ERRATA: SECTION 3.12, SOCIOECONOMICS AND COMMUNITIES

Errata No.	Draft EIR/EIS Reference		Errata Final EIR/EIS	
	Section	Page	Correction and Rationale	Errata Page Reference
1	3.12.2.3	3.12-9, 3.12-10, 3.12-11, 3.12-13, 3.12-14, 3.12-16, 3.12-17, 3.12-20, 3.12-21	Revised Table 3.12-1 to remove a footnote referring to a possible update of the Boyle Heights Community Plan; added a policy from this plan; corrected the names and dates of certain municipal codes	16-118
2	3.12.5.1	3.12-45	Revised Table 3.12-11 to correct a typographical error concerning the number of parks and recreational resources; included River Park (planned) and Meadow Park (planned); revised the parks and recreational resources column and the table title; added a table note; updated table source dates	16-120
3	3.12.6.3	3.12-80	Updated the discussion of induced jobs to reflect the 2026 Business Plan	16-121
4	3.12.6.3	3.12-94, 3.12-95	Updated the discussion of induced jobs to reflect the 2026 Business Plan	16-122
5	3.12.6.3	3.12-98	Updated the discussion of employment growth to reflect the 2026 Business Plan	16-123
6	3.12.8.2	3.12-104	Updated the discussion of induced jobs to reflect the 2026 Business Plan	16-123
7	3.12.8.2	3.12-108	Revised Table 3.12-41 to update induced jobs to reflect the 2026 Business Plan	16-123

EIR/EIS = environmental impact report/environmental impact statement; No. = number

3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

3.12 Socioeconomics and Communities

3.12.1 Introduction

Section 3.12, Socioeconomics and Communities, of the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section (project section) Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) discusses the potential impacts of the No Project Alternative and the High-Speed Rail (HSR) Project Alternatives, otherwise called Shared Passenger Track Alternative A and Shared Passenger Track Alternative B, on socioeconomic and community resources. This section also describes impact avoidance and minimization features (IAMF) that would avoid, minimize, or reduce these impacts. Mitigation measures are proposed to further reduce, compensate for, or offset impacts of the project. Section 3.12 also defines the socioeconomic and community resources in the region and describes the affected environment in the resource study areas (RSA).

PURPOSE

Socioeconomics and Communities

The communities adjacent to the proposed project would bear the majority of the benefits and burdens of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. This environmental impact report/ environmental impact statement evaluates potential impacts and benefits on socioeconomic conditions and important community facilities, and proposes strategies to avoid negative effects, if possible, and disclose those that may be unavoidable.

The following technical reports serve as the basis for the information in this section and are available on request.

- *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Community Impact Assessment* (Authority 2025a)
- *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Draft Relocation Impact Report* (Authority 2025b)
- *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Transportation Technical Report* (Authority 2025c)
- *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Air Quality and Global Climate Change Technical Report* (Authority 2025d)
- *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Noise and Vibration Technical Report* (Authority 2025e)
- *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Aesthetics and Visual Quality Technical Report* (Authority 2025f)

Additional details on socioeconomic and community resources are provided in the following appendices in Volume 2 of this Draft EIR/EIS:

- Appendix 2-A, Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features
- Appendix 2-B, Applicable Design Standards
- Appendix 3.1-A, Regional and Local Policy Inventory and Consistency Analysis
- Appendix 3.12-A, Relocation Assistance Benefits
- Appendix 3.12-B, Public Facility Tables
- Appendix 3.12-C, Public Facility Maps
- Appendix 3.12-D, Bikeway Maps
- Appendix 3.12-E, Business Displacement Maps
- Appendix 3.12-F, Children's Health and Safety Risk Assessment

This section includes detailed analysis of environmental resources, affected environment, environmental consequences, and mitigation measures based on the guidance provided in *Project Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement Environmental Methodology Guidelines*, Versions 5.9 and 5.11 (Authority 2017, 2022). Twelve other resource sections and one chapter in this Draft EIR/EIS provide additional information related to effects on socioeconomic and community resources, including:

- **Section 3.2, Transportation:** Construction and operational changes from the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives on transit, roadway, freight, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.
- **Section 3.3, Air Quality and Global Climate Change:** Construction and operational changes from the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives on regional and local air quality and air emissions.
- **Section 3.4, Noise and Vibration:** Construction and operational changes from the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives related to noise and vibration and the feasibility of noise abatement.
- **Section 3.5, Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference:** Operational changes related to electromagnetic fields (EMF) and electromagnetic interference (EMI) resulting from the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives.
- **Section 3.6, Public Utilities and Energy:** Construction and operational changes from the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives on public utilities, water demand, solid and hazardous waste generation, and energy consumption.
- **Section 3.10, Hazardous Materials and Wastes:** Construction and operational changes from the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives on or from hazardous materials and wastes.
- **Section 3.11, Safety and Security:** Construction and operational changes from the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives related to temporary and permanent emergency responders' operations.
- **Section 3.13, Station Planning, Land Use, and Development:** Construction and operational changes from the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives related to existing and planned land use and zoning.
- **Section 3.15, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space:** Construction and operational changes from the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives related to parks, recreation, and open space.
- **Section 3.16, Aesthetics and Visual Quality:** Construction and operational changes from the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives related to the visual environment in areas adjacent to or within viewing range of the project section.
- **Section 3.18, Regional Growth:** Construction and operational changes from the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives related to population and employment growth, project-related induced growth, and future urban development.
- **Section 3.19, Cumulative Impacts:** Construction and operational changes from the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives together with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.
- **Chapter 5, Community Analysis:** Describes outreach to communities during the Draft EIR/EIS process and analyzes whether impacts of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would have disproportionately adverse effects on minority or low-income populations.

Section 3.12.5, Affected Environment, describes the affected environment for socioeconomics and communities. Impact summaries and conclusions for the project are presented in Section 3.12.6, Environmental Consequences. Section 3.12.7, Mitigation Measures, presents mitigation measures for impacts that cannot be avoided or minimized adequately by IAMFs. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Impacts Summary (Section 3.12.8) summarizes the impacts of the project and compares them to the anticipated impacts of the No Project Alternative. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Significance Conclusions (Section 3.12.9) provides a summary of CEQA determinations of significance for construction and operational impacts for the project.

3.12.1.1 Definition of Resources

The following are definitions for the socioeconomic and community resources analyzed in this Draft EIR/EIS.

