

## **APPENDIX 2-K: POLICY CONSISTENCY ANALYSES**

## APPENDIX 2-K: POLICY CONSISTENCY ANALYSES

Since publication of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), the following substantive changes have been made to this appendix:

- This appendix was updated to provide additional consistency analysis with the Morgan Hill General Plan Transportation Element concerning several features of Alternative 2 in Table 1, Policy Inconsistency, Reconciliation, and Rationale for Transportation.
- This appendix was updated to include *Communications Hill Specific Plan Area Development Policy* (City of San Jose 2014) in Table 5, *Santa Clara Valley Agricultural Plan* (County of Santa Clara and Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority 2018) in Table 7, and *Envision: San José 2040 General Plan* (City of San Jose 2011) in Table 9.
- SO-MM#1 and SO-MM#2 were removed from Table 5.

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) is a state agency and therefore is not required to comply with local land use and zoning regulations, however it has endeavored to design and construct the San Francisco to San Jose Project Section (Project Section) so that it is as compatible as possible with land use and zoning regulations. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) regulations require the discussion of any inconsistency or conflict of a proposed action with regional or local plans and laws. Where inconsistencies or conflicts exist, the CEQ and FRA require a description of the extent of reconciliation and the reason for proceeding if full reconciliation is not feasible (40 C.F.R. § 1506.2(d) and 64 Fed. Reg. 28545, 14(n)(15)). California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines also require that an environmental impact report discuss the inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans, specific plans, and regional plans (CEQA Guidelines § 15125(d)).

Although the *San Jose to Merced Project Section Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)* (EIR/EIS) describes the Project Section's inconsistency with local plans in order to provide a context for the project, inconsistency with such plans is not considered an environmental impact.

This appendix provides the following for each resource with identified policy inconsistencies:

- A statement for each policy that the Project Section is inconsistent with, and an explanation of any inconsistencies.
- A discussion of reconciliation approaches the Authority has committed to take to reconcile any inconsistency. These consist of impact avoidance and minimization features and mitigation measures (described in Volume 2, Appendix 2-E, Project Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features) and activities described in Appendix 2-D, Applicable Design Standards.
- The rationale for carrying forth the Project Section if it remains inconsistent with the policy despite these approaches.

## Transportation

**Table 1 Policy Inconsistency, Reconciliation, and Rationale for Transportation**

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>Santa Clara County General Plan (1994)</b>			
<p>Policy C-TR 12: It is the goal of this plan to achieve a LOS no lower than D at peak travel periods on city streets, county roads, expressways and state highways. However, in certain instances, a lower level of service may be acceptable when LOS D cannot practically be achieved.</p>	<p>Inconsistent. The project would cause some intersections under County jurisdiction to operate at worse than LOS of D or better, resulting in an inconsistency with the County's LOS policy.</p>	<p>While the project includes features to implement level of service mitigations, the project will remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.</p>	<p>While the project would degrade intersection LOS at some locations, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes features to minimize level of service degradation.</p>
<b>City of San Jose General Plan (2011)</b>			
<p>Policy TR-5.3: The minimum overall roadway performance during peak travel periods should be level of service "D" except for designated areas.</p>	<p>Inconsistent. The project would cause some intersections under City jurisdiction to operate at worse than the target LOS of D or better, resulting in an inconsistency with the City's LOS policy.</p>	<p>While the project includes features to implement level of service mitigations, the project will remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.</p>	<p>While the project would degrade intersection LOS at some locations, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes features to minimize level of service degradation.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>City of Morgan Hill General Plan (2016)</b>			
<p>Policy TR-3.4. As the LOS Policy and design criteria for roadway improvements, use a Tiered LOS Standard as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ LOS F in the Downtown at Main/Monterey, along Monterey Road between Main and Fifth Street, and along Depot Street at First through Fifth Streets [...]</li> <li>○ LOS D for intersections and segments elsewhere; except [for] LOS E for identified freeway ramps/zones, road segments and intersections that (1) provide a transition to and are located on the periphery of downtown; (2) are freeway zone intersections; and/or (3) where achieving LOS D could result in interim intersection improvements which would be “over-built” once the city’s circulation network has been completed, and/or would involve unacceptable impacts [ . . . ]</li> </ul>	<p>Inconsistent.</p> <p>The project would cause some intersections under City jurisdiction to operate at worse than the target LOS of D or better, resulting in an inconsistency with the City’s LOS policy.</p>	<p>While the project includes features to implement level of service mitigations, the project will remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.</p>	<p>While the project would degrade intersection LOS at some locations, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes features to minimize level of service degradation.</p>
<p>The Transportation Element shows the future circulation system for the City, including planned 2035 improvements. The Transportation Element shows an extension of Madrone Parkway across the railroad, Monterey Road, to Hale Avenue. The Transportation Element also shows maintaining a connection of Tilton Ave. to Monterey Road. The Transportation Element also states the following: “While not analyzed or included in the Circulation Plan for 2030, future consideration should be given to extending Butterfield north of Madrone to connect to Burnett Avenue, perhaps then curving northwest to connect to Tilton Avenue.”</p>	<p>Partially Inconsistent.</p> <p>According to the City, they are planning to amend the General Plan in the future to show a grade separation and connections of Burnett Avenue and Tilton Avenue and eliminate the grade separation and extension of Madrone Parkway through to Hale Avenue, but, as of October 2020, that amendment had not yet been realized. Consequently, Alternative 2 is not inconsistent with the currently adopted General Plan Transportation Element in regard to Madrone Parkway but is inconsistent in regard to Tilton Avenue, which is designed in Alternative 2 to be a cul-de-sac.</p>	<p>Due to the realignment of Monterey Road with Alternative 2, there is insufficient space to connect Monterey Road and Tilton Avenue.</p>	<p>No resolution due to space limitations.</p>
<b>City of Gilroy General Plan (2002)</b>			

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>Policy 12.08 Standard LOS. Maintain traffic conditions at LOS C or better at Gilroy intersections and roadways, allowing some commercial and industrial areas to operate at LOS D or better. Exceptions to this standard will be allowed only where the City Council determines that the improvements needed to maintain the City's standard level of service at specific locations are infeasible.</p>	<p>Inconsistent. The project would cause some intersections under City jurisdiction to operate at worse than the target LOS of D or better, resulting in an inconsistency with the City's LOS policy.</p>	<p>While the project includes features to implement level of service mitigations, the project will remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.</p>	<p>While the project would degrade intersection LOS at some locations, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes features to minimize level of service degradation.</p>

Sources: City of Gilroy 2002; City of Morgan Hill 2016; City of San Jose 2011; County of Santa Clara 1994.

LOS = level-of-service

HSR = high-speed rail

Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority

## Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases

**Table 2 Policy Consistency or Inconsistency, Reconciliation, and Rationale**

Policy	Consistent or Inconsistent	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>Plan Bay Area 2040 (2017)</b>			
<p>Target#3: Reduce adverse health impacts associated with air quality, road safety, and physical inactivity by 10%.</p>	<p>Inconsistent During construction, the project would result in temporary emissions of criteria pollutants that could increase temporary health risks in the vicinity of existing communities.</p>	<p>AQ-IAMF#1 and AQ-IAMF#2 would minimize emissions of fugitive dust and off-gassing emissions of VOCs from paints and other coatings. AQ-IAMF#3 through AQ-IAMF#6 would reduce and minimize impacts by requiring the use of renewable diesel and the cleanest reasonably available equipment and control measures to limit criteria pollutant emissions from construction equipment, vehicles, and concrete batch plants. Despite these onsite controls, all project alternatives would result in temporary violations of the NAAQS and CAAQS, which have been established to protect public health. Therefore, the project would remain inconsistent.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The Authority has incorporated IAMFs into the project to minimize impacts on air quality and public health.</p>

Sources: ABAG and MTC 2017.  
 NAAQS = national ambient air quality standards  
 CAAQS = California ambient air quality standards  
 Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority  
 IAMF = impact avoidance and minimization feature

## Noise and Vibration

**Table 3 Policy Inconsistency, Reconciliation, and Rationale for Noise and Vibration**

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>Santa Clara County General Plan (1994)</b>			
Noise Compatibility for Land Use in Santa Clara County, page P-5	Project implementation would result in noise environments that exceed 70 L <sub>dn</sub> which is <i>Critical</i> for all noise-sensitive land use	<p>This is applicable to all similar inconsistencies with Land Use Compatibility.</p> <p>The project would incorporate NV-MM#3 to minimize operations noise impacts, and it would consider the following: construct noise barriers, support City implementation of Quiet Zones where cities decide to implement them, install sound insulation, or acquire easements on properties severely affected by noise. These determinations would be based on criteria in the Authority’s Noise and Vibration Mitigation Guidelines (Volume 2, Appendix 3.4-B). These measures would reduce or compensate for severe noise impacts from operations. NV-MM#4 requires HSR vehicles to meet federal regulations for noise (40 C.F.R. Part 201.12) at the time of procurement. NV-MM#5 requires the contractor to document how they minimized or eliminated rail gaps related to special trackwork, which can be a major source of noise during operations. NV-MM#6, requires final design noise measures. These mitigation measures would all be effective at reducing the number of severe noise impacts in the RSA; however, they would not mitigate all noise impacts.</p> <p>NV-MM#4 would help to avoid or reduce train horn noise impacts near at-grade crossings with regional implementation of grade separations, but funding is not assured for this mitigation and thus its implementation is uncertain. Thus, there are locations where it is not technically feasible to meet the noise limits.</p>	<p>This is applicable to all similar inconsistencies with Land Use Compatibility.</p> <p>Although mitigation measures would be able to reduce project noise levels, they would not reduce all levels to the standards for residential, commercial, and institutional land uses due to the limitations in noise barrier cost effectiveness, implementation (HSR cannot implement quiet zones; only local jurisdictions can), and funding (in regard to grade separations).</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>Santa Clara County Ordinance Code (2016)</b>			
<p>Construction hours No construction 7 pm to 7 am, weekdays. None allowed on Sundays and holidays</p>	<p>Project construction would occur at night and on weekends outside the hours in the code.</p>	<p>This is applicable to all similar inconsistencies with construction hours. The project would incorporate NV-IAMF#1 to minimize noise impacts by requiring compliance with FRA guidelines for minimizing construction noise and vibration impacts when work is conducted within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors. The Authority would implement NV-MM#1 which would require the contractor to prepare a noise-monitoring program and noise control plan prior to construction to comply with the FRA construction noise limits wherever feasible. The monitoring program would describe the actions the contractor would use to reduce noise, such as installing temporary noise barriers, avoiding nighttime construction near residential areas, and using low-noise emission equipment.</p>	<p>This is applicable to all similar inconsistencies with construction hours. Construction would occur in a constrained operating rail corridor. Track work and some other work would need to be done at night to avoid disruption to Caltrain commuter rail operations and/or roadway operations. Thus, there are locations where it is not technically feasible to meet the noise limits.</p>
<b>City of Santa Clara 2010-2035 General Plan (2010)</b>			
<p>General Plan Noise Standards, Table 8.14-1</p>	<p>Project implementation would result in noise environments that exceed 70 L<sub>dn</sub> which Requires Design and insulation for residential land use/FRA Category 2 and schools and churches, etc./FRA Category 3) or 73 L<sub>dn</sub> which is <i>Incompatible</i> for residential land use/FRA Category 2 and schools and churches, etc./FRA Category 3. At institutional and commercial land use/FRA Category 3, project implementation would result in noise environments that exceed 75 L<sub>dn</sub>/CNEL which requires design and insulation.</p>	<p>This reconciliation is the same as already noted above for Land Use Compatibility.</p>	<p>This rationale is the same as already noted above for Land Use Compatibility</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (2011)</b>			
Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise in San Jose, Table 4	<p>Project implementation would result in noise environments that exceed 70 L<sub>dn</sub> which requires acoustical analysis for residential land use/FRA Category 2 and schools and churches, etc./FRA Category 3.</p> <p>At institutional and commercial land use/FRA Category 3, project implementation would result in noise environments that exceed 77 L<sub>dn</sub> which requires acoustical analysis.</p>	This reconciliation is the same as already noted above for Land Use Compatibility.	This reconciliation is the same as already noted above for Land Use Compatibility
<b>Morgan Hill 2035 General Plan (2016)</b>			
State of California Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise Environments, Table SSI-1	<p>Project implementation would result in noise environments that exceed 70 CNEL which is <i>Normally Unacceptable</i> for residential land use/FRA Category 2 and schools and churches, etc./FRA Category 3, or 75 CNEL which is <i>Clearly Unacceptable</i> for residential land use/FRA Category 2 and schools and churches, etc./FRA Category 3.</p> <p>At office and commercial land use/FRA Category 3, project implementation would result in noise environments that exceed 75 CNEL which is <i>Normally Unacceptable</i>.</p>	This reconciliation is the same as already noted above for Land Use Compatibility.	This rationale is the same as already noted above for Land Use Compatibility
<b>Morgan Hill Municipal Code (2017)</b>			
Section 8.28.040 Construction hours limited to 7 am – 8 pm M-F and 9 am – 6 pm Saturday Not allowed Sundays and holidays	Project construction would occur at night and on weekends outside the hours in the code.	This reconciliation is the same as already noted above for construction hours.	This rationale is the same as already noted above for construction hours.

