Title :	
Business/Organization :	
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	Bakersfield
State :	CA
Zip Code :	93308
Telephone :	661-706-0496
Email :	Mr_wally_beveille@yahoo.com
Email Subscription :	Bakersfield to Palmdale , Board of Directors, Construction Updates General
Cell Phone :	
Add to Mailing List :	Yes
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :	

I021-1

I would like to see the current expenditure reports for any and all monies used by this project from conception to today's date.

In addition I would like to see the breakdown for each business / company and or individuals receiving any form of payment.

Also I want to see a list of individuals , complete disclosure as to their connections to any and all local, state, and or federal government even if it's only by marriage to ensure open and fair contract awards and no conflicts of interest.

EIR/EIS Comment : Yes

Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I021 (GYSGT Wally Beville II, December 20, 2017)

I021-1

The commenter is requesting financial and personal and professional connections for all participants in the development of high-speed rail. This comment is not on the content or adequacy of the environmental document but rather is a request for financial information related to the procurement process for the HSR. This comment is noted and the commenter's request has been shared with the appropriate Authority staff.

Submission I022 (Greg Blankenship, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #422 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 1/19/2018
Response Requested : No
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 1/16/2018
Submission Method : Program Info Line
First Name : Greg
Last Name : Blankenship
Professional Title :
Business/Organization :
Address :
Apt./Suite No. :
City :
State : CA
Zip Code :
Telephone :
Email :
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List : Yes
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I022-1 | Hi, this is Greg Blankenship 661-281-9517 I just want to leave a comment that I would like the train station to be located in Bakersfield on Truxtun, not at the F Street site. That downtown where all the other things are, thank you, bye.
EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I022 (Greg Blankenship, January 16, 2018)

I022-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

Submission I023 (Kristie Blaylock, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #316 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 1/16/2018
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 1/16/2018
Submission Method : Project Email
First Name : Kristie
Last Name : Blaylock
Professional Title :
Business/Organization :
Address : 430 Laurel Dr.
Apt./Suite No. :
City : Bodfish
State : CA
Zip Code : 93205
Telephone :
Email : kblaylock39@gmail.com
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I023-1 | I believe the best location for the HSR station in Bakersfield would be on Truxtun Ave.

Thank you,

Kristie Blaylock
 430 Laurel Dr.
 Bodfish, CA 93205

EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I023 (Kristie Blaylock, January 16, 2018)

I023-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

Submission I024 (Joe Bradford, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #415 DETAIL	
Status :	Unread
Record Date :	1/16/2018
Response Requested :	
Affiliation Type :	Individual
Interest As :	Individual
Submission Date :	1/16/2018
Submission Method :	Website
First Name :	Joe
Last Name :	Bradford
Professional Title :	
Business/Organization :	
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	Bakersfield
State :	CA
Zip Code :	93309
Telephone :	661-330-1194
Email :	joe@casamoore.com
Email Subscription :	
Cell Phone :	
Add to Mailing List :	No
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :	

I024-1 | I am totally against high speed rail in California and am against putting a station on F Street in Bakersfield. We cannot afford this boondoggle project.
 EIR/EIS Comment :
 Official Comment Period :

Response to Submission I024 (Joe Bradford, January 16, 2018)

I024-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

Submission I025 (Ron Bull, January 4, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #236 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	1/4/2018
Response Requested :	
Affiliation Type :	Individual
Interest As :	Individual
Submission Date :	1/4/2018
Submission Method :	Website
First Name :	Ron
Last Name :	Bull
Professional Title :	
Business/Organization :	
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	Bakersfield
State :	CA
Zip Code :	93306
Telephone :	661-378-3929
Email :	bladerOnner@aol.com
Email Subscription :	
Cell Phone :	
Add to Mailing List :	No
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :	
I025-1	<p>the path of the high speed rail needs to be truxton not f st .</p> <p>f st will be a bad traffic problem for people trying to get downtown for all the events Bakersfield will offer</p> <p>it is to far from central bakersfield</p> <p>EIR/EIS Comment : Yes</p> <p>Official Comment Period : Yes</p>

Response to Submission I025 (Ron Bull, January 4, 2018)

I025-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-General-08: Support of/Opposition to the Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated and May 2014 Project Alternatives.