- **Communities:** *Communities* refers to groups of people living in the same city, town, or neighborhood who exhibit behavior patterns expressed through daily social interactions, the use of local facilities, participation in local organizations, and involvement in activities that satisfy the population's economic and social needs.
- **Displacements and Relocations:** *Displacements* refer to the movement of people out of their residences, businesses, or nonprofit organizations as a result of acquisition of private property for a transportation project. *Displacement* also refers to businesses and residences occupying property acquired for the project. *Relocations* refers to the movement of affected businesses and residences into suitable replacement sites and placement of people into new homes or commercial properties with assistance and benefits in accordance with federal and California laws as discussed in Section 3.12.2, Laws, Regulations, and Orders.
- **Economic Impacts:** *Economic Impacts* are changes in employment, business productivity, and public funding. Public funding can be affected by displacements and relocations of residences and businesses, which in turn can alter school district funding and property and sales tax revenues.

3.12.2 Laws, Regulations, and Orders

This section describes the federal, state, and local laws, regulations, orders, and plans that are relevant to socioeconomics and communities. General NEPA and CEQA requirements for assessment and disclosure of environmental impacts are described in Section 3.1, Introduction, and are therefore not restated in this resource section. NEPA and CEQA requirements specific to the evaluation of socioeconomics and communities are, however, described in this section.

3.12.2.1 Federal

Federal Railroad Administration, Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (64 *Federal Register* 28545)

The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts Section 14(n)(14) require an EIS to assess the impacts of the alternatives on the transportation and general mobility of the elderly and handicapped.

Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (United States Presidential Executive Order 13045)

U.S. Presidential Executive Order 13045 requires federal agencies to minimize environmental health and safety risks to children and to prioritize the identification and assessment of environmental health and safety risks that may have a disproportionate effect on children.

Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S. Code 12101–12213)

The Americans with Disabilities Act prohibits discrimination of persons with disabilities and requires equal opportunity in employment, state and local government services, public accommodations, commercial facilities, and transportation.

Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (42 U.S. Code 61)

The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Program ensures that persons displaced as a result of a federal action or by an undertaking involving federal funds are treated fairly, consistently, and equitably. This helps to ensure persons will not suffer disproportionate injuries as a result of projects designed for the benefit of the public as a whole.

United States Environmental Protection Agency School Siting Guidelines (Public Law 110-140)

In December 2007, the Energy Independence and Security Act was enacted by Congress and included a requirement for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to develop guidelines for the siting of school facilities with the following considerations: (1) special vulnerabilities of children to hazardous substances or pollution exposures in any case in which the potential for contamination at a potential school site exists; (2) modes of transportation available to students and staff; (3) efficient use of energy; and (4) potential use of a school at the site as an emergency shelter (available at https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-06/documents/school_siting_guidelines-2.pdf). The intention of these guidelines is to assist local school districts and community members with understanding environmental factors in making school siting decisions. Although state agencies, such as the Authority, are not subject to local plans, regulations, and requirements, the Authority may choose to consider factors set in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency guidelines when assessing the mitigation measures developed to minimize effects on existing or planned schools adjacent to the HSR alignment.

Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981 (7 U.S. Code 4201–4209 and 7 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 658)

The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) (7 U.S. Code 4201 et seq.) is intended to protect farmland and requires federal agencies to coordinate with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, if their activities may irreversibly convert farmland to nonagricultural use, either directly or indirectly. The stated purpose of the FPPA is to "minimize the extent to which federal programs contribute to the unnecessary conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses." The FPPA requires federal agencies to examine potential direct and indirect effects on farmland of a proposed action and its alternatives before approving an activity that would convert farmland to nonagricultural use. The U.S. Department of Agriculture issues regulations to implement the FPPA (7 CFR Part 658).

For the purpose of the FPPA, "Important Farmland" includes prime farmland, unique farmland, and farmland of statewide or local importance, as defined by Section 1540(c)(1) of the FPPA. Classification standards differ from state to state; each state may set its own criteria for classification in each category. Federal farmland classification criteria may differ from those developed by the California Department of Conservation, which are described in Section 3.12.2.2, State. Farmland subject to FPPA requirements includes forestland, pastureland, cropland, or other land but does not include water or urban built-up land.

The FPPA exempts the following land types:

- Soil types not suitable for crops, such as rocky terrain or sand dunes
- Sites where the project's right-of-way is entirely within a delineated urban area and the project requires no prime or unique farmland, nor farmland of statewide or local importance
- Farmland that has already been converted to industrial, residential, or commercial or is used for recreational activity

The FPPA applies to projects and programs sponsored or financed in whole or in part by the federal government. FPPA implementing regulations spell out requirements to ensure that federal programs, to the extent practicable, are compatible with state, local, and private programs and policies to protect farmland. The FPPA requires a rating of farmland conversion impacts based on land evaluation and site assessment criteria identified in 7 CFR Part 658.5. These criteria are addressed through completion of a Farmland Conversion Impact Rating for Corridor Type Projects (NRCS-CPA-106) form, which requires input from both the federal agency involved and the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

3.12.2.2 State

California Relocation Act (California Government Code Section 7260 et seq.)

In parallel with the federal law, the California Relocation Act requires state and local governments to provide relocation assistance and benefits to persons displaced as a result of projects undertaken by state or local governments that do not involve federal funds. However, because the project would receive federal funding, the Uniform Act takes precedence.

California High-Speed Rail Authority Title VI Plan

In March 2012, the Authority adopted a policy and plan to ensure that the California HSR System complies with Title VI. The policy states:

- The Authority is committed to ensuring that no person in the state of California is excluded from participation in, nor denied the benefits of, its programs, activities, and services on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, sex, or disability as afforded by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Related Statutes.
- The FRA requires the Authority, as a federal grant recipient, to conform to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes. The Authority's sub-recipients and contractors are required to prevent discrimination and ensure nondiscrimination in of their programs, activities, and services.
- As permitted and authorized by Title VI, the Authority will administer a Title VI Program in accordance with the spirit and intent of the nondiscrimination laws and regulations.

The Title VI Plan includes a commitment to inclusive public involvement of persons affected by the California HSR System.

California High-Speed Rail Authority Limited English Proficiency Policy and Plan

In May 2012, the Authority adopted a policy and plan to ensure the California HSR Program complies with the requirements of U.S. Presidential Executive Order 13166. The policy states:

- It is the policy of the Authority to communicate effectively and provide meaningful access to Limited English Proficiency (LEP) individuals to the Authority's programs, services, and activities. The Authority will provide free language assistance services to LEP individuals encountered or whenever an LEP individual requests language assistance services.
- The Authority will treat LEP individuals with dignity and respect. Language assistance will be provided through a variety of methods, including staff interpreters, translation and interpreter service contracts, and formal arrangements with local organizations providing interpretation or translation services or telephonic interpreter services.