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>The City of Gilroy 2002-2020 General Plan (2002)</b>			
Permissible (sic) Maximum Outdoor and indoor Noise Levels, Figure 8-3	Project implementation would result in noise environments that exceed the City's 70 L <sub>dn</sub> maximum for residential land use with sound attenuation measures in place.  At commercial land use/FRA Category 3, project implementation would result in noise environments that exceed the City's maximum 65 L <sub>dn</sub> .	This reconciliation is the same as already noted above for Land Use Compatibility.	This rationale is the same as already noted above for Land Use Compatibility
<b>Gilroy Municipal Code (2017)</b>			
Chapter 16 offences, 16.38 construction allowed 7 am – 7 pm M-F and 9 am – 7 pm Sat None allowed Sundays and holidays	Project construction would occur at night and on weekends outside the hours in the code.	This reconciliation is the same as already noted above for construction hours.	This rationale is the same as already noted above for construction hours.
<b>San Benito County 2035 General Plan (2015)</b>			
HS-8.3 construction Allowed 7 am -6 pm M-F and 8 am – 5 pm Saturday. Not allowed Sunday and holidays	Project construction would occur at night and on weekends outside the hours in the code.	This reconciliation is the same as already noted above for construction hours.	This rationale is the same as already noted above for construction hours.
<b>2030 Merced County General Plan (2013)</b>			
HS-7.9 Transportation Project, Policy HS-7.9 Significance thresholds are based on increase over existing: for existing <60 L <sub>dn</sub> an increase over 5 dB would be significant; for existing >65 L <sub>dn</sub> , an increase of more than 1.5 dB would be significant; for existing 60-65 L <sub>dn</sub> , an	Project implementation would result in noise increases that would be up to 23 dBA where the existing noise level is less than 60 L <sub>dn</sub> , 12.5 dBA where the existing noise level is 60 to 65 L <sub>dn</sub> and 8.1 dBA where the existing noise level is greater than 65 L <sub>dn</sub> . These increases would be significant per Merced County General Plan.	The project would incorporate NV-MM#3 to minimize operations noise impacts, and it would consider the following: construct noise barriers, support City implementation of Quiet Zones where cities decide to implement them, install sound insulation, or acquire easements on properties severely affected by noise. These determinations would be based on criteria in the Authority's Noise and Vibration Mitigation Guidelines (Volume 2, Appendix 3.4-B). These measures would reduce or compensate for severe noise impacts from operations. NV-MM#4 requires HSR vehicles to meet federal regulations for noise (40 C.F.R. Part 201.12) at	Although mitigation measures would be able to reduce project noise levels, they would not reduce all levels to the standards for residential, commercial, and institutional land uses due to the limitations in noise barrier cost effectiveness, implementation (HSR cannot implement quiet zones; only local jurisdictions can), and funding (in regard to grade separations).

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
increase more than 3 dB would be significant.		the time of procurement. NV-MM#5 requires the contractor to document how they minimized or eliminated rail gaps related to special trackwork, which can be a major source of noise during operations. NV-MM#6, requires final design noise measures. These mitigation measures would all be effective at reducing the number of severe noise impacts in the RSA; however, they would not mitigate all noise impacts. TR-MM#2 would help to avoid or reduce train horn noise impacts near at-grade crossings with regional implementation of grade separations, but funding is not assured for this mitigation and thus its implementation is uncertain. Thus, there are locations where it is not technically feasible to meet the noise limits.	
Land Use Compatibility, Figure 10.1	Project implementation would result in noise environments that exceed 70 Ldn which is <i>Normally Unacceptable</i> for residential land use/FRA Category 2 and schools and churches, etc./FRA Category 3, or 75 Ldn which is <i>Clearly Unacceptable</i> for residential land use.	This reconciliation is the same as already noted above for Land Use Compatibility.	This rationale is the same as already noted above for Land Use Compatibility.
<b>Merced County Ordinance Code (2016)</b>			
10.60.030 sound level limit Construction hours allowed 7 am to 6 pm	Project construction would occur at night and on weekends outside the hours in the code.	This reconciliation is the same as already noted above for construction hours.	This rationale is the same as already noted above for construction hours.

Sources: City of Gilroy 2002; City of Morgan Hill 2016; City of San Jose 2011; City of Santa Clara 2010; County of Merced 2013; County of San Benito 2015; County of Santa Clara 1994.

## Hydrology and Water Resources

**Table 4 Policy Inconsistency, Reconciliation, and Rationale for Hydrology and Water Resources**

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>City of Morgan Hill General Plan (2016)</b>			
Policy NRE-8.6: Protect properties located in areas that have soils with rapid water percolation from future development in order to ensure existing water quality. Permit development (including commercial and industrial uses) in such areas only under strict safety limitations according to the City's Hazardous Materials Storage Ordinance section specifically related to high percolation rates.	Inconsistent. The project extent is located within groundwater recharge areas and other areas with rapid percolation along the foothills of the Coast Ranges and Diablo Range; such areas are susceptible to contamination from hazardous waste.	A spill prevention, control, and countermeasure plan would control and minimize potential groundwater contamination during construction (HMW-IAMF#6). An Environmental Management System would be developed to identify and promote the use nonhazardous materials (HMW-IAMF#9), which reduce the potential effects of a leak or spill. A hazardous materials and waste plan would be prepared that describes responsible parties and procedures for hazardous waste and the transport of hazardous materials on public roadways (HMW-IAMF#7). Stations and maintenance facilities would be designed to minimize the exposure of pollutants to runoff in accordance with the Phase II MS4 permit. Stations and maintenance facilities would operate under a SWPPP in compliance with the IGP to further minimize potential groundwater quality impacts (HYD-IAMF#4).	While the project extent would develop portions of groundwater recharge areas in the Coyote Valley, which are susceptible to groundwater contamination, project features would minimize potential impacts on groundwater quality.
<b>City of Gilroy General Plan (2002)</b>			
Policy 25.18: Restrict urban development and expansion in areas prone to flooding (as indicated on the Flood Hazards Map) or on properties where drainage problems or saturated soil conditions create flood hazards. Allow development in such areas only if measures are enacted to reduce these hazards to an acceptable level of risk.	Inconsistent. The project extent would include development within areas susceptible to flood hazards within Gilroy, including the construction of viaducts and a maintenance of way facility in the Soap Lake floodplain.	Although the project extent would include development in floodplains, a Flood Protection Plan would be prepared to establish procedures and design features so that the project extent remains operational during the 100-year flood. In addition, the Flood Protection Plan would minimize impacts on the 100-year profiles, footprints, and peak flows of floodplains and floodways, including the Soap Lake floodplain (HYD-IAMF#2).	The project extent would include development within floodplains in Gilroy, because the proposed alignment crosses numerous low-lying areas susceptible to flooding. Project features would minimize potential effects of development in floodplains with a Flood Protection Plan.

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>The Santa Clara Valley Greenprint (2014)</b>			
<p>Strategy 1b: Advocate policies and use land protection measures that prevent urban development in groundwater recharge areas, particularly the Coyote Valley.</p>	<p>Inconsistent. The project extent includes development in groundwater recharge areas in the Coyote Valley.</p>	<p>Although the project extent would include development in groundwater recharge areas, the proposed development would be a small percentage of the overall recharge area. A Stormwater Management and Treatment Plan would include BMPs, such as infiltration BMPs, that would facilitate the percolation of runoff from impervious surfaces (HYD-IAMF#1).</p>	<p>While the project extent would entail development in portions of groundwater recharge areas in the Coyote Valley, project features have been incorporated to minimize impacts on groundwater recharge, including compliance with the Phase II MS4 permit, which requires infiltration BMPs within the southern portion of the Coyote Valley.</p>
<p>Strategy 4a: Ensure that leases and management agreements for the Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority's agricultural tenants are written to protect water resources from depletion, pollution, development, and fire, including promotion of organic operations to limit the use of pesticides and fertilizers.</p>	<p>Inconsistent. Constructing the project extent would require the relocation or modification of existing irrigation and drainage features in agricultural lands, potentially resulting in the degradation of water resources.</p>	<p>Modifying and realigning jurisdictional features would be conducted in compliance with conditions in permits issued by regulatory agencies. During construction, a SWPPP would be implemented under the county general plan to avoid or minimize the discharge of sediment and pollutants to water resources, such as irrigation facilities and drainage features (HYD-IAMF#3). An Annual Vegetation Management Plan would be prepared to avoid or minimize discharges of pesticides during operations.</p>	<p>While construction of the project extent would require the modification and realignment of waterbodies, numerous IAMFs have been incorporated into the project to prevent the degradation and pollution of water resources in the Santa Clara Valley.</p>

Sources: City of Gilroy 2002; City of Morgan Hill 2016; Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority 2014.

## Socioeconomics and Communities

**Table 5 Policy Inconsistency, Reconciliation, and Rationale for Socioeconomics and Communities**

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>Santa Clara County General Plan (1994, 2014)</b>			
<p>Policy HG 21. The conservation and rehabilitation of the existing housing supply shall be encouraged and facilitated.</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>The project extent would require the acquisition of land within the project footprint, result in the demolition of some existing residences that could widen existing community divisions, affect social relationships, and alter the existing character and integrity of the communities through which it passes. Project features and compliance with the Uniform Act would minimize the impacts on existing housing stock by providing relocation assistance for displaced residents. Mitigation measures would partially reduce these impacts; however, some existing housing and businesses would be permanently removed.</p>	<p>The Authority and FRA would work with local governments to enhance the public benefits of HSR development so that they help meet the needs of the local communities, including housing. The Authority must comply with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act, as amended (Uniform Act), as identified in SOCIO-IAMF#2. ^ Despite implementation of ^ design features, the project would remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.</p>	<p>While the project extent would convert residential land uses to transportation and industrial uses, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes features to minimize division of communities and reduction of housing stock.</p>
<b>Envision: San Jose 2040 General Plan (2011) and 2014–23 Housing Element (2015)</b>			
<p>Policy H-2.3. Conserve viable housing stock through a balanced combination of housing code enforcement and complementary programs such as rehabilitation loans and grants to help maintain the supply of low-priced housing.</p> <p>Policy H-3.4. Promote the conservation and rehabilitation of existing viable housing stock.</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>The project extent would require the acquisition of land within the project footprint, result in the demolition of some existing residences that could widen existing community divisions, affect social relationships, and alter the existing character and integrity of the communities through which it passes. Project features would minimize the impacts on existing housing stock by providing replacement housing.</p>	<p>The Authority and FRA would work with local governments to enhance the public benefits of HSR development so that they help meet the needs of the local communities, including housing. The Authority must comply with the Uniform Act, as amended, as identified in SOCIO-IAMF#2. ^ Despite implementation of ^ design features, the project would remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.</p>	<p>While the project extent would convert residential land uses to transportation and industrial uses, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes features to minimize division of communities and reduction of housing stock.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
	Mitigation measures would partially reduce these impacts; however, some existing housing and businesses would be permanently removed.		
<b>Communications Hill Specific Plan (1992)</b>			
Adopt site planning and architectural guidelines and noise attenuation techniques to protect Communications Hill residents and workers from excessive noise from arterials, freeways, the fairground activities, adjacent industrial activities and trains and planes traveling nearby.	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>The project extent would introduce new sources of noise and vibration and could widen existing community divisions and affect social relationships. Project features would minimize the effects of noise and vibration through specific design features such as noise barriers and enclosed viaduct. Mitigation measures would partially reduce these impacts; however, some increased noise would be unavoidable.</p>	The Authority and FRA would work with local governments to enhance the public benefits of HSR development so that they help meet the needs of the local communities. The project includes NV-IAMF#1, Noise and Vibration, which requires that FTA and FRA guidelines for minimizing noise and vibration effects at sensitive receptors would be followed during construction and would minimize the effects of construction noise and vibration on communities. While the project includes this feature to implement urban design guidelines, the project would remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.	While the project extent would result in increased noise and vibration to sensitive receptors, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes features to minimize increased noise and vibration.
<b>Communications Hill Specific Plan Area Development Policy (2014)</b>			
<p>ADP Improvement 8: Capitol Caltrain Station Pedestrian/Bicycle Connection along Monterey Highway.</p> <p>Access from the Communications Hill 2 project site to the Capitol Caltrain Station on the east side of the railroad tracks adjacent to Monterey Road can be acquired by way of three options. These options were developed because property would need to be obtained from private property owners. Option #1 assumes the crossing would located north of the existing Capitol Caltrain Station. The overcrossing location for</p>	<p>Project Alternatives would introduce new tracks, permanent structures, and temporary construction staging where the policy proposes trail and crossing options.</p> <p>Option #1 would be consistent with Alternatives 1 through 4. The proposed trail would pass under the viaducts in Alternatives 1-3. For all alternatives, the crossing would pass over or under the Caltrain and blended corridor.</p>	Conversion of the overcrossing in Option #2 and #3 to an undercrossing would make Option #2 and #3 consistent with Alternatives 1 through 3.	None of the project Alternatives would preclude construction of a pedestrian and bicycle overcrossing at Capitol Caltrain Station. All options proposed in ADP Improvement 8 remain feasible.