Submission I026 (Garrett Busch, December 20, 2017)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #210 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 12/20/2017
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 12/20/2017
Submission Method : Project Email
First Name : Garrett
Last Name : Busch
Professional Title :
Business/Organization :
Address :
Apt./Suite No. :
City :
State :
Zip Code :
Telephone :
Email : Garrett.Busch@wonderful.com
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone : (661) 229-8254
Add to Mailing List :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

Greetings,

I026-1 | I'm emailing to express my concerns with the proposed F-st/204 location for the HSR in Bakersfield. I feel that if the station is placed at that location, as opposed to the Truxton Amtrak spot, it will not allow the city of Bakersfield to fully reap the benefits that the HSR could provide. The Truxton location would help the downtown significantly, and would cost less than the F-st location as it wouldn't require roads to be re-directed. Lastly, failing to choose the Truxton location would lead to a significant amount of unrealized job growth if the HSR then does not choose the area south of Shafter to place the heavy maintenance facility. Overall, the benefits to Bakersfield by choosing the Truxton location are too great to ignore by choosing the F-st location instead.

I026-2 |

Thanks,

Garrett Busch
 Strategy Consultant
 Mobile: (661) 229-8254
 garrett.busch@wonderful.com<mailto:garrett.busch@wonderful.com>
 [Image result for the wonderful company]

EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I026 (Garrett Busch, December 20, 2017)

I026-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-General-08: Support of/Opposition to the Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated and May 2014 Project Alternatives.

I026-2

The HMF decision will be made separately from the identification of the preferred alignment and station alternatives in the Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS. A decision on the HMF site will be made sometime after environmental review is complete for both the Fresno to Bakersfield section and the Wye area near Chowchilla (the Wye area is being evaluated on a supplemental basis via a Subsequent EIR/Supplemental EIS to the certified 2012 Merced to Fresno Section EIR/EIS). To support this future decision, additional comparative study, design, and review may be necessary. Subsequent review and study may include further design.

Submission I027 (Kevin Bush, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #348 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 1/16/2018
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 1/16/2018
Submission Method : Project Email
First Name : Kevin
Last Name : Bush
Professional Title : Real Estate Consultant
Business/Organization :
Address :
Apt./Suite No. :
City :
State :
Zip Code :
Telephone : 661-204-5994
Email : 2045994@gmail.com
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I am writing to provide formal comments in response to the Fresno to Bakersfield Locally Generated Alignment draft EIR/EIS.

I027-1

I fully support the May 2014 Project (Hybrid Alignment) with a station at Truxtun Avenue and oppose the Locally Generated Alignment at F. Street.

Thank you

Kevin Bush
 Real Estate Consultant

(661) 204-5994
EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I027 (Kevin Bush, January 16, 2018)

I027-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

Submission I028 (Aaron Casida, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #311 DETAIL	
Status :	Action Pending
Record Date :	1/16/2018
Response Requested :	
Affiliation Type :	Individual
Interest As :	Individual
Submission Date :	1/16/2018
Submission Method :	Website
First Name :	Aaron
Last Name :	Casida
Professional Title :	
Business/Organization :	
Address :	
Apt./Suite No. :	
City :	Bakersfield
State :	CA
Zip Code :	93308
Telephone :	
Email :	Aaron.casida@bakerhughes.com
Email Subscription :	
Cell Phone :	
Add to Mailing List :	No
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :	
I028-1	I would like to see the station on Truxtun Avenue.
EIR/EIS Comment :	Yes
Official Comment Period :	Yes

Response to Submission I028 (Aaron Casida, January 16, 2018)

I028-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.

Submission I029 (James Clark, January 16, 2018)

Fresno - Bakersfield (2014 June+) - RECORD #410 DETAIL

Status : Action Pending
Record Date : 1/17/2018
Response Requested :
Affiliation Type : Individual
Interest As : Individual
Submission Date : 1/16/2018
Submission Method : Project Email
First Name : James
Last Name : Clark
Professional Title :
Business/Organization :
Address :
Apt./Suite No. :
City :
State :
Zip Code :
Telephone :
Email : jbc315@icloud.com
Email Subscription :
Cell Phone :
Add to Mailing List :
Stakeholder Comments/Issues :

I029-1 | Rail station needs to be on Truxton!

Sent from my iPhone
EIR/EIS Comment : Yes
Official Comment Period : Yes

Response to Submission I029 (James Clark, January 16, 2018)

I029-1

Refer to Standard Response FB-LGA-Response-GENERAL-10: Comments with Opinion Only.