The LEP Policy and Plan supplements the Title VI Program Plan (Limited English Proficiency Plan); Resolution 12-15 (Authority 2012).

California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (California Government Code Section 51200 et seq.)

The California Land Conservation Act of 1965, commonly known as the Williamson Act, provides a property tax incentive for the voluntary enrollment of agricultural and open space lands in contracts between local government and landowners. The contract restricts the land to agricultural and open space uses, and compatible uses defined in state law and local ordinances. Local government establishes an agricultural preserve defining the boundary in which a city or county will enter into contracts with landowners. Local governments calculate the property tax assessment based on the actual land use instead of the potential land value assuming full development, thereby providing a financial incentive to conserve agricultural or open space uses.

Williamson Act contracts are for 10 years and longer. The contract is renewed automatically each year, maintaining a constant, 10-year contract, unless the landowner or local government files to initiate nonrenewal. Should that occur, the Williamson Act would terminate 9 years after the filing

of a notice of nonrenewal. Only a landowner can petition for a contract cancellation. Tentative contract cancellations can be approved only after a local government approves, and the landowner pays a cancellation fee.

California has the following policies regarding public acquisition of and locating public improvements on lands in agricultural preserves and on lands under Williamson Act contracts (Cal. Gov. Code Sections 51290–51295):

- State policy is to avoid locating federal, state, or local public improvements and improvements of public utilities, and the acquisition of land, in agricultural preserves.
- State policy is to locate public improvements that are in agricultural preserves on land other than land under Williamson Act contract.
- State policy is that an agency or entity proposing to locate such an improvement, in considering the relative costs of parcels of land and the development of improvements, give consideration of the value to the public of land, particularly prime agricultural land, in an agricultural preserve.

3.12.2.3 Regional and Local

This section discusses relevant regional and local programs, policies, regulations, and permitting requirements. The project would primarily be within Los Angeles and Orange Counties and the cities of Los Angeles, Vernon, Commerce, Bell, Montebello, Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, Norwalk, La Mirada, Buena Park, Fullerton, and Anaheim. The city of Orange is also within the RSA. Table 3.12-1 lists local plans and policies that were identified and considered for analysis.

Table 3.12-1 Regional and Local Plans and Policies

Policy Title	Summary
Southern California	
SCAG 2024–2050 Connect SoCal Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2024)	The 2024–2050 SCAG RTP/SCS, or Connect SoCal 2024, includes goals, strategies, programs, and projects that will help the SCAG region in reducing its socioeconomic impacts. Policies in the plan include: ▪ Policy 4. Ensure the implementation of Complete Streets that are sensitive to urban, suburban or rural contexts and improve transportation safety for all, but especially for vulnerable road users (e.g., people, especially older adults and children, walking and biking) ▪ Policy 14. Encourage the development of transportation projects that provide convenient, cost-effective and safe alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle travel (e.g., trips made by foot, on bikes, via transit, etc.) ▪ Policy 17. Support the implementation of technology designed to provide equal access to mobility, employment, economic opportunity, education, health and other quality-of-life opportunities for all residents within the SCAG region ▪ Policy 20. Promote technology that has the capacity to facilitate economic growth, improve workforce development opportunities, and enhance safety and security ▪ Policy 27. Establish a user fee–based system that better reflects the true cost of transportation, provides firewall protection for new and existing transportation funds, and represents equitable distribution of costs and benefits ▪ Policy 32. Promote the growth of origins and destinations, with a focus on future housing and population growth, in areas with existing and planned urban infrastructure that includes transit and utilities ▪ Policy 33. Promote the growth of origins and destinations, in areas with a proclivity toward multimodal options like transit and active transportation, to reduce single occupant vehicle (SOV) dependency and vehicle miles traveled ▪ Policy 43. Support communities across the region to realize 15-minute communities through incremental changes that improve equity, quality of life, public health, mobility, sustainability, resilience and economic vitality ▪ Policy 44. Encourage efforts that elevate innovative approaches to increasing access to neighborhood destinations and amenities through an array of people-centered mobility options ▪ Policy 55. Promote equitable use of and access to clean transportation technologies so that all may benefit from them
Los Angeles County	
Los Angeles County 2035 General Plan, Mobility Element, Economic Development Element, Land Use Element (2025)	▪ Policy M 1.1: Provide for the accommodation of all users, including pedestrians, motorists, bicyclists, equestrians, users of public transit, seniors, children, and persons with disabilities when requiring or planning for new, or retrofitting existing, transportation corridors/networks whenever appropriate and feasible. ▪ Policy M 1.2: Ensure that streets are safe for sensitive users, such as seniors and children. ▪ Goal M 4: An efficient multimodal transportation system that serves the needs of all residents. – Policy M 4.1: Expand transportation options that reduce automobile dependence.

Policy Title	Summary
	– Policy M 4.4: Ensure expanded mobility and increase transit access for underserved transit users, such as seniors, students, low income households, and persons with disabilities. – Policy M 4.9: Ensure the participation of all potentially affected communities in the transportation planning and decision-making process. – Policy M 4.10: Support the linkage of regional and community-level transportation systems, including multimodal networks. – Policy M 4.12: Work with adjacent jurisdictions to ensure connectivity and the creation of an integrated regional network. ▪ Goal M 7: Transportation networks that minimize negative impacts to the environment and communities. ▪ Goal ED 1: An economic base and fiscal structures that attract and retain valuable industries and businesses. – Policy ED 1.4: Encourage the expansion and retention of targeted industries and other growth economic sectors, such as the entertainment industry, aerospace industry, agriculture, transportation/logistics, healthcare, biomed/biotech, hospitality and tourism. ▪ Goal ED 2: Land use practices and regulations that foster economic development and growth. – Policy ED 2.3: Ensure environmental justice in economic development activities. – Policy ED 2.7: Incentivize economic development and growth along existing transportation corridors and in urbanized areas. – Policy ED 2.8: Incentivize as much as feasible, environmentally sustainable practices and high standards of development in the communities that bear disproportionate pollution and health impacts. ▪ Goal ED 3: An expanded and improved infrastructure system to support economic growth and development. – Policy ED 3.2: Support the use of public-private partnerships to develop, fund, and deliver critical infrastructure. – Policy ED 3.3: Work with state agencies dedicated to financing important critical infrastructure and economic development projects. ▪ Goal LU 2: Community-based planning efforts that implement the General Plan and incorporate public input, and regional and community level collaboration. – Policy LU 2.2: Ensure broad outreach, public participation, and opportunities for community input in community-based planning efforts. – Policy LU 2.3: Consult with and ensure that applicable County departments, adjacent cities and other stakeholders are involved in community-based planning efforts. – Policy LU 2.5: Support and actively participate in inter-jurisdictional and regional planning efforts to help inform community-based planning efforts. – Policy LU 2.7: Set priorities for Planning Area-specific issues, including transportation, housing, open space, and public safety as part of community-based planning efforts. ▪ Goal LU 4: Infill development and redevelopment that strengthens and enhances communities.