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>Options #2 and #3 would be approximately the same; adjacent to or very near the existing Station. The design of the crossing itself would be the same regardless of the access location. These options are generally described below and shown on Figure 2.</p> <p>Option #1 Alignment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construct approximately 400 linear feet of sidewalk or pathway from the project site to the western landing of the future overcrossing to be located north of the existing Capitol Caltrain Station.</li> <li>Construct a pedestrian/bicycle overcrossing between the end of the sidewalk/pathway and the existing sidewalk on the east side of the railroad tracks. The sidewalk on the east side of the railroad tracks along Monterey Road would be utilized to access the Station.</li> <li>Requires right-of-way (easement) from at least one private property owner.</li> <li>Requires coordination/permit from the Joint Powers Board</li> </ul> <p>Option #2 Alignment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construct approximately 1,200 linear feet of pathway or trail from the project site to the western landing of the overcrossing to the Caltrain Station. A portion of this trail would run along the east side of the railroad tracks.</li> </ul>	<p>Option #2 would be consistent with Alternative 4 and inconsistent with Alternatives 1 through 3 as an over crossing would require a substantial increase in crossing height with the construction of the viaduct.</p> <p>Option #3 would be inconsistent with Alternatives 1 through 3 as an over crossing would require a substantial increase in crossing height with the construction of the viaduct. Option #3 would be consistent with Alternative 4 as the Option #3 overcrossing could connect to the overcrossing included in the Alternative 4 Capitol Caltrain Station design.</p>		

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construct a pedestrian/bicycle overcrossing between the end of the pathway/trail and the Station.</li> <li>Requires easement from at least two private property owners.</li> <li>Requires coordination/permit from the Joint Powers Board.</li> </ul> <p>Option #3 Alignment Utilize existing public streets and sidewalks south of the project site to the extent possible to access the future overcrossing. This would require the construction of approximately 2,200 linear feet of new sidewalks from the project site along Hillcap and Hillsdale Avenues and Granite Rock Way. At the terminus of Granite Rock Way, an approximately 400-foot long pathway/trail would be constructed to the western landing of the overcrossing. Construct a pedestrian/bicycle overcrossing between the end of the pathway/trail and the Station.</p>			
<b>Morgan Hill 2035 General Plan (2016) and 2015–2023 Housing Element Update (2015)</b>			
<p>Policy CNF-2.3. Quality of life. Maintain Morgan Hill’s high quality of life for existing and future residents.</p> <p>Policy CNF-11.1. Preservation of Single-Family Neighborhoods. Encourage preservation and rehabilitation of single-family neighborhoods within the City.</p> <p>Policy CNF-15.6. Preservation of Homes Along Monterey Road. Encourage preservation of older homes along</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>The project extent would require the acquisition of land within the project footprint and result in the demolition of some existing residences and commercial and industrial properties that could widen existing community divisions, affect social relationships, reduce the quality of life for residents, and alter the existing character and integrity of the communities through which it passes. Some agricultural land</p>	<p>The Authority and FRA would work with local governments to enhance the public benefits of HSR development so that they help meet the needs of the local communities: Numerous project features and mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce effects on communities from emissions, noise and vibration, risks to community security and safety, degradation of visual quality, and disruption of circulation and access on communities. The Authority will comply</p>	<p>While the project extent would convert residential, commercial and public facilities to transportation and industrial uses, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes features to minimize division of communities, reduction of housing stock, and increased noise and vibration.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>Monterey Road north of Central Avenue for commercial and office use.</p> <p>Policy CNF-17.1. Industrial Land Conversion. Discourage the conversion of property designated for industrial to non-industrial uses.</p> <p>Policy CNF-17.4. Property between Monterey Road and UPRR Tracks. Allow a mix of uses on the property located on the east side of Monterey Road south of the Union Pacific train trestle. Require designs for new development to recognize the significance of this portion of Monterey Road as the northerly entrance to downtown and the necessary limitations on use due to its single point of access.</p> <p>Policy ED-3.1. Business Retention, Expansion, and Attraction Efforts. Encourage retention and expansion of existing businesses, and attract new businesses.</p> <p>Policy ED-3.2. Employment Land Supply. Preserve the City's supply of industrial and commercial lands to support the City's goals and policies related to economic development and jobs-housing balance.</p> <p>Policy NRE-4.1. Agriculture Retention and Transition to Urban Uses. Support programs and techniques, including conservation easements and purchase of development rights to encourage the retention of agricultural activities and to minimize conflicts in the transition from agriculture to urban uses</p>	<p>would be displaced that could result in reduced agricultural production revenues. Project features and compliance with the Uniform Act would minimize the impacts on existing housing stock, commercial and industrial properties, agricultural facilities, and community and public facilities by maintaining access during project extent construction and operation, and offering relocation assistance. Mitigation measures would partially reconcile these impacts; however, some existing housing, commercial and industrial properties, and agricultural land would be permanently removed.</p>	<p>with the Uniform Act to provide relocation assistance for residents, businesses, agricultural properties, and community and public facilities. Despite implementation of project features and mitigation measures, the project would remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.</p>	

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>Policy NRE-4.9. Urban Encroachment. Require new urban development adjacent to an existing agricultural operation to create an appropriate buffer area, on land within the proposed development, between urban uses and agricultural activities.</p> <p>Policy NRE-4.10. Land Use to Support Agricultural Viability. Maintain the economic viability of agriculture using a variety of methods.</p>			
<p>Policy SSI-8.1. Exterior Noise Level Standards. Require new development projects to be designed and constructed to meet acceptable exterior noise level standards.</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>The project extent would introduce new sources of noise and vibration that could widen existing community divisions, affect social relationships, reduce the quality of life for residents, and alter the existing character and integrity of the communities through which it passes. Project features would minimize the impacts from noise and vibration. Mitigation measures would partially reduce these impacts; however, some severe noise effects would remain.</p>	<p>The Authority and FRA would work with local governments to enhance the public benefits of HSR development so that they help meet the needs of the local communities. The project includes features to minimize noise (NV-IAMF#1) to the maximum extent feasible. While the project includes this feature to implement urban design guidelines, the project would remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.</p>	<p>While the project extent would result in increased noise and vibration to sensitive receptors, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes features to minimize increased noise and vibration.</p>
<p><b>Downtown Morgan Hill Specific Plan (2009)</b></p>			
<p>Encourage the preservation of the small-scale residential neighborhoods west of Monterey Road and north of Fourth Street.</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>The East of UPRR design option under Alternative 2 would travel through these neighborhoods and would require the acquisition of land within the project footprint, introduce new sources of noise and vibration, and result in the demolition of some existing residences that could widen existing community divisions, affect social relationships, reduce the quality of life for residents, and alter the</p>	<p>The Authority and FRA would work with local governments to enhance the public benefits of HSR development so that they help meet the needs of the local communities. Numerous project features have been incorporated to minimize effects on communities, including housing. While the project includes these features, the project would remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.</p>	<p>While the project extent would convert residential land uses to transportation and industrial uses, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes features to minimize division of communities and reduction of housing stock.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
	<p>existing character and integrity of the communities through which it passes. Project features and compliance with the Uniform Act would minimize the impacts on existing housing stock by providing by providing relocation assistance for displaced residents and would minimize the impacts from noise and vibration and changes in visual character. Mitigation measures would partially reduce these impacts; however, some existing housing and businesses would be permanently removed, some increased noise would be unavoidable, and there would be a change in the existing visual environment.</p>		
<b>City of Gilroy 2020 General Plan (2002) and 2015-23 Housing Element (2014)</b>			
<p>Policy 4.01. Economic Viability of Agriculture. Support the long-term economic viability of agriculture and agri-tourism, thereby encouraging landowners to keep their land in cultivation.</p> <p>Policy 4.02, Agricultural Land Preservation. Work with the County, LAFCo, and other relevant agencies as well as private landowners to protect agricultural and grazing lands from encroachment by urban uses, and to encourage the use of such lands for active cultivation. Specifically, implement the strategies and actions recommended by the South County Agricultural Study (Strategies to Balance Planned Growth and Agricultural Viability in the Areas South and East of Gilroy, October 1996).</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>The project extent would require the acquisition of agricultural land within the project footprint that could result in reduced agricultural production revenues. Project features would minimize the impacts on existing housing stock and agricultural facilities by maintaining access for agricultural operations during construction and operation, and offering relocation assistance. Mitigation measures would partially reduce these impacts; however, some existing agricultural land would be permanently removed.</p>	<p>The Authority and FRA would work with local governments to enhance the public benefits of HSR development so that they help meet the needs of the local communities: Numerous project features have been incorporated to minimize effects on communities, including agricultural properties. While the project includes these features, the project would remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.</p>	<p>While the project extent would convert farmland to transportation and industrial uses, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes features to minimize effects on agricultural properties.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>Santa Benito County 2035 General Plan (2015)</b>			
<p>Policy LU-3.2 Agricultural Integrity and Flexibility. The County shall protect the integrity of existing agricultural resources, and provide for flexibility and economic viability of farming and ranching operations.</p> <p>Policy NCR-1.1 Maintenance of Open Space. The County shall support and encourage maintenance of open space lands that support natural resources, agricultural resources, recreation, tribal resources, wildlife habitat, water management, scenic quality, and other beneficial uses.</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>The project extent would reduce the amount of land available for agricultural production. The project extent would introduce a large visual element into the existing rural landscape that would alter the rural character and natural beauty of the area. The project extent would also result in displacements of farm residences, acquisition of agricultural parcels, and splitting of some agricultural parcels along the alignment, resulting in the conversion of agricultural land, conflicts with the overall aim of the general plan policies, and short-term economic impacts. Project features and mitigation measures would reduce economic impacts, and compensation would be distributed on a case-by-case basis for split parcels. The project extent would result in overall economic benefits and facilitate regional economic expansion.</p>	<p>The Authority and FRA would work with local governments to enhance the public benefits of HSR development so that they help meet the needs of the local communities. Numerous project features have been incorporated to minimize effects on communities, including agricultural properties and open space. While the project includes these features, the project would remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.</p>	<p>While the project extent would convert farmland and open space to transportation and industrial uses, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes features to minimize effects on agricultural properties and open space.</p>
<b>2030 Merced County General Plan (2013)</b>			
<p>Policy AG-2.2. Agricultural Land Mitigation (RDR) Protect productive agricultural areas from conversion to non-agricultural residential uses by establishing and implementing an agricultural mitigation program that matches acres converted with farmland acres of similar quality to those converted preserved at a 1:1 ratio. Coordinate with the six cities in Merced County and the Merced Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo), consistent with</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>The project extent would reduce the amount of land available for agricultural production. The project extent would also result in displacements of farm residences, acquisition of agricultural parcels, and splitting of some agricultural parcels along the alignment, resulting in the conversion of agricultural land, conflicts with the overall aim of the general plan policies, and short-term</p>	<p>The Authority and FRA would work with local governments to enhance the public benefits of HSR development so that they help meet the needs of the local communities. Numerous project features have been incorporated to minimize effects on communities, including agricultural properties. While the project includes these features, the project would remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.</p>	<p>While the project extent would convert farmland to transportation and industrial uses, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes features to minimize effects on agricultural properties.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>LAFCo’s statutory mission to preserve agricultural land and open space, to establish consistent standards and mitigation for the loss of farmland. In addition, the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (LESA model) may be used to determine whether the conservation land is of equal or greater value than the land being converted.</p> <p>Policy AG-2.8. Conservation Easements (RDR/MPSP) Support the efforts of public, private, and non-profit organizations to preserve agricultural areas in the County through dedicated conservation easements, and range land held as environmental mitigation.</p>	<p>economic impacts. Project features and mitigation measures would reduce economic impacts, and compensation would be distributed on a case-by-case basis for split parcels. The project extent would result in overall economic benefits and facilitate regional economic expansion.</p>		
<p>Policy HS-7.4. New Noise or Groundborne Vibration Generating Uses (RDR) Require new commercial and industrial uses to minimize encroachment on incompatible noise or groundborne vibration sensitive land uses. Also consider the potential for encroachment by residential and other noise or groundborne vibration sensitive land uses on adjacent lands that could significantly impact the viability of the commercial or industrial areas.</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>The project extent would introduce new sources of noise and vibration that could widen existing community divisions, affect social relationships, reduce the quality of life for residents, and alter the existing character and integrity of the communities through which it passes. Project features would minimize the impacts from noise and vibration. Mitigation measures would partially reduce these impacts; however, some severe noise effects would remain.</p>	<p>The Authority and FRA would work with local governments to enhance the public benefits of HSR development so that they help meet the needs of the local communities. The project includes features to minimize noise (NV-IAMF#1) to the maximum extent feasible. While the project includes this feature to implement urban design guidelines, the project would remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.</p>	<p>While the project extent would result in increased noise and vibration to sensitive receptors, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes measures to minimize increased noise and vibration.</p>

Sources: City of Gilroy 2002, 2014; City of Morgan Hill 2009, 2015, 2016; City of San Jose 1992, 2011, 2015; County of Merced 2013; County of San Benito 2015; County of Santa Clara 1994, 2014. The Project Section’s consistency with regional and local plans and policies is assessed for adopted plans only.

## Station Planning, Land Use, and Development

**Table 6 Policy Inconsistency, Reconciliation, and Rationale for Station Planning, Land Use, and Development**

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>2030 Merced County General Plan (2013)</b>			
<p>Policy LU-2.3: Land Use Activity Limitations (RDR)                      -- Limit allowed land use within Agricultural and Foothill Pasture areas to agricultural crop production, farm support operations, and grazing and open space uses.</p>	<p>All project alternatives, as one component of the overall statewide HSR system, would introduce a non-allowable land use within Agricultural and Foothill Pasture areas. Alternative 3 would result in the greatest inconsistency with this policy because it would affect the greatest amount of agricultural and pasture land.</p>	<p>The Authority and FRA would work with local governments to enhance the public benefits of HSR development so that they help meet the needs of the local communities, including housing and job opportunities (LU-IAMF#1: HSR Station Area Development: General Principles and Guidelines, and LU-IAMF#2: Station Area Planning and Local Agency Coordination). While the project includes features to implement urban design guidelines to maximize compatible design, the project would introduce a non-allowable use into agricultural and pasture zones and would remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.</p>	<p>While the project extent would introduce non-permitted transportation and industrial uses into agricultural zones, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR system. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes features to minimize conflicts with existing land uses (including agricultural land) and land use plans.</p>
<b>Santa Clara County General Plan (1994)</b>			
<p>Policy R-LU 2: Rural unincorporated lands outside cities' Urban Service Areas that are not designated 'Rural Residential' or other specialized land uses shall be designated as a type of 'Resource Conservation Area.' These lands consist primarily of the mountains and foothills, Bay wetlands and lowlands, and valley agricultural lands.</p> <p>Policy R-LU 3: The general intent of each 'Resource Conservation Area' designation is to encourage land uses and densities appropriate to the rural unincorporated areas that also:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. help preserve rural character;</li> <li>b. conserve natural, scenic, and cultural resources;</li> </ol>	<p>All project for alternatives would result in introduction of transportation and industrial uses into Resource Conservation Areas and non-permitted land uses into designated agricultural areas. Alternative 3 would result in the greatest inconsistency with this policy because it would affect the greatest amount of agricultural and pasture land.</p>	<p>The Authority and FRA would work with local governments to enhance the public benefits of HSR development so that they help meet the needs of the local communities, including housing and job opportunities (LU-IAMF#1: HSR Station Area Development: General Principles and Guidelines, and LU-IAMF#2: Station Area Planning and Local Agency Coordination). While the project includes features to implement urban design guidelines to maximize compatible design, the project would introduce a non-permitted use into agricultural zones and would remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.</p>	<p>While the project extent would introduce non-permitted transportation and industrial uses into agricultural zones, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR system. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes features to minimize conflicts with existing land uses (including agricultural land) and land use plans.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>c. protect public health and safety from natural and man-made hazards;</p> <p>d. preserve agriculture and prime agricultural soils;</p> <p>e. protect watersheds and water quality;</p> <p>f. enhance air quality; and</p> <p>g. minimize the demand for and cost of public services and facilities.</p> <p>Policy R-LU-11: Allowable land uses shall be limited to: a. agriculture and ancillary uses; b. uses necessary to directly support local agriculture; and c. other uses compatible with agriculture which clearly enhance the long term viability of local agriculture and agricultural lands.</p>			
<b>Morgan Hill 2035 General Plan (2016)</b>			
<p>Policy NRE-1.4. South County Open Space. Preserve and maintain the wide variety of open spaces in the South County; including greenbelt areas, parks, and agricultural uses.</p>	<p>All project alternatives would result in loss of existing open space areas. Alternative 3 would result in the greatest inconsistency with this policy because it would affect the greatest amount of open space area.</p>	<p>The Authority and FRA would work with local governments to enhance the public benefits of HSR development so that they help meet the needs of the local communities, including housing and job opportunities (LU-IAMF#1: HSR Station Area Development: General Principles and Guidelines, and LU-IAMF#2: Station Area Planning and Local Agency Coordination). The project would also incorporate features to minimize impacts on open space, including PK-IAMF#1: Parks, Recreation, and Open Space. While the project includes features to implement urban design guidelines to maximize compatible design and features to minimize effects on open space, the project would remove areas of open space and would remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.</p>	<p>While the project extent would remove some open space, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR system. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes features to minimize conflicts with existing land uses (including agricultural land) and land use plans.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>San Benito County 2035 General Plan (2015)</b>			
<p>Policy NCR-1.1 Maintenance of Open Space. The County shall support and encourage maintenance of open space lands that support natural resources, agricultural resources, recreation, tribal resources, wildlife habitat, water management, scenic quality, and other beneficial uses.</p>	<p>All project alternatives would result in loss of existing open space areas. Alternative 3 would result in the greatest inconsistency with this policy because it would affect the greatest amount of open space area.</p>	<p>The Authority and FRA would work with local governments to enhance the public benefits of HSR development so that they help meet the needs of the local communities, including housing and job opportunities (LU-IAMF#1: HSR Station Area Development: General Principles and Guidelines, and LU-IAMF#2: Station Area Planning and Local Agency Coordination). The project would also incorporate features to minimize impacts on open space, including PK-IAMF#1: Parks, Recreation, and Open Space. While the project includes features to implement urban design guidelines to maximize compatible design and features to minimize effects on open space, the project would remove areas of open space and would remain inconsistent. Not reconciled.</p>	<p>While the project extent would remove some open space, the Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR system. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes features to minimize conflicts with existing land uses (including agricultural land) and land use plans.</p>

Sources: City of Morgan Hill 2016; County of Merced 2013; County of San Benito 2015; County of Santa Clara 1994.

The project extent's consistency with regional and local plans and policies is assessed for adopted plans only.