Policy Title	Summary
	– Policy LU 4.3: Encourage transit-oriented development in urban and suburban areas with the appropriate residential density along transit corridors and within station areas. ▪ Goal LU 5: Vibrant, livable and healthy communities with a mix of land uses, services and amenities. – Policy LU 5.7: Direct resources to areas that lack amenities, such as transit, clean air, grocery stores, bikeways, parks, and other components of a healthy community. ▪ Goal LU 7: Compatible land uses that complement neighborhood character and the natural environment. – Policy LU 7.8: Promote environmental justice in the areas bearing disproportionate impacts from stationary pollution sources. ▪ Goal LU 9: Land use patterns and community infrastructure that promote health and wellness. ▪ Policy LU 10.1: Encourage community outreach and stakeholder agency input early and often in the design of projects. ▪ Policy LU 10.5: Encourage the use of distinctive landscaping, signage and other features to define the unique character of districts, neighborhoods or communities, and engender community identity, pride and community interaction. ▪ Policy LU 10.9: Encourage land uses and design that stimulate positive and productive human relations and foster the achievement of community goals.
Los Angeles County Code of Ordinances (2025)	Title 22, Planning and Zoning, of the Los Angeles County Code of Ordinances contains articles that pertain to construction and zoning within Los Angeles County.
City of Los Angeles	
City of Los Angeles General Plan (2024), Framework Element (2023), Mobility Element (2016)	▪ Framework Objective 3.3: Accommodate projected population and employment growth within the City and each community plan area and plan for the provision of adequate supporting transportation and utility infrastructure and public services. ▪ Framework Policy 3.3.1: Accommodate projected population and employment growth in accordance with the Long-Range Land Use Diagram and forecasts in Table 2-2 [of the City of Los Angeles General Plan Land Use Element], using these in the formulation of the community plans and as the basis for the planning for and implementation of infrastructure improvements and public services. ▪ Mobility Plan Policy 1.5. Reduce conflicts and improve safety at railroad crossings through design, planning, and operation. ▪ Mobility Plan Policy 3.6 Continue to promote Union Station as the major regional transportation hub linking Amtrak, Metrolink, Metro Rail, and high-speed rail service. ▪ Mobility Plan Policy 5.1: Encourage the development of a sustainable transportation system that promotes environmental and public health.
Los Angeles Municipal Code (2025)	The following chapters of the Los Angeles Municipal Code contain articles relevant to socioeconomics and communities: Chapter IV, Public Welfare; Chapter V, Public Safety and Protection; Chapter VII, Transportation; Chapter XI, Noise Regulation; and Chapter XVI, Housing Regulations.

Policy Title	Summary
Downtown Community Plan (2024)	▪ Land Use Goal 1: A safe, secure, and high quality residential environment for all economic, age, and ethnic segments of the community – Policy LU 22.16: Advance efforts to plan for the future integration of high speed rail and other transit projects, such as the Southeast Gateway line and Link US, to reinforce Union Station and Downtown as a hub of regional transit ▪ PO Goal 8: Connected infrastructure that respects and preserves diversified economic activities while enhancing recreational opportunities. – PO 8.1 Maintain functional use of the rail facilities, while allowing for bold and innovative design along parcels adjacent to the Los Angeles River (River). – PO 8.2 Accommodate major regional rail connection projects such as Link US, High Speed Rail, and the Southeast Gateway Line. ▪ MC Goal 5 A comprehensive transit system that connects downtown's districts and downtown to communities throughout the region. – MC 5.1 Support major regional rail infrastructure projects, such as Link US and California High Speed Rail that will improve connectivity between Downtown and the surrounding region and reduce travel times
Boyle Heights Community Plan (2024)[1]	Boyle Heights has high levels of transit ridership, making transit options a high priority to create better connectivity throughout the community, as well as to neighboring communities. The plan supports transportation improvements identified through the Mobility Plan 2035. The proposed plan seeks to enhance access to all modes in the local circulation system, improving access on transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. This is accomplished through applying new land use and zoning regulations to encourage mixing and scales of use as well as site design supportive of all modes. The proposed plan also implements Mobility Plan 2035 with a refined lens on the Boyle Heights CPA and is consistent with the objectives of the SCAG 2016–2040 RTP/SCS and SCAG 2020–2045 RTP/SCS.

Policy Title	Summary
City of Vernon	
City of Vernon General Plan, Land Use Element, Circulation and Infrastructure Element, Housing Element (2023)	▪ Goal LU-1: Promote and maintain manufacturing and other industrial uses as the primary land use within the City. – Policy LU 1.1: Designate all properties in Vernon for manufacturing and industrial use, and permit other uses only with a Conditional Use Permit or other discretionary review process. Permit certain uses only in specified Overlay Districts with a Conditional Use Permit or other discretionary process. – Policy LU 1.2: Accommodate, at limited and specific areas of the City, those commercial, service, and retail uses that complement but do not detract from the purposely established industrial character of the City. Limit such uses to the Commercial Overlay District, and permit only with a Conditional Use Permit or other discretionary review process. ▪ Goal LU-3: Maintain Vernon as a highly desirable location for industry, and continue to attract the types of industry the City is well positioned to serve. – Policy LU-3.4: Invest in activities and programs that advertise and promote Vernon as a quality and desirable location for industry. ▪ Goal CI-1: Provide a balanced transportation system for the safe and efficient movement of people, goods, and emergency services throughout the City. – Policy CI-1.1: Continue to improve the street system to meet the minimum standards contained in this Element. – Policy CI-1.4: Evaluate implementing measures that reduce the maneuvering of trucks on streets with substantial traffic during periods of high traffic volumes. – Policy CI-1.7: Encourage the use of ride sharing and public transit for persons employed in the City to reduce traffic congestion and the need for off-street parking in the City. – Policy H-1.3: Mitigate any residential displacement impacts occurring as a result of residential demolition. ▪ Goal H-2: Maintain all existing dwelling units within the City. – Policy H-2.1: Provide for the retention of existing residential units in the City that are economically and physically sound.
The Code of the City of Vernon (2024)	The following titles within the Code of the City of Vernon contain articles relevant to socioeconomics and communities: Chapter 21, Storm Sewer System Ordinance; Chapter 22, Streets and Sidewalks; Chapter 24, Building and Construction; Chapter 26, Zoning; and Chapter 27, Community Development.