HSR = high-speed rail

Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority

FRA = Federal Railroad Administration

IAMF = impact avoidance and minimization feature

## Agricultural Farmland

**Table 7 Policy Inconsistency, Reconciliation, and Rationale for Agricultural Farmland**

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>Plan Bay Area 2040 (2017)</b>			
<p>Goal: Open Space and Agricultural Preservation. Direct development within urban footprint ... [The goal's] intent [is] to shift travel mode [from car-centric transportation] and achieve the plan's open space and agricultural preservation target.</p>	<p>Inconsistent Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert substantial Important Farmland for operational infrastructure.</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, Conserve Important Farmland (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Farmland of Local Importance, and Unique Farmland), the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program's purchase of agricultural easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the project extent. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>
<b>Santa Clara County General Plan, 1995–2010 (1994)</b>			
<p>C-RC 37: Agriculture should be encouraged and agricultural lands retained for their vital contributions to the overall economy, quality of life, and for their functional importance to Santa Clara County.</p> <p>C-RC 40. Long term land use stability and dependability to preserve agriculture shall be maintained and enhanced by the following general means:</p>	<p>Inconsistent Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert substantial Important Farmland for operational infrastructure.</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, Conserve Important Farmland (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Farmland of Local Importance, and Unique Farmland), the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program's purchase of agricultural easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the project extent. In addition, the Authority would fund the</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>b. regulating non-agricultural uses in agricultural areas, and their intensity and impacts on adjacent lands</p> <p>c. maintaining agriculturally-viable parcel sizes</p> <p>R-GD 1.1 1. Preserve the resources and rural character of lands outside Urban Service Areas (USAs).</p> <p>R-GD 3e. Land uses and development permitted under County jurisdiction shall be consistent with the following major County policies:</p> <p>e. preservation of agriculture.</p> <p>R-RC 40b. Long term land use stability and dependability to preserve agriculture shall be maintained and enhanced by the following general means:</p> <p>b. regulating non-agricultural uses in agricultural areas, and their intensity and impacts on adjacent lands</p> <p>R-RC 57 c. Agriculture shall be encouraged and prime agricultural lands retained for their value to the overall economy and quality of life of Santa Clara County, including:</p> <p>c. preservation of a diminishing natural resource, prime agricultural soils.</p> <p>R-LU-8. Santa Clara County is enriched by a special combination of the very finest soils, a very favorable, dependable growing climate, and generally adequate water supplies.... This combination of factors makes it highly desirable that certain lands be preserved for their intrinsic value as</p>		<p>purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>agricultural land and for productive agricultural land uses.</p> <p>SC 14.4. Some prime agricultural lands in South County (particularly within the prime agricultural areas east and south of Gilroy) should be preserved for agricultural use.</p>			
<p>R-RC 61 a, b, c. Allowable land uses in exclusive agricultural areas shall be limited to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. agriculture and ancillary uses,</li> <li>b. uses necessary to directly support local agriculture, and</li> <li>c. other uses compatible with agriculture which clearly enhance the long term viability of local agriculture and agricultural lands.</li> </ul> <p>R-LU 11 a, b, c. Allowable land uses shall be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. agriculture and ancillary uses;</li> <li>b. uses necessary to directly support local agriculture; and</li> <li>c. other uses compatible with agriculture which clearly enhance the long term viability of local agriculture and agricultural lands.</li> </ul>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would not serve as an agricultural use and would not provide direct or indirect support to agricultural farmland.</p>	<p>While the project extent alternatives would not provide direct or indirect support to agricultural land, under AG-IAMF#6, Equipment Crossings, the Authority in coordination with the property owners of land in use for agricultural operations would finalize the realignments of any affected access roads to provide equipment crossings to minimize impediments to routine agricultural operations and normal business activities that may result from long-term operation of the project extent. In this way, the project extent would remain as compatible as possible with livestock and equipment movement.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this feature to minimize inconsistency with agricultural farmland, the project extent does not directly support local agriculture nor would it enhance the long term viability of local agriculture and agricultural lands. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>HSR has a restricted right-of-way and a limited number of stations. This combination of factors limits the potential for HSR to have an effect outside the immediate corridor.</p>
<p>R-LU-3 d. The general intent of each 'Resource Conservation Area' designation is to encourage land uses and densities appropriate to the rural unincorporated areas that also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. preserve agriculture and prime agricultural soils.</li> </ul>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert Important Farmlands within an Agricultural Conservation Easement.</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program's purchase of agricultural easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the Central Valley Wye. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
		<p>Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	
<b>Santa Clara County Code of Ordinances (2018)</b>			
<p>Title 18 Zoning, Chapter 18.08 Regulations for A- Agricultural Zoning Districts. Chapter 18.08 designates agricultural zones and permitted uses allowed therein.</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert Important Farmland for operational infrastructure.</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program's purchase of agricultural easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the Central Valley Wye. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>
<b>Santa Clara Valley Agricultural Plan (2018)</b>			
<p><b>Focus Area: Land Use Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Objective 1:</b> Recognize Viable Agricultural Lands and Sub-Areas Within the County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.</li> </ul> <p>Strategies / Actions</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would not serve as an agricultural use and would not extend zoning or agricultural designations.</p>	<p>While the project extent alternatives would not provide direct or indirect support to agricultural land, under AG-IAMF#6, Equipment Crossings, the Authority in coordination with the property owners of land in use for agricultural operations would finalize the realignments of any affected access roads to provide equipment crossings to minimize impediments to routine agricultural operations and normal business activities that may result from long-term operation of the project extent.</p>	<p>HSR has a restricted right-of-way and a limited number of stations. This combination of factors limits the potential for HSR to have an effect outside the immediate corridor.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Extend Agricultural zoning to encompass all viable agricultural lands.</li> <li>b. Consider designation of agricultural zoning regions specific to sub-areas in the Agricultural Resource Area (ARA) that share a common identity, for focused application of agricultural protection tools.</li> <li>c. Coordinate with neighboring Santa Clara Valley cities to create consistency in the designation of agricultural areas between the County and Cities' General Plans.</li> </ul>		<p>In this way, the project extent would remain as compatible as possible with livestock and equipment movement.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this feature to minimize inconsistency with agricultural farmland, the project extent does not directly support local agriculture nor would it enhance the long term viability of local agriculture and agricultural lands. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Objective 2:</b> Prevent the Conversion of Agricultural Lands to Non-Agricultural Uses Within the Rural Areas.</li> </ul> <p>Strategies / Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Prevent the establishment of incompatible uses within the ARA which increase land speculation and impair ongoing agricultural production.</li> <li>b. Prevent conversion of agricultural lands into rural ranchettes that increase land speculation and reduce viability of ongoing neighboring farm operations.</li> <li>c. Enact a County-wide agricultural mitigation fee that requires a mitigation fee for development that converts viable agricultural land to other uses.</li> </ul>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert substantial Important Farmland for operational infrastructure.</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, Conserve Important Farmland (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Farmland of Local Importance, and Unique Farmland), the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program's purchase of agricultural conservation easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the project extent. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>▪ <b>Objective 4:</b> Reduce Conflict Between Incompatible Uses and Agriculture Within Agricultural Areas.</p> <p>Strategies / Actions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Require setbacks/buffers for new non-agricultural development within or adjacent to agricultural lands to reduce interface between incompatible land uses and farming.</li> <li>b. Strengthen right-to-farm requirements.</li> </ol>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would not serve as an agricultural use and would not provide direct or indirect support to agricultural farmland.</p>	<p>While the project extent alternatives would not provide direct or indirect support to agricultural land, under AG-IAMF#6, Equipment Crossings, the Authority in coordination with the property owners of land in use for agricultural operations would finalize the realignments of any affected access roads to provide equipment crossings to minimize impediments to routine agricultural operations and normal business activities that may result from long-term operation of the project extent. In this way, the project extent would remain as compatible as possible with livestock and equipment movement.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this feature to minimize inconsistency with agricultural farmland, the project extent does not directly support local agriculture nor would it enhance the long term viability of local agriculture and agricultural lands. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>HSR has a restricted right-of-way and a limited number of stations. This combination of factors limits the potential for HSR to have an effect outside the immediate corridor.</p>
<p><b>Focus Area: Regional Agricultural Conservation Easement Program and Other Voluntary Financial Incentives</b></p> <p>▪ <b>Objective 5:</b> Establish a Regional Agricultural Conservation Easement Purchasing Program for the Santa Clara Valley.</p> <p>Strategies / Actions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Establish a Regional ACE Purchasing Program.</li> </ol>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert Important Farmlands within an Agricultural Conservation Easement.</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program's purchase of agricultural conservation easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the Central Valley Wye. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>▪ <b>Objective 6:</b> Encourage Landowners to Take Advantage of Property Tax Incentives to Keep Land in Agriculture.</p> <p>Strategies / Actions</p> <p>a. Increase participation in the County’s Williamson Act Program and Establish a Farmland Security Zone Program.</p>	<p>Inconsistent.</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert Important Farmland, potentially creating remainder parcels that would not meet county criteria for inclusion in Williamson Act and Farmland Security Zone programs and convert Important Farmlands within an Agricultural Conservation Easement</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program’s purchase of agricultural conservation easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the Central Valley Wye. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>
<p>▪ <b>Objective 7:</b> Identify Opportunities and Create Programs that Provide Financial Compensation to Farmers for Providing Ecosystem Benefits (GHG Reduction, Groundwater and Floodplain Protection) Through Farming.</p> <p>Strategies / Actions</p> <p>a. One of the most important means to protect the local agricultural land base is to help ensure that farmers and ranchers can stay profitable over the long-term, reducing the pressure to sell land for development.</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert Important Farmlands for operational infrastructure.</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program’s purchase of agricultural conservation easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the Central Valley Wye. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p><b>Focus Area: Agricultural Economic Development Strategy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Objective 8:</b> Support the viability of the agricultural economy.</li> </ul> <p>Strategies / Actions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Support farmers in obtaining permits and regulatory compliance associated with actions and activities that support long term agricultural investment and growth of the agricultural economy.</li> </ol>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert Important Farmlands for operational infrastructure.</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program’s purchase of agricultural conservation easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the Central Valley Wye. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Objective 9:</b> Improve the Climate for the Growth of a Diverse, Vibrant, and Innovative Agriculture Economy.</li> </ul> <p>Strategies / Actions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Create an Agricultural Enterprise Program for specific sub-areas of the ARA.</li> <li>b. Coordinate and support the small farms initiative effort under way by the SCC Food Systems Alliance.</li> <li>c. Support expansion of ag tourism.</li> <li>d. Address the need for additional distribution and processing space for agricultural products; include assessment of “hubs” for co-located businesses.</li> </ol>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert Important Farmlands for operational infrastructure.</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program’s purchase of agricultural conservation easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the Central Valley Wye. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>▪ <b>Objective 10:</b> Support the Growth of New Farms and Creation of New Farmers to Provide Diversity and Long-Term Resiliency in the Local Agricultural Economy.</p> <p>Strategies / Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Address the needs of beginning and immigrant farmers, currently in the Country or interested in starting farming operations in the County, for land access, technical assistance and financial assistance.</li> <li>b. Develop an action plan for implementation of a Farm Incubator or AgPark, with related programs.</li> </ul>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert Important Farmlands for operational infrastructure</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program’s purchase of agricultural conservation easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the Central Valley Wye. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>
<p><b>Santa Clara Valley GreenPrint (2014))</b></p>			
<p><b>Goal: Conserve farms, ranches, and other working landscapes to sustain the economic viability of local agriculture.</b></p> <p><b>Strategies for Protecting Farms, Ranches, and Other Working Lands</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Protect farms and ranches through fee purchase, conservation easements, and other incentives. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Partner with local and regional conservation organizations to secure funding for regionally significant farm and ranch protection projects with a focus on (1) farms and ranches that demonstrate long-term economic viability and operational adaptability,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert substantial Important Farmland for operational infrastructure.</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, Conserve Important Farmland (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Farmland of Local Importance, and Unique Farmland), the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program’s purchase of agricultural easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the project extent. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>and that provide multiple environmental benefits and (2) urban-edge farmlands threatened by conversion to non-agricultural uses.</p> <p>b. Increase the Authority’s funding and staffing capacity to manage conservation easements by developing program guidelines and mitigation policies.</p> <p>c. Explore the use of new conservation tools to help make farming economically viable, such as affirmative easements, right to purchase at farm value, and payment for ecosystem service programs.</p> <p>d. As new funding becomes available, develop a matching grant program to fund local Resource Conservation Districts, UC Cooperative Extension, land trusts, or other nonprofit conservation partners that assist farmers and ranchers with agricultural and natural resource protection projects.</p> <p>f. Work with conservation partners to conduct outreach to agricultural landowners to raise awareness about the Authority’s conservation programs.</p>		<p>to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	
<p>2. Manage Open Space Authority lands for natural resource protection and viable agricultural operations, and to model effective public-private partnerships.</p> <p>a. Engage experts to develop comprehensive management plans</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert Important Farmland for operational infrastructure.</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program’s purchase of agricultural easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>for Authority properties and easements that integrate agricultural and natural resources.</p> <p>b. Work with the Natural Resources Conservation Service, Resource Conservation Districts, and other partners to share best practices for land management and secure funding to implement farm and rangeland conservation projects on Authority preserves and nearby private lands that enhance water quality, habitat protection, carbon sequestration, and other ecosystem services.</p> <p>c. Demonstrate and interpret successful conservation practices on Authority lands, such as hedgerows, sediment basins, irrigation efficiency projects, or other climate-smart projects.</p> <p>d. Explore opportunities for beginning farmers to lease Authority agricultural lands, for example, through California FarmLink. Offer competitive leases and long-term land security in exchange for tenants' commitment to implementing on-farm conservation and stewardship projects.</p>		<p>replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the Central Valley Wye. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>
<p>4. Engage in local, regional, and state land use planning and policy projects to promote farm and rangeland protection and the economic viability of regional agriculture.</p> <p>a. Work with the Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert Important Farmland for operational infrastructure.</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program's purchase of agricultural easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>Commission (LAFCO), the County, and cities to maintain and strengthen agricultural zoning, maintain effective urban growth boundaries, and develop and implement effective agricultural mitigation policies and projects.</p> <p>b. Work with state legislators to restore funding for the Williamson Act (including a focus on urban-edge farms, which are grossly underrepresented in Williamson Act contracts) and engage County leadership to secure funding and provide incentives, such as transportation project mitigation, and urban agriculture incentive zones to increase agricultural viability and protect open space.</p> <p>c. Advocate for agricultural tax credits such as California’s Natural Heritage Tax Credit program.</p> <p>e. Initiate multi-benefit agricultural conservation projects that contribute to groundwater recharge and water supplies, water quality, and flood risk reduction.</p> <p>g. Advocate for a portion of AB 32 cap-and-trade revenues to be directed to farmland conservation.</p> <p>h. Strengthen SB 375 to integrate agricultural protection into the local Sustainable Communities Strategy (Plan Bay Area) and to promote agricultural protection within Association of Bay Area</p>		<p>replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the Central Valley Wye. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>Government (ABAG) Priority Conservation Areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Support adoption of minimum statewide standards for mitigating the loss of farmland when a project results in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.</li> <li>j. Engage with transportation projects needing agricultural mitigation, such as the High Speed Rail and highway widening projects.</li> <li>k. Support implementation of a local agricultural enterprise zone to use tax benefits to incentivize farmland protection and value-added farm enterprises</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Pajaro River Watershed Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (2014)</b></p>			
<p><b>Flood Protection Goal:</b> Ensure flood management strategies are developed and implemented through a collaborative and watershed-wide approach and are designed to maximize opportunities for comprehensive management of water resources.</p> <p><b>Objectives:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Reach consensus on the Pajaro River Risk Reduction Project necessary to protect existing urban areas and infrastructure from flooding and erosion from the 100-year event and to maximize opportunities to protect agricultural land uses.</li> <li>5. Provide community benefits beyond flood protection such as public access, open space, recreation, agriculture preservation and economic development</li> </ul>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert Important Farmland for operational infrastructure.</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program’s purchase of agricultural easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the Central Valley Wye. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>Envision San José 2040 (2011)</b>			
<p>LU-20.1 1. Protect and preserve the remaining farmlands within San José's sphere of influence that are not planned for urbanization in the timeframe of the Envision General Plan, such as mid- and south Coyote Valley, through the following means:</p> <p>1. Strongly discourage conversion of agricultural lands outside the Urban Growth Boundary to non-agricultural uses.</p> <p>LU-20.9. Explore use of agricultural easements, transfer/purchase of development rights, or other options to keep Mid-Coyote Valley as permanent agriculture.</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert Important Farmland for operational infrastructure.</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program's purchase of agricultural easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the Central Valley Wye. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>
<b>Morgan Hill 2035 General Plan (2016)</b>			
<p>NRE-1.4. South County Open Space. Preserve and maintain the wide variety of open spaces in the South County; including greenbelt areas, parks, and agricultural uses.</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert Important Farmland for operational infrastructure.</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program's purchase of agricultural easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the Central Valley Wye. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
		to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.  Not reconciled.	
<b>Morgan Hill ZA-14-11 Agricultural Mitigation Ordinance (2015)</b>			
1. Preserve open space agricultural lands and agricultural activity within the Morgan Hill sphere of influence.	Inconsistent Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert Important Farmland for operational infrastructure.	Through AG-MM#1, the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program’s purchase of agricultural easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the Central Valley Wye. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.  While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.  Not reconciled.	The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.
<b>Gilroy 2020 General Plan (2002)</b>			
4.02. Agricultural Land Preservation. Work with the County, LAFCo, and other relevant agencies as well as private landowners to protect agricultural and grazing lands from encroachment by urban uses, and to encourage the use of such lands for active cultivation. Specifically, implement the strategies and actions recommended by the South County Agricultural Study (Strategies to Balance Planned Growth and Agricultural Viability in the Areas South and East of Gilroy, October 1996).	Inconsistent Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert Important Farmland for operational infrastructure.	Through AG-MM#1, the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program’s purchase of agricultural easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the Central Valley Wye. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important	The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
		<p>Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	
<b>2035 San Benito County General Plan (2015)</b>			
<p>LU-3.2. Agricultural Integrity and Flexibility. The County shall protect the integrity of existing agricultural resources, and provide for flexibility and economic viability of farming and ranching operations.</p> <p>LU-3.12. Agricultural Viability of Small Parcel Sizes. The County shall require project applicants seeking to subdivide agriculturally-zoned parcels to demonstrate the continued viability of lots less than 40 acres for commercial agriculture operations.</p> <p>LU-3.14. Land Trusts and Financial Incentives. The County shall consider land trusts and financial incentives to preserve agricultural soil resources and to protect the integrity of important agricultural areas for future use.</p> <p>NCR-1.1. Maintenance of Open Space. The County shall support and encourage maintenance of open space lands that support agricultural resources.</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert Important Farmland for operational infrastructure.</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program's purchase of agricultural easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the Central Valley Wye. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>
<b>2030 Merced County General Plan (2013)</b>			
<p>AG-2.16: Coordinate with the California High-Speed Rail Authority to locate the high-speed rail lines along existing major transportation corridors, such as SRs 99 or 152, to minimize the conversion of</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would not create high-speed rail lines that fully follow an existing major</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program's purchase of agricultural easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>productive agricultural land to nonagricultural uses.</p>	<p>transportation corridor along portions of its length within Merced County.</p>	<p>the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the Central Valley Wye. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>
<p><b>City of Los Banos 2030 General Plan Update (2009)</b></p>			
<p>Policy POSR-G-8: Promote preservation of agriculture within the Planning Area.</p> <p>Policy POSR-I-28: Work with the County and with the Grasslands Water District to preserve agricultural uses outside the Urban Growth Boundary.</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any of the alternatives would permanently convert substantial Important Farmland for operational infrastructure.</p>	<p>Through AG-MM#1, Conserve Important Farmland (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Farmland of Local Importance, and Unique Farmland), the Authority would fund the DOC California Farmland Conservancy Program’s purchase of agricultural easements from willing sellers. This program would preserve Important Farmland in an amount commensurate with the quantity and quality of the converted farmlands, within the same agricultural regions as the impacts occur. The replacement ratio would be 1:1 for lands that are permanently, directly converted to nonagricultural use by the project extent. In addition, the Authority would fund the purchase of an additional increment of acreage for agricultural conservation easements at a ratio of not less than 0.5:1 for Important Farmland within a 25-foot wide area adjacent to HSR permanently fenced infrastructure.</p> <p>While the project extent includes this mitigation to preserve agricultural farmland, Important Farmland would be converted to nonagricultural uses. As a result, the project extent would remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project extent design includes measures to minimize conversion of agricultural lands.</p>

Sources: ABAG and MTC 2018; City of Gilroy 2002; City of Los Banos 2009; City of Morgan Hill 2016; City of San Jose 2011; County of Merced 2013; County of San Benito 2015; County of Santa Clara 1994.  
 DOC = California Department of Conservation  
 HSR = high-speed rail

Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority  
 LAFCo = Local Agency Formation Commission

## Aesthetics and Visual Quality

**Table 8 Policy Inconsistency, Reconciliation, and Rationale for Aesthetics and Visual Quality**

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>Santa Clara County General Plan (1994)</b>			
Policy C-GD 17: Provide protection of a scenic corridor in Coyote Valley adjacent to US 101.	Inconsistent C-GD 17. Implementation of the East Gilroy LMF/MOWF under Alternative 3 or South Gilroy LMF/MOWF under Alternatives 1 and 2 would place a large industrial facility in a rural agricultural setting east of the city of Gilroy that would degrade the visual environment.	Prior to construction the contractor will document, through issue of a technical memorandum, how the Authority’s aesthetic guidelines have been employed to minimize visual impacts. The Authority seeks to balance providing a consistent, project-wide aesthetic with the local context for the numerous HSR non-station structures across the state. Examples of aesthetic options that can be applied to non-standard structures in the HSR system will be provided to local jurisdictions (AVR-IAMF#1). The Authority will also require its contractors to document that the Authority’s <i>Aesthetic Design Review Process</i> has been followed (AVR-IAMF#2).  While the proposed project includes these features to minimize visual impacts, it will remain inconsistent.  Not reconciled.	The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes measures that will soften the appearance of HSR infrastructure to minimize visual impacts on sensitive viewers.
Policy C-PR 39: Protect the visual integrity of the scenic gateways to the South County (Pacheco Pass, Hecker Pass, Route 101 south of Gilroy, and a Coyote greenbelt area north of Morgan Hill).  Policy R-PR 41: Protect the visual integrity of the scenic gateways to the South County—Pacheco Pass, Hecker Pass, Route 101 south of Gilroy, and a Coyote greenbelt area north of Morgan Hill.	Inconsistent Implementation of any alternative would degrade the visual environment along SR 152 in the Pacheco Creek Valley by regrading and removing the existing topography and land cover to provide a tunnel portal. Alternatives 1 and 3 would implement HSR aerial structure parallel to US 101 in the Coyote Valley that would block views and overwhelm the existing topography with its scale.	Prior to construction the contractor will document, through issue of a technical memorandum, how the Authority’s aesthetic guidelines have been employed to minimize visual impacts. The Authority seeks to balance providing a consistent, project-wide aesthetic with the local context for the numerous HSR non-station structures across the state. Examples of aesthetic options that can be applied to non-standard structures in the HSR system will be provided to local jurisdictions (AVR-IAMF#1). The Authority will also require its contractors to document	The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes measures that will soften the appearance of HSR infrastructure to minimize visual impacts on sensitive viewers.

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
		<p>that the Authority's <i>Aesthetic Design Review Process</i> has been followed (AVR-IAMF#2).</p> <p>While the proposed project includes these features to minimize visual impacts, it will remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	
<p>Policy C-RC 61: Public and private development and infrastructure located in areas of special scenic significance should not create major, lasting adverse visual impacts</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any alternative would degrade the visual environment along SR 152 in the Pacheco Creek Valley by regrading and removing the existing topography and land cover to provide a tunnel portal. All alternatives would implement HSR aerial structure parallel to SR 152 in the Pacheco Creek Valley that would block views and overwhelm the existing topography with its scale.</p>	<p>Prior to construction the contractor will document, through issue of a technical memorandum, how the Authority's aesthetic guidelines have been employed to minimize visual impacts. The Authority seeks to balance providing a consistent, project-wide aesthetic with the local context for the numerous HSR non-station structures across the state. Examples of aesthetic options that can be applied to non-standard structures in the HSR system will be provided to local jurisdictions (AVR-IAMF#1). The Authority will also require its contractors to document that the Authority's <i>Aesthetic Design Review Process</i> has been followed (AVR-IAMF#2).</p> <p>While the proposed project includes these features to minimize visual impacts, it will remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes measures that will soften the appearance of HSR infrastructure to minimize visual impacts on sensitive viewers.</p>
<p>Policy R-GD 20: Grading and terrain alteration should conserve the natural landscape and resources, minimize erosion impacts, protect scenic resources, habitat, and water resources.</p> <p>Policy R-GD 25: Grading associated with roads, bridges, retaining walls, or similar improvements related to access requirements should not create a significant visual scar or impact to the environment. They should generally</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any alternative would degrade the visual environment along SR 152 in the Pacheco Creek Valley by regrading and removing the existing topography and land cover to provide a tunnel portal.</p>	<p>Prior to construction the contractor will document, through issue of a technical memorandum, how the Authority's aesthetic guidelines have been employed to minimize visual impacts. The Authority seeks to balance providing a consistent, project-wide aesthetic with the local context for the numerous HSR non-station structures across the state. Examples of aesthetic options that can be applied to non-standard structures in the HSR system will be provided to local jurisdictions (AVR-IAMF#1). The Authority will also require its contractors to document that the Authority's <i>Aesthetic Design Review Process</i> has been followed (AVR-IAMF#2).</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes measures that will soften the appearance of HSR infrastructure to minimize visual impacts on sensitive viewers.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>follow natural terrain and contours to the maximum extent feasible.</p> <p>Policy R-RC 101: Roads, building sites, structures, and public facilities shall not be allowed to create major or lasting visible scars on the landscape.</p> <p>Policy R-RC(i) 36: Protect the scenic value of the following major County thoroughfares and entranceways through state scenic highway designation, including SR 152 east of Gilroy (Pacheco Pass), SR 152 west of Gilroy (Hecker Pass), and US 101 south of the San Jose city limits.</p> <p>Policy SC 16.6: The visual integrity of the scenic gateways to the South County (Pacheco Pass, Hecker Pass, Route 101 south of Gilroy, and a Coyote greenbelt area north of Morgan Hill) should be protected.</p>		<p>While the proposed project includes these features to minimize visual impacts, it will remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	
<p>Policy R-LU 79: New public transportation facilities shall be compatible with the land uses in the areas in which they are located and consistent with the County's General Plan.</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of the East Gilroy LMF/MOWF under Alternative 3 or South Gilroy LMF/MOWF under Alternatives 1 and 2 would place a large industrial facility in a rural location that would degrade the visual environment.</p>	<p>Prior to construction the contractor will document, through issue of a technical memorandum, how the Authority's aesthetic guidelines have been employed to minimize visual impacts. The Authority seeks to balance providing a consistent, project-wide aesthetic with the local context for the numerous HSR non-station structures across the state. Examples of aesthetic options that can be applied to non-standard structures in the HSR system will be provided to local jurisdictions (AVR-IAMF#1). The Authority will also require its contractors to document that the Authority's <i>Aesthetic Design Review Process</i> has been followed (AVR-IAMF#2).</p> <p>While the proposed project includes these features to minimize visual impacts, it will remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes measures that will soften the appearance of HSR infrastructure to minimize visual impacts on sensitive viewers.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>2030 Merced County General Plan (2013)</b>			
<p>Policy NR-4.1: Promote the preservation of agricultural land, ranch land, and other open space areas as a means of protecting the County's scenic resources.</p>	<p>Inconsistent Implementation of any alternative would cross through agricultural and open-space lands. Views to and from these lands would be blocked by HSR infrastructure.</p>	<p>Prior to construction the contractor will document, through issue of a technical memorandum, how the Authority's aesthetic guidelines have been employed to minimize visual impacts. The Authority seeks to balance providing a consistent, project-wide aesthetic with the local context for the numerous HSR non-station structures across the state. Examples of aesthetic options that can be applied to non-standard structures in the HSR system will be provided to local jurisdictions (AVR-IAMF#1). The Authority will also require its contractors to document that the Authority's <i>Aesthetic Design Review Process</i> has been followed (AVR-IAMF#2).  While the project includes these features to minimize visual impacts, views would not be restored and the project will remain inconsistent.  Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes measures that will soften the appearance of HSR infrastructure to minimize visual impacts on sensitive viewers.</p>
<b>Envision: San José 2040 General Plan (2011)</b>			
<p>Policy IN-1.9: Design new public and private utility facilities to be safe, aesthetically pleasing, compatible with adjacent uses, and consistent with the Envision General Plan goals and policies for fiscal sustainability, environmental leadership, an innovative economy, and quality neighborhoods.</p> <p>Policy CD-9.1: Ensure that development within the designated Rural Scenic Corridors is designed to preserve and enhance attractive natural and built vistas.</p> <p>Policy CD-9.3: Ensure that development along designated Rural</p>	<p>Inconsistent Alternatives 1 or 3 would place an aerial structure along Monterey Highway in the Coyote Valley that would block views and overwhelm the existing topography with its scale.</p>	<p>Prior to construction the contractor will document, through issue of a technical memorandum, how the Authority's aesthetic guidelines have been employed to minimize visual impacts. The Authority seeks to balance providing a consistent, project-wide aesthetic with the local context for the numerous HSR non-station structures across the state. Examples of aesthetic options that can be applied to non-standard structures in the HSR system will be provided to local jurisdictions (AVR-IAMF#1). The Authority will also require its contractors to document that the Authority's <i>Aesthetic Design Review Process</i> has been followed (AVR-IAMF#2).  While the proposed project includes these features to minimize visual impacts, views would not be restored and the project will remain inconsistent.  Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes measures that will soften the appearance of HSR infrastructure to minimize visual impacts on sensitive viewers.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>Scenic Corridors preserves significant views of the Valley and mountains, especially in, or adjacent to, Coyote Valley, the Diablo Range, the Silver Creek Hills, the Santa Teresa Ridge, and the Santa Cruz Mountains.</p> <p>Policy CD-10.1: Recognize the importance of Gateways in shaping perceptions of San José.</p>			
<b>Morgan Hill 2035 General Plan (2016)</b>			
<p>Policy NRE-2.1: Hillside and Ridgeline Views. Protect views of hillsides, ridgelines, and prominent natural features surrounding the City. These features help define the City's historic rural character, sense of place, image and identity.</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of any alternative would include aerial structures or embankments that would block distant views to prominent natural features surrounding Morgan Hill for viewers adjacent to HSR. Alternatives 1 and 3 would place an aerial structure along US 101 that would block views. Alternative 2 would grade-separate roadways over HSR and UPRR where overcrossings and embankments would block distant views to prominent natural features surrounding Morgan Hill for viewers adjacent to HSR.</p>	<p>Prior to construction the contractor will document, through issue of a technical memorandum, how the Authority's aesthetic guidelines have been employed to minimize visual impacts. The Authority seeks to balance providing a consistent, project-wide aesthetic with the local context for the numerous HSR non-station structures across the state. Examples of aesthetic options that can be applied to non-standard structures in the HSR system will be provided to local jurisdictions (AVR-IAMF#1). The Authority will also require its contractors to document that the Authority's <i>Aesthetic Design Review Process</i> has been followed (AVR-IAMF#2).</p> <p>While the proposed project includes these features to minimize visual impacts, views would not be restored and the project will remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes measures that will soften the appearance of HSR infrastructure to minimize visual impacts on sensitive viewers.</p>
<p>Policy NRE-6.4: Tree Preservation and Protection. Preserve and protect mature, healthy trees whenever feasible, particularly native trees, historically significant trees, and other trees which are of significant size or of significant aesthetic value to the</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Implementation of Alternative 2 would remove all Keesling's Shade Trees along Monterey Highway from the northern city limit of Morgan Hill to Cochrane Road.</p>	<p>Prior to construction the contractor will document, through issue of a technical memorandum, how the Authority's aesthetic guidelines have been employed to minimize visual impacts. The Authority seeks to balance providing a consistent, project-wide aesthetic with the local context for the numerous HSR non-station structures across the state. Examples of aesthetic options that can be applied to non-standard structures in the HSR system will be</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes measures that will soften the appearance of HSR infrastructure to minimize</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>immediate vicinity or to the community as a whole.</p>		<p>provided to local jurisdictions (AVR-IAMF#1). The Authority will also require its contractors to document that the Authority's <i>Aesthetic Design Review Process</i> has been followed (AVR-IAMF#2).</p> <p>While the proposed project includes these features to minimize visual impacts, the historic trees will be removed and the project will remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>visual impacts on sensitive viewers.</p>
<b>Coyote Creek Parkway County Park Master Plan (2006)</b>			
<p>Policy PR-5: Maintain opportunities for the Parkway user to experience a sense of remoteness within the context of a rural riparian habitat corridor.</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Alternatives 1 and 3 would place an aerial structure adjacent to the Coyote Creek Parkway that would block views and overwhelm the existing topography with its scale.</p>	<p>Prior to construction the contractor will document, through issue of a technical memorandum, how the Authority's aesthetic guidelines have been employed to minimize visual impacts. The Authority seeks to balance providing a consistent, project-wide aesthetic with the local context for the numerous HSR non-station structures across the state. Examples of aesthetic options that can be applied to non-standard structures in the HSR system will be provided to local jurisdictions (AVR-IAMF#1). The Authority will also require its contractors to document that the Authority's <i>Aesthetic Design Review Process</i> has been followed (AVR-IAMF#2).</p> <p>While the proposed project includes these features to minimize visual impacts, views would not be restored and the project will remain inconsistent.</p> <p>Not reconciled.</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resource areas. The project design includes measures that will soften the appearance of HSR infrastructure to minimize visual impacts on sensitive viewers.</p>