Policy Title	Summary
City of Bell	
City of Bell 2030 General Plan, Land Use and Sustainability Element, Health and Safety Element, Mobility and Circulation Element (2022)	▪ Land Use and Sustainability Element Policy 10. The City of Bell shall ensure that land use and development plans of other agencies (Caltrans, LAUSD, etc.) do not adversely impact the community. As part of this process, the City shall be proactive in its review of CEQA documents provided by other public agencies in the vicinity of the City. ▪ Health and Safety Element Policy 23: The City of Bell shall cooperate with all public agencies so as to minimize transportation related noise. Applicable City, State, and Federal noise control regulations shall be enforced. ▪ Mobility and Circulation Element Policy 1. The City of Bell shall continue to participate in regional transportation planning efforts. The City shall participate in all regional transportation planning and development initiatives including those hosted by SCAG, Caltrans, Los Angeles County MTA, and ECO Rapid Transit. ▪ Mobility and Circulation Element Policy 6. The City of Bell shall establish a Level of Service (LOS) "D" as the acceptable standard where such a standard is appropriate. In addition, the City shall incorporate LOS "D" as a standard on traffic studies and traffic level of service mitigation.
City of Bell Municipal Code (2024)	The following titles of the City of Bell Municipal Code contain articles relevant to socioeconomics and communities: Title 10, Vehicles and Traffic; Title 12, Streets, Sidewalks, and Public Places; Title 13, Public Services; Title 15, Buildings and Construction; and Title 17, Zoning.

Policy Title	Summary
City of Commerce	
City of Commerce 2020 General Plan, Community Development Element, Transportation Element, Air Quality Element (2008)	▪ Community Development Policy 3.1: The City of Commerce will continue to promote the maintenance and preservation of industrial activities and business that contribute to the City's economic and employment base. ▪ Community Development Policy 3.3: The City of Commerce will encourage the continued revitalization of the City's industrial districts to accommodate economic development and growth. ▪ Community Development Policy 7.1: The City of Commerce will ensure that all future public facilities and improvements do not have a significant adverse impact on the community and that any such impacts must be mitigated to the fullest extent possible. ▪ Community Development Policy 7.2: The City of Commerce will oppose the over-concentration of public facilities and improvements that provide benefits to the region at large while adversely impacting the local community. The region at large must share both the benefits and the disadvantages of such uses and facilities. ▪ Community Development Policy 7.3. The City of Commerce will take a proactive role in meeting with regional planning agencies to ensure that the local community's voice is heard in the planning public facilities. ▪ Transportation Policy 1.6: The City of Commerce will continue to support the operation of, and further the enhancement of, a safe and efficient regional and inter-city transit system. ▪ Transportation Policy 6.1: The City of Commerce will ensure that all future transportation facilities that will provide a regional benefit do not have a significant adverse impact on the community and that any such impacts must be mitigated to the fullest extent possible. ▪ Transportation Policy 6.2. The City of Commerce will oppose any regional public transportation improvement that does not first consider the potential impacts of such facilities on the local community in which the facility will be located. ▪ Transportation Policy 6.3. The City of Commerce will take a proactive role in meeting with regional planning agencies to ensure that the local community's voice is heard in the planning for future regional transportation facilities. ▪ Air Quality Policy 1.1. The City of Commerce will consider environmental justice issues as they are related to potential health impacts associated with air pollution and ensure that all land use decisions, including enforcement actions, are made in an equitable fashion to protect residents, regardless of age, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, socioeconomic status, or geographic location from the health effects of air pollution.
Commerce Municipal Code (2024)	The following titles of the Commerce Municipal Code contain articles relevant to socioeconomics and communities: Title 10, Vehicles, Traffic, and Parking; Title 12, Streets and Sidewalks; Title 13, Public Utilities; Title 15, Buildings and Construction; and Title 19, Zoning.

Policy Title	Summary
City of Montebello	
City of Montebello General Plan (2024)	▪ Element 3: Our Well Planned Community — This chapter will feature the preferred land use plan that directs new growth by reinvesting in key opportunity areas like the Downtown, Corridors and large parcels along the highway, while protecting natural resources, respecting stable residential neighborhoods, and making great places by insisting on the highest standard in architecture, landscaping and urban design. ▪ Element 4: Our Accessible Community — Addresses transportation choices advocated by SB 375 and AB 1358 by strengthening and balancing pedestrian, bike, and transit connections in the City and surrounding region. ▪ Element 5: Our Healthy Community — Will seek to build effective partnerships that improve physical and mental health and social well being.
Montebello Municipal Code (2024)	The following titles of the City of Montebello Municipal Code contain articles relevant to socioeconomics and communities: Title 10, Vehicles and Traffic; Title 12, Streets and Sidewalks; Title 13, Public Utilities; Title 15, Buildings and Construction; and Title 17, Zoning.
City of Pico Rivera	
City of Pico Rivera General Plan, Circulation Element, Community Facilities Element, Economic Prosperity Element, Environmental Resource Element (2014)	▪ Circulation Goal 5.1: Promote active living, improve local air quality, and enhance the livability of the community through an integrated multimodal network that serves all users within the City and offers convenient mobility options, including vehicular travel, transit services, bicycle routes, and pedestrian paths. – Circulation Policy 5.1-1: Multimodal Options. Make transportation mode shifts possible by designing, operating, and maintaining streets to enable safe and convenient access and travel for all users—pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and people of all ages and abilities, as well as freight and motor vehicle drivers—and to foster a sense of place in the public realm. – Circulation Policy 5.1-2: Serve All Users. Provide a safe, efficient, and accessible transportation network that meets the needs of all users in the community, including seniors, youth, and the disabled, and contributes to the community's quality of life by: o Balancing the needs of all users of the public rights-of-way by providing safe and convenient travel and access for bicyclists, transit riders, freight and motor vehicle drivers, and people of all ages and abilities. o Designing streets to accommodate larger vehicles such as buses, fire service vehicles, and freight delivery trucks without compromising pedestrian and bicycle safety. o Providing safe and comfortable access for persons with disabilities. o Providing public open space that integrates amenities including street trees and landscaping, street and sidewalk lighting, transit facilities, street furniture, water features, and public art work. – Circulation Policy 5.4-8: ADA. Incorporate American with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements to create an accessible pedestrian system that can serve all users. – Community Facilities Policy 6.1-1: Involved Citizenry. Provide for the full inclusion of people of diverse backgrounds, ages, genders, interests, lifestyles, and socioeconomic status in governmental decision-making through a variety of community outreach and information programs.

Policy Title	Summary
	▪ Economic Prosperity Goal 7.5: A community that looks successful and is attractive to existing and potential businesses and employees. – Economic Prosperity Policy 7.5-1: Livable Community. In conjunction with the Chamber of Commerce and other organizations, promote Pico Rivera's unique character and lifestyle as a means of attracting and retaining higher-income, college-educated professionals to the community along with the businesses they manage. – Economic Prosperity Policy 7.5-2: Business Climate. In conjunction with the Chamber of Commerce and other organizations, promote Pico Rivera as a highly livable community and an excellent place to do business, stressing its advantages (e.g., location close to downtown Los Angeles, skilled workforce, involved community). ▪ Economic Prosperity Goal 7.6 Adequate infrastructure to support existing businesses and industries and desired expansion of the community's business sector. – Economic Prosperity Policy 7.6.1 Infrastructure Investment. Improve public infrastructure in commercial and employment-generating areas. ▪ Environmental Resources Goal 8.1: A sustainable community where land use and transportation improvements are consistent with regional planning efforts and adopted plans to reduce dependence on the use of fossil fuels and decrease greenhouse gas emissions. – Environmental Resources Policy 8.6.1: Conserve areas that serve as interim and permanent open space in the City, including the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel river corridors and their spreading grounds, other publicly maintained open space, and utility corridors. ▪ Healthy Communities Goal 10.2: A balanced and healthy transportation system where transit, bicycling, and walking are alternative methods to the automobile. – Healthy Communities Policy 10.6-1: Development patterns. Promote development patterns that reduce commute times, provide public space for people to congregate and interact socially, that encourage civic participation and foster safe and attractive environments. – Healthy Communities Policy 10.7-19: Community Centers. Regularly maintain, improve, and expand, when necessary, existing community centers to adequately meet the City's needs.
Pico Rivera Municipal Code (2025)	The following titles of the City of Pico Rivera Municipal Code contain articles relevant to socioeconomics and communities: Title 10, Vehicles and Traffic; Title 12, Streets and Sidewalks; Title 13, Public Utilities; Title 15, Buildings and Construction; and Title 18, Zoning.
City of Santa Fe Springs	
Re-Imagine Santa Fe Springs 2040 General Plan, Land Use Element, Circulation Element (2022)	▪ Land Use Goal LU-8: Vibrant mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly districts around transit stations – Land Use Policy LU-8.1: Transit Oriented Development. Promote development of high-density residential uses, mixed use, and commercial services within walking distance of commuter rail transit stations ▪ Circulation Goal C-4: A comprehensive transit system that provides convenient and reliable transit access to residential neighborhoods and activity destinations

Policy Title	Summary
Code of Santa Fe Springs (2025)	The following chapters of the Code of Santa Fe Springs contain articles relevant to socioeconomics and communities: Chapter 73, Bicycles; Chapter 96, Streets and Sidewalks; Chapter 150, Building Regulations; and Chapter 155, Zoning.
City of Norwalk	
Vision Norwalk – The City of Norwalk General Plan,[1] Land Use Element, Circulation Element (2023)	▪ Land Use Objective 2: To coordinate land use with newly developed as well as future planned transportation facilities and infrastructure; and to provide for upgraded infrastructure and services to support the City's physical and economic growth and development. ▪ Land Use Objective 3: To develop an integrated transportation system, utilizing existing and future public and private transportation modes to meet the City's and regional transportation needs in a more efficient manner. ▪ Circulation Goal 1: An adequate transportation/circulation system that supports regional and local land uses at adopted level of service (LOS) standards and complies with requirements of the County Transportation Management Program (CMP). ▪ Circulation Goal 2: A network of regional transportation facilities which ensures the safe and efficient movement of people and goods from within the City to areas outside its boundaries and which accommodates the regional travel demands of developing areas outside the city. ▪ Circulation Goal 3: A circulation system that maximizes efficiency through the use of transportation system management and demand management strategies. ▪ Circulation Goal 4: An efficient public transportation system that provides mobility to all City residents, employees and visitors.
Norwalk Municipal Code (2024)	The following titles of the City of Norwalk Municipal Code contain articles relevant to socioeconomics and communities: Title 10, Vehicles and Traffic; Title 12, Streets and Sidewalks; Title 13, Public Services; Title 15, Buildings and Construction; and Title 17, Zoning.
City of La Mirada	
City of La Mirada General Plan, Circulation Element, Open Space and Conservation Element (2003)	▪ Circulation Goal 3.0: Make alternative transportation convenient, safe, and responsive to changing transit demands. – Circulation Policy 3.2: Work with regional and local transit service providers to improve the connectivity of transit service to other regional transportation service. – Open Space and Conservation Policy 3.2: Support local and regional projects that improve mobility, reduce congestion on freeways, and improve air quality.
La Mirada Code of Ordinances (2024)	The following titles of the La Mirada Code of Ordinances contain articles relevant to socioeconomics and communities: Title 10, Vehicles and Traffic; Title 12, Streets and Sidewalks; Title 13, Water and Sewage; Title 14, Utilities; and Title 17, Buildings and Construction.