Sources: City of Morgan Hill 2016; City of San Jose 2011; County of Merced 2013; County of Santa Clara 1994; Santa Clara County Parks 2006.  
 Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority  
 HSR = high-speed rail  
 LMF = light maintenance facility  
 MOWF = maintenance of way facility  
 SR = State Route  
 US = U.S. Highway

## Cultural Resources

**Table 9 Policy Inconsistency, Reconciliation, and Rationale for Cultural Resources**

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<b>Envision San José 2040 General Plan (2011)</b>			
<p>Goal ER-10: Preserve and conserve archaeologically significant structures, sites, districts and artifacts in order to promote a greater sense of historic awareness and community identity.</p> <p>Goal LU-13: Preserve and enhance historic landmarks and districts in order to promote a greater sense of historic awareness and community identity and contribute toward a sense of place.</p>	<p>Inconsistent.</p> <p>Significant adverse impacts would occur to known historical resources, including human remains. Additionally, there is a potential for construction activities to encounter unknown archaeological resources or human remains.</p>	<p>Through implementation of CUL-MM#1, the Authority would complete Phased Identification inventory for archaeological resources and utilize or further develop treatment plans for any identified resources that would be impaired by the project. Implementation of CUL-MM#2 would insure that construction crews are trained to identify archaeological resources during construction activities, provide for construction monitoring by qualified professionals in areas of archaeological sensitivity, and establish procedures to stop work in the event of a discovery. Also in accordance with CUL-MM#2, if human remains are encountered, the appropriate state and federal laws would be followed to determine whether the remains are affiliated with a Native American tribe; if so, such remains would be treated appropriately. In accordance with CUL-MM#3, in the event that an unknown archaeological resource is encountered and cannot be avoided, mitigation measures would be applied as stipulated by the MOA and ATP. CUL-MM#4 would require a relocation plan to be prepared and implemented for resources that the alternative would demolish. CUL-MM#4 would be applied to resources where it appears that the resource could feasibly be relocated without degradation of its integrity of setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. CUL-MM#6 would be applied to require that properties experiencing a significant impact be fully documented prior to construction to record the character-defining features, and CUL-MM#7 would be applied to provide for the creation of interpretive materials using documentation prepared under CUL-MM#6. CUL-MM#10 would require that new station facilities be designed in a manner consistent with the SOI's Standards for Rehabilitation. CUL-MM#11 would relocate an ATC site away from the location of a historical</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resources areas. Through project features and implementation of mitigation measures, the Authority would reconcile potential inconsistencies and avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts on cultural resources.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
		<p>resource, 415 Illinois Avenue, and would prevent the resource's demolition.</p> <p>With the implementation of CUL-MM#1, CUL-MM#2, CUL-MM#3, CUL-MM#4, CUL-MM#6, CUL-MM#7, CUL-MM#10, and CUL-MM#11, the inconsistency would be reconciled and the project would be consistent with these goals and policies.</p>	
<b>Santa Clara County General Plan (1994, revised 2006)</b>			
<p>Goal 5.1: Heritage Resource Protection. Protection and preservation of heritage resources both natural (e.g. heritage trees; and paleontological resources) and cultural (e.g. historic sites and structures, and archeological sites). Cultural heritage resources reflecting the contributions to society of all cultures acknowledged, preserved and commemorated.</p> <p>Policy C-RC-52: Heritage Resources Preservation. Prevention of unnecessary losses to heritage resources should be ensured as much as possible through adequate ordinances, regulations, and standard review procedures. Mitigation efforts, such as relocation of the resource, should be employed where feasible when projects will have significant adverse impact upon heritage resources.</p>	<p>Inconsistent.</p> <p>Significant adverse impacts would occur to known historical resources, including human remains. Additionally, there is a potential for construction activities to encounter unknown archaeological resources or human remains.</p>	<p>Through implementation of CUL-MM#1, the Authority would complete Phased Identification inventory for archaeological resources and utilize or further develop treatment plans for any identified resources that would be impaired by the project. Implementation of CUL-MM#2 would insure that construction crews are trained to identify archaeological resources during construction activities, provide for construction monitoring by qualified professionals in areas of archaeological sensitivity, and establish procedures to stop work in the event of a discovery. Also in accordance with CUL-MM#2, if human remains are encountered, the appropriate state and federal laws would be followed to determine whether the remains are affiliated with a Native American tribe; if so, such remains would be treated appropriately. In accordance with CUL-MM#3, in the event that an unknown archaeological resource is encountered and cannot be avoided, mitigation measures would be applied as stipulated by the MOA and ATP. CUL-MM#4 would require a relocation plan to be prepared and implemented for resources that the alternative would demolish. CUL-MM#4 would be applied to resources where it appears that the resource could feasibly be relocated without degradation of its integrity of setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. CUL-MM#6 would be applied to require that properties experiencing a significant impact be fully documented prior to construction to record the character-defining features, and CUL-MM#7 would be applied to provide for the creation of interpretive materials using documentation prepared</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resources areas. Through project features and implementation of mitigation measures, the Authority would reconcile potential inconsistencies and avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts on cultural resources.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
		<p>under CUL-MM#6. CUL-MM#10 would require that new station facilities be designed in a manner consistent with the SOI's Standards for Rehabilitation. CUL-MM#11 would relocate an ATC site away from the location of a historical resource, 415 Illinois Avenue, and would prevent the resource's demolition.</p> <p>With the implementation of CUL-MM#1, CUL-MM#2, CUL-MM#3, CUL-MM#4, CUL-MM#6, CUL-MM#7, CUL-MM#10, and CUL-MM#11, the inconsistency would be reconciled and the project would be consistent with these goals and policies.</p>	
<b>City of Santa Clara General Plan (2010)</b>			
<p>Policy 5.6.2-P1: Areas of Historic Sensitivity. Evaluate any proposed changes to properties within 100 feet of historic resources on the City's list of Architecturally or Historically Significant Properties for potential negative effects on the historic integrity of the resource or its historic context.</p> <p>Goal 5.6.3-G1: Archaeological and Cultural Resources. Protection and preservation of cultural resources, as well as archaeological and paleontological sites.</p>	<p>Inconsistent.</p> <p>Significant adverse impacts would occur to known historical resources located within the area of potential effects. Additionally, there is a potential for construction activities to encounter unknown archaeological resources or human remains.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is a potential for construction activities to affect the 100-foot setting of historical resources located outside of the area of potential effects.</p>	<p>Through implementation of CUL-MM#1, the Authority would complete Phased Identification inventory for archaeological resources and utilize or further develop treatment plans for any identified resources that would be impaired by the project. Implementation of CUL-MM#2 would insure that construction crews are trained to identify archaeological resources during construction activities, provide for construction monitoring by qualified professionals in areas of archaeological sensitivity, and establish procedures to stop work in the event of a discovery. Also in accordance with CUL-MM#2, if human remains are encountered, the appropriate state and federal laws would be followed to determine whether the remains are affiliated with a Native American tribe; if so, such remains would be treated appropriately. In accordance with CUL-MM#3, in the event that an unknown archaeological resource is encountered and cannot be avoided, mitigation measures would be applied as stipulated by the MOA and ATP. CUL-MM#4 would require a relocation plan to be prepared and implemented for resources that the alternative would demolish. CUL-MM#4 would be applied to resources where it appears that the resource could feasibly be relocated without degradation of its integrity of setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. CUL-MM#6 would be applied to require that properties experiencing a significant impact be fully documented prior</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resources areas. Through project features and implementation of mitigation measures, the Authority would reconcile potential inconsistencies and avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts on cultural resources.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
		<p>to construction to record the character-defining features, and CUL-MM#7 would be applied to provide for the creation of interpretive materials using documentation prepared under CUL-MM#6. CUL-MM#10 would require that new station facilities be designed in a manner consistent with the SOI's Standards for Rehabilitation. CUL-MM#11 would relocate an ATC site away from the location of a historical resource, 415 Illinois Avenue, and would prevent the resource's demolition. However, mitigation measures would apply only to historical resources within the area of potential effects.</p> <p>With the implementation of CUL-MM#1, CUL-MM#2, CUL-MM#3, CUL-MM#4, CUL-MM#6, CUL-MM#7, CUL-MM#10, and CUL-MM#11, one inconsistency would be reconciled and the project would be consistent with Goal 5.6.3-G1. The project would remain inconsistent with Policy 5.6.2-P1.</p>	
<b>City of Morgan Hill 2035 General Plan (2016)</b>			
<p>Policy HC-8.1: Identify and protect historic resources. Identify and protect heritage resources from loss and destruction.</p>	<p>Inconsistent. Significant adverse impacts would occur to known historical resources. Additionally, there is a potential for construction activities to encounter unknown archaeological resources or human remains.</p>	<p>Through implementation of CUL-MM#1, the Authority would complete Phased Identification inventory for archaeological resources and utilize or further develop treatment plans for any identified resources that would be impaired by the project. Implementation of CUL-MM#2 would insure that construction crews are trained to identify archaeological resources during construction activities, provide for construction monitoring by qualified professionals in areas of archaeological sensitivity, and establish procedures to stop work in the event of a discovery. Also in accordance with CUL-MM#2, if human remains are encountered, the appropriate state and federal laws would be followed to determine whether the remains are affiliated with a Native American tribe; if so, such remains would be treated appropriately. In accordance with CUL-MM#3, in the event that an unknown archaeological resource is encountered and cannot be avoided, mitigation measures would be applied as stipulated by the MOA and ATP. CUL-MM#4 would require a relocation plan to be prepared and implemented for resources that the alternative would</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resources areas. Through project features and implementation of mitigation measures, the Authority would reconcile potential inconsistencies and avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts on cultural resources.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
		<p>demolish. CUL-MM#4 would be applied to resources where it appears that the resource could feasibly be relocated without degradation of its integrity of setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. CUL-MM#6 would be applied to require that properties experiencing a significant impact be fully documented prior to construction to record the character-defining features, and CUL-MM#7 would be applied to provide for the creation of interpretive materials using documentation prepared under CUL-MM#6. CUL-MM#10 would require that new station facilities be designed in a manner consistent with the SOI's Standards for Rehabilitation. CUL-MM#11 would relocate an ATC site away from the location of a historical resource, 415 Illinois Avenue, and would prevent the resource's demolition.</p> <p>With the implementation of CUL-MM#1, CUL-MM#2, CUL-MM#3, CUL-MM#4, CUL-MM#6, CUL-MM#7, CUL-MM#10, and CUL-MM#11, the inconsistency would be reconciled and the project would be consistent with these goals and policies.</p>	
<b>San Benito County 2035 General Plan (2015)</b>			
<p>Goal NCR-7: To protect, preserve, and enhance the unique cultural and historic resources in the county.</p>	<p>Inconsistent. Significant adverse impacts would occur to known historical resources. Additionally, there is a potential for construction activities to encounter unknown archaeological resources or human remains.</p>	<p>Through implementation of CUL-MM#1, the Authority would complete Phased Identification inventory for archaeological resources and utilize or further develop treatment plans for any identified resources that would be impaired by the project. Implementation of CUL-MM#2 would insure that construction crews are trained to identify archaeological resources during construction activities, provide for construction monitoring by qualified professionals in areas of archaeological sensitivity, and establish procedures to stop work in the event of a discovery. Also in accordance with CUL-MM#2, if human remains are encountered, the appropriate state and federal laws would be followed to determine whether the remains are affiliated with a Native American tribe; if so, such remains would be treated appropriately. In accordance with CUL-MM#3, in the event that an unknown archaeological resource is encountered and cannot be avoided, mitigation measures would be</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resources areas. Through project features and implementation of mitigation measures, the Authority would reconcile potential inconsistencies and avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts on cultural resources.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
		<p>applied as stipulated by the MOA and ATP. CUL-MM#4 would require a relocation plan to be prepared and implemented for resources that the alternative would demolish. CUL-MM#4 would be applied to resources where it appears that the resource could feasibly be relocated without degradation of its integrity of setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. CUL-MM#6 would be applied to require that properties experiencing a significant impact be fully documented prior to construction to record the character-defining features, and CUL-MM#7 would be applied to provide for the creation of interpretive materials using documentation prepared under CUL-MM#6. CUL-MM#10 would require that new station facilities be designed in a manner consistent with the SOI's Standards for Rehabilitation. CUL-MM#11 would relocate an ATC site away from the location of a historical resource, 415 Illinois Avenue, and would prevent the resource's demolition.</p> <p>With the implementation of CUL-MM#1, CUL-MM#2, CUL-MM#3, CUL-MM#4, CUL-MM#6, CUL-MM#7, CUL-MM#10, and CUL-MM#11, the inconsistency would be reconciled and the project would be consistent with these goals and policies.</p>	
<b>2030 Merced County General Plan (2013)</b>			
<p>Goal RCR-2: Protect and preserve the cultural, archaeological, and historic resources of the County in order to maintain its unique character.</p> <p>Policy RCR-2.1: Archaeological Site and Artifact Protection. Require development projects that affect archaeological sites and artifacts to avoid disturbance or damage to these sites.</p> <p>Policy RCR-2.5: Human Remains Discovery. Requires that, in the event of</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Significant adverse impacts would occur to known historical resources. Additionally, there is a potential for construction activities to encounter unknown archaeological resources or human remains.</p>	<p>Through implementation of CUL-MM#1, the Authority would complete Phased Identification inventory for archaeological resources and utilize or further develop treatment plans for any identified resources that would be impaired by the project. Implementation of CUL-MM#2 would insure that construction crews are trained to identify archaeological resources during construction activities, provide for construction monitoring by qualified professionals in areas of archaeological sensitivity, and establish procedures to stop work in the event of a discovery. Also in accordance with CUL-MM#2, if human remains are encountered, the appropriate state and federal laws would be followed to determine whether the remains are affiliated with a Native</p>	<p>The Authority is mandated to construct and operate the HSR project. This is a state-level project that would have benefits across multiple resources areas. Through project features and implementation of mitigation measures, the Authority would reconcile potential inconsistencies and avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts on cultural resources.</p>