Policy Title	Summary
Orange County	
County of Orange General Plan, Land Use Element, Growth Management Element (2025)	▪ Land Use Policy 5: To plan an integrated land use and transportation system that accommodates travel demand for all modes of transit. ▪ Land Use Policy 7: To require new development to be compatible with adjacent areas. ▪ Land Use Policy 9: To guide development so that the quality of the physical environment is enhanced. ▪ Growth Management Goal 1: Reduce traffic congestion. ▪ Growth Management Goal 2: Ensure that adequate transportation facilities, public facilities, equipment, and services are provided for existing and future residents.
Codified Ordinances of the County of Orange (2024)	The following titles of the Codified Ordinances of the County of Orange contain articles relevant to socioeconomics and communities: Title 2, Public Facilities; Title 6, Highways, Bridges, Rights-of-Way, Vehicles; and Title 7, Land Use and Building Regulations.
City of Buena Park	
Buena Park 2035 General Plan, Land Use Element, Mobility Element, Open Space and Recreation Element, Environmental Justice Element (2022)	▪ Policy LU-3.1: Ensure that development activities acknowledge the protection and enhancement of quality of life in the City's neighborhoods. ▪ Goal M-1: A comprehensive circulation system that supports the policies of the General Plan and facilitates the efficient movement of people and goods through the City. ▪ Policy M-3.4: Discourage the creation of new roadway connections which would adversely impact the residential character of existing residential neighborhoods. ▪ Goal M-7: Reduced traffic congestion within the City and surrounding area. ▪ Policy M-9.3: New development projects and public infrastructure projects shall ensure direct pedestrian connections to existing and foreseeable future transit stops. ▪ Goal OSR-1: Availability of and access to open space resources. ▪ Goal EJ-1: Reduce pollution exposure and improve air quality. ▪ Policy EJ-1.3: Mitigate the impacts of pollution on existing sensitive land uses and prevent the development of new pollution generating sources by requiring adequate mitigation of air contaminant exposure in any new sensitive land-use developments that are close to mobile or stationary sources of pollution. ▪ Policy EJ-1.4: Minimize potential impacts from air pollution among sensitive land use through feasible and effective measures, such as setbacks, vegetative barriers, ventilation systems, and/or air filters. ▪ Policy EJ-3.1: Prioritize and allocate city resources to provide public facilities and services to communities in need. ▪ Policy EJ-3.2: Support public and private investments in vulnerable communities that increase economic opportunity and environmental quality. ▪ Policy EJ-3.4: Support projects, programs and policies which support equal access to public facilities and infrastructure for all community residents. ▪ Policy EJ-3.5: Plan and design projects, including City Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects, to consider current and planned adjacent land uses, local transportation needs, and climate change vulnerabilities, while incorporating the latest and best practice design guidance.

Policy Title	Summary
	▪ Policy EJ-3.6: Coordinate with regional planning and transportation agencies to provide high quality public transit services. ▪ Policy EJ-4.3: Support policies, projects and programs which encourage transit-oriented development that provides access to local and regional opportunities and strengthens community development. ▪ Policy EJ-6.1: Proactively and meaningfully engage community residents in the planning and development process by using culturally appropriate and accessible channels, including: providing appropriate language services; providing child care; holding meetings, focus groups, or listening sessions at a variety of venues throughout the community; and using participatory facilitation techniques. ▪ Policy EJ-6.2: Consult with California Native American tribes to provide them with an opportunity to participate in local land use decisions at an early planning stage, for the purpose of protecting, or mitigating impacts to cultural places. ▪ Policy EJ-6.3: Facilitate the meaningful participation of community residents, businesses, and organizations in the development, adoption, and implementation of planning, public facilities and built environment initiatives, and consider their input throughout the decision-making process. ▪ Policy EJ-6.4: Foster collaborative partnerships, including with public health professionals and other public and private sector stakeholders, to develop and implement Environmental Justice-related initiatives. ▪ Implementation Strategy EJ-3: Ensure that development projects are reviewed for conformance with environmental policies as a part of the discretionary review process. ▪ Implementation Strategy EJ-5: At public meetings and outreach events provide appropriate language services, childcare, and options for live or delayed online participation. ▪ Implementation Strategy EJ-8: Include the results of public outreach with decision-makers to help inform their decision making process.
Buena Park Municipal Code (2025)	The following titles of the Buena Park Municipal Code contain articles relevant to socioeconomics and communities: Title 10, Vehicles and Traffic; Title 12, Streets, Sidewalks, and Public Property; Title 13, Utilities; Title 15, Buildings and Construction Safety; and Title 19, Zoning.

Policy Title	Summary
City of Fullerton	
The Fullerton Plan, Built Environment Element, Economy Element (2025)	▪ Built Environment Policy 1.7: Support projects programs, policies and regulations to promote a development pattern that encourages a network of multi-modal transportation options. ▪ Built Environment Policy 1.11: Support programs, policies and regulations to consider the immediate and surrounding contexts of projects to promote positive design relationships and use compatibility with adjacent built environments and land uses, including the public realm. ▪ Built Environment Goal 5.0: A balanced system promoting transportation alternatives that enable mobility and an enhanced quality of life. – Built Environment Policy 5.1: Support regional and subregional efforts to implement programs that coordinate the multimodal transportation needs and requirements across jurisdictions, including but not limited to the Master Plan of Arterial Highways, the Commuter Bikeways Strategic Plan, the Signal Synchronization Master Plan, the Orange County Congestion Management Plan, and the Growth Management Plan. – Built Environment Policy 5.2: Support regional and subregional efforts to increase alternatives to and infrastructure supporting reduction of single occupant vehicle trips. – Built Environment Policy 5.5: Support projects, programs, policies and regulations to advance the Fullerton Transportation Center as an important economic asset that provides efficient regional travel and mode choice options for business, commerce and the general public. – Built Environment Policy 5.8: Support programs, policies and regulations to plan for and implement an efficient transportation network that maximizes capacity for person-trips, not just vehicle-trips. ▪ Built Environment Goal 8: Protection from the adverse effect of noise. ▪ Economy Policy 9.1: Support projects, programs and policies with regional organizations involved in economic development to strengthen strategic alliances, ensure the efficient use of City resources and to encourage mutually supportive efforts.
Fullerton Transportation Center Specific Plan (2015)	▪ Goal 2: Create a mixed-use neighborhood that contributes toward a sustainable Downtown economy. ▪ Goal 3: Create a mixed-use and transit-oriented neighborhood that contributes to a sustainable natural environment.
Fullerton Transit Village Specific Plan (2004)	▪ Goal 2: To reclaim the currently blighted site and transform it into an aesthetic living environment, integral with downtown Fullerton. ▪ Goal 5: To provide a desirable community where people want to live.
Fullerton Municipal Code (2025)	The following titles of the Fullerton Municipal Code contain articles relevant to socioeconomics and communities: Title 9, Parks; Title 12, Water and Sewers; and Title 15, Zoning.