Policy	Description of Inconsistency	Reconciliation	Rationale
<p>discovery of human remains on any project construction site, all work in the vicinity of the find will cease and the County coroner and Native American Heritage Commission will be notified.</p>		<p>American tribe; if so, such remains would be treated appropriately. In accordance with CUL-MM#3, in the event that an unknown archaeological resource is encountered and cannot be avoided, mitigation measures would be applied as stipulated by the MOA and ATP. CUL-MM#4 would require a relocation plan to be prepared and implemented for resources that the alternative would demolish. CUL-MM#4 would be applied to resources where it appears that the resource could feasibly be relocated without degradation of its integrity of setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. CUL-MM#6 would be applied to require that properties experiencing a significant impact be fully documented prior to construction to record the character-defining features, and CUL-MM#7 would be applied to provide for the creation of interpretive materials using documentation prepared under CUL-MM#6. CUL-MM#10 would require that new station facilities be designed in a manner consistent with the SOI's Standards for Rehabilitation. CUL-MM#11 would relocate an ATC site away from the location of a historical resource, 415 Illinois Avenue, and would prevent the resource's demolition.</p> <p>With the implementation of CUL-MM#1, CUL-MM#2, CUL-MM#3, CUL-MM#4, CUL-MM#6, CUL-MM#7, CUL-MM#10, and CUL-MM#11, the inconsistency would be reconciled and the project would be consistent with these goals and policies.</p>	

Sources: City of Gilroy 2002; City of Morgan Hill 2016; City of Santa Clara 2010; County of Merced 2013; County of San Benito 2015; County of Santa Clara 1994.

The project extent's consistency with regional and local plans and policies is assessed for adopted plans only.

ATP = Archaeological Treatment Program

Authority = California High-Speed Rail Authority

CUL-MM = Cultural Resources Mitigation Measure

HSR = high-speed rail

MOA = Memorandum of Agreement

## References

- Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC). 2017. *Plan Bay Area 2040*. [http://2040.planbayarea.org/cdn/farfuture/DNwQeazEwHfJg-HZ-GMZSVQxPV0mKk0nTUKVaDSes/1506467747/sites/default/files/2017-09/Plan\\_Bay\\_Area\\_2040-09262017-links.pdf](http://2040.planbayarea.org/cdn/farfuture/DNwQeazEwHfJg-HZ-GMZSVQxPV0mKk0nTUKVaDSes/1506467747/sites/default/files/2017-09/Plan_Bay_Area_2040-09262017-links.pdf) (accessed October 16, 2017).
- California High-Speed Rail Authority and Federal Railroad Administration (Authority and FRA). 2005. *Final Program Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Proposed California High-Speed Train System*. Sacramento, CA and Washington, DC. August 2005.
- City of Gilroy. 2002. *2020 General Plan*. [www.ci.gilroy.ca.us/274/2020-General-Plan](http://www.ci.gilroy.ca.us/274/2020-General-Plan) (accessed March 7, 2017).
- . 2014. *2015-23 Housing Element*. [www.cityofgilroy.org/DocumentCenter/View/5272](http://www.cityofgilroy.org/DocumentCenter/View/5272) (accessed March 7, 2017).
- City of Los Banos. 2009. *2030 General Plan Update*. Approved July 15. [http://losbanos.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/plan\\_gp\\_entire.pdf](http://losbanos.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/plan_gp_entire.pdf) (accessed April 14, 2017).
- City of Morgan Hill. 2009. *Downtown Morgan Hill Specific Plan*. [www.morgan-hill.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/3195](http://www.morgan-hill.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/3195) (accessed March 8, 2017).
- . 2015. *2015-2023 Housing Element Update*. [www.morgan-hill.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/15642](http://www.morgan-hill.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/15642) (accessed March 8, 2017).
- . 2016. *2035 General Plan*. [http://morganhill2035.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/MorganHill2035\\_GeneralPlan\\_Adopted1.pdf](http://morganhill2035.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/MorganHill2035_GeneralPlan_Adopted1.pdf). (accessed March 7, 2017).
- City of San Jose. 1992. *Communications Hill Specific Plan*. Available at: [www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/Home/View/345](http://www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/Home/View/345). (accessed October 12, 2017).
- . 2011. *Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan: Building a City of Great Places*. Adopted November 1, 2011. Available online: <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/Home/View/474>. (accessed June 9, 2016).
- . 2014. *Communications Hill Specific Plan Area Development Policy. June 2, 2014*. <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showdocument?id=24679> (accessed November 11, 2020).
- . 2015. *2014-23 Housing Element*. [www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/43711](http://www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/43711) (accessed March 6, 2017).
- City of Santa Clara. 2010. *City of Santa Clara 2010–2035 General Plan*. November. <http://santaclaraca.gov/government/departments/community-development/planning-division/general-plan> (accessed March 7, 2017).
- County of Merced. 2013. *2030 Merced County General Plan*. [www.co.merced.ca.us/DocumentCenter/Home/View/6766](http://www.co.merced.ca.us/DocumentCenter/Home/View/6766) (accessed March 8, 2017).
- County of San Benito. 2015. *2035 General Plan*. <http://cosb.us/wp-content/uploads/Adopted-2035-GPU.pdf> (accessed March 8, 2017).
- County of Santa Clara. 1994 (revised 2006). *Santa Clara County General Plan, 1995–2010*. December 20. [www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/PlansOrdinances/GP/Pages/GP.aspx](http://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/PlansOrdinances/GP/Pages/GP.aspx) (accessed March 8, 2017).
- . 2014. *County of Santa Clara Housing Element Update 2015-2022*. June. [http://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/DocsForms/Documents/HealthElement\\_2015\\_Adopted\\_Final.pdf](http://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/DocsForms/Documents/HealthElement_2015_Adopted_Final.pdf) (accessed March 8, 2017).
- County of Santa Clara and Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority. 2018. *Santa Clara Valley Agricultural Plan: Investing in our Working Lands for Regional Resilience*. January 2018.

[www.openspaceauthority.org/system/user\\_files/Documents/Grids/current\\_projects/SCV\\_ActionPlan\\_010318.pdf](http://www.openspaceauthority.org/system/user_files/Documents/Grids/current_projects/SCV_ActionPlan_010318.pdf) (accessed September 2, 2020).

Santa Clara County Parks. 2006. *Coyote Creek Parkway County Park: Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan and Master Plan Draft*. Prepared by 2M Associates, Jones and Stokes Associates, Balance Hydrologics, Inc., and Harison and Associates. Available online: [www.sccgov.org/sites/parks/PlansProjects/Documents/Coyote-Creek-Parkway/Draft-Integrated-Plan-Report.pdf](http://www.sccgov.org/sites/parks/PlansProjects/Documents/Coyote-Creek-Parkway/Draft-Integrated-Plan-Report.pdf) (accessed June 9, 2016).

Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority. 2014. Santa Clara Valley Greenprint. Available at: [www.openspaceauthority.org/about/pdf/SCVOSA.Greenprint.FINAL.March2014\\_RevisedWithCovers28May2014\\_LoRes.pdf](http://www.openspaceauthority.org/about/pdf/SCVOSA.Greenprint.FINAL.March2014_RevisedWithCovers28May2014_LoRes.pdf) (accessed on July 12, 2017).