Policy Title	Summary
City of Anaheim	
City of Anaheim General Plan, Land Use Element, Economic Development Element, Circulation Element, Growth Management Element (2025)	▪ Land Use Goal 3.1: Pursue land uses along major corridors that enhance the city's image and stimulate appropriate development at strategic locations. ▪ Economic Development Goal 6.3: Create a major, mixed-use regional center in The Platinum Triangle providing employment, shopping, entertainment, and housing for residents, employees and visitors. ▪ Economic Development Goal 15.1: Establish the Platinum Triangle as a thriving economic center that provides residents, visitors and employees with a variety of housing, employment, shopping and entertainment opportunities that are accessed by arterial highway, transit systems and pedestrian promenades. ▪ Circulation Goal 1.1: Provide a comprehensive multimodal transportation system that facilitates current and long-term circulation of people and goods in and through the City. ▪ Circulation Goal 2.3: Improve regional access for City residents and workers. ▪ Circulation Goal 6.1: Support the development of mass transit to enhance modal choice. ▪ Growth Management Goal 1.4: Develop land use strategies and incentives to reduce the amount of vehicle miles traveled within the City. ▪ Growth Management Goal 2.1: Reduce traffic congestion on the City's arterial highway system.
Platinum Triangle Master Land Use Plan (2017)	The Platinum Triangle Master Land Use Plan establishes the following planning principles related to the project: ▪ 2.1.2 Stimulate Market-Driven Development: The Master Land Use Plan is intended to encourage and facilitate and encourage new development within the Platinum Triangle. The PTMU Overlay Zone is designed to guide, not inhibit, current market forces. Development that will lead to strong economic return is encouraged. The growth of housing in the Platinum Triangle will also stimulate high quality office development since few locations within the region allow for office development adjacent to housing and local services. ▪ 2.1.5 Reinforce Transit Oriented Development Opportunities: the Master Land Use Plan and PTMU Overlay Zone provide opportunities for Transit Oriented Development in close proximity to existing and future rail and bus transportation facilities. ▪ 2.1.6 Maintain and Enhance Connectivity: The linkage between The Anaheim Resort and the Platinum Triangle will be enhanced, connecting key activity centers including Angel Stadium of Anaheim, The Grove of Anaheim, the Honda Center, the Anaheim Convention Center and The Disneyland Resort. On a more local level, emerging neighborhoods will be connected by a newly expanded functional and convenient street network and pedestrian walkways. The system will allow high capacity event-based networks to work in conjunction with an everyday, pedestrian-friendly local circulation system.
Anaheim Municipal Code (2025)	The following titles of the Anaheim Municipal Code contain articles relevant to socioeconomics and communities: Title 6, Public Health and Safety; Title 10, Public Service and Utilities; Title 12, Streets and Sidewalks; Title 13, Parks and Boulevards; Title 14, Traffic; Title 15, Buildings and Housing; and Title 18, Zoning.

Policy Title	Summary
City of Orange	
Orange General Plan (2025)	▪ Land Use Policy 2.6: Encourage linkage in and around mixed-use areas using a multi-modal circulation network, particularly transit, pedestrian sidewalks, paths and paseos, and bicycle and trail systems. ▪ Land Use Goal 7.0: Promote coordinated planning among City departments and agencies, property owners, residents, special districts, and other jurisdictions in the region. – Land Use Policy 7.4: Ensure positive benefits for Orange from regional transportation, lane use, air quality, waste management and disposal, and habitat conservation plans. – Land Use Policy 7.5: Work with and encourage other agencies and service providers to minimize potential visual and environmental impacts of their facilities on Orange. ▪ Circulation Goal 2.0: Provide an effective regional transportation network. – Circulation Policy 2.3: Cooperate with and support local and regional agencies' efforts to improve regional arterials and transit in order to address increasing traffic congestion. – Circulation Policy 2.4: Coordinate land use planning with anticipated future development of roadways and other transportation facility improvements as well as the expansion of commuter rail and bus service. – Circulation Policy 2.6: Encourage the use of regional rail, transit, bicycling, carpools, and vanpools for work trips to relieve congestion. ▪ Growth Policy 1.7: Promote the expansion and development of alternative methods of transportation. ▪ Growth Goal 2.0: Provide for adequate regional and local transportation facilities. – Growth Policy 2.1: Cooperate with other agencies to address regional issues and opportunities related to growth, transportation, infrastructure, and other planning issues. ▪ Economic Development Goal 6.0: Provide sufficient infrastructure to support anticipated economic development and growth.
Orange Municipal Code (2024)	The following titles of the Orange Municipal Code contains articles relevant to socioeconomics and communities: Title 3, Revenue and Finance; Title 7, Environment; Title 10, Vehicles and Traffic; and Title 17, Zoning.

Sources: City of Anaheim 2017, 2025a, 2025b; City of Bell 2022, 2024; City of Buena Park 2022, 2025; City of Commerce 2008, 2024a; City of Fullerton 2004, 2015, 2025a, 2025b; City of La Mirada 2003, 2024a; City of Los Angeles 2024a, 2024b, 2024c, 2025; City of Montebello 2024a, 2024b; City of Norwalk 2023, 2024a; City of Orange 2024a, 2025; City of Pico Rivera 2014, 2025; City of Santa Fe Springs 2022, 2025; City of Vernon 2023, 2024a; County of Los Angeles 2025a, 2025b; County of Orange 2024a, 2025; SCAG 2024

[1] This plan is currently undergoing an update as of January 2025.

AB = Assembly Bill; ADA = Americans with Disabilities Act; Caltrans = California Department of Transportation; CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act; CMP = County Transportation Management Program; CPA = Community Plan Area; LAUSD = Los Angeles Unified School District; LOS = level of service; MTA = Metropolitan Transportation Authority; PTMU = Platinum Triangle Mixed Use; RTP = Regional Transportation Plan; SB = Senate Bill; SCAG = Southern California Association of Governments; SCS = Sustainable Communities Strategy; SOV = single-occupancy vehicle

3.12.3 Consistency with Plans and Laws

As indicated in Section 3.1.5.3, Consistency with Plans and Laws, CEQA and NEPA require a discussion of inconsistencies or conflicts between a proposed undertaking and federal, state, regional, or local plans and laws. CEQA and FRA NEPA implementing procedures require the discussion of any inconsistency or conflict between a proposed action and federal, state, regional,

or local plans and laws. Where inconsistencies or conflicts exist, the Authority must provide a description of the extent of reconciliation and the reason for proceeding if full reconciliation is not feasible under NEPA (64 Fed. Reg. 28545, 14(n)(15)) and must discuss the inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans, specific plans, and regional plans under CEQA (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d)).

Several federal and state laws, listed in Section 3.12.2.1, Federal, and Section 3.12.2.2, respectively, pertain to socioeconomics and communities. Pursuant to U.S. Code Title 23 Section 327, under the NEPA Assignment Memorandum of Understanding between the FRA and the State of California, effective July 23, 2019, and renewed on July 22, 2024, the Authority is the federal lead agency for environmental reviews and approvals for Authority Phase 1 and Phase 2 California HSR System projects. The Authority, as the lead agency proposing to build and operate the HSR system, is required to comply with federal and state laws and regulations and to secure applicable federal and state permits prior to initiating construction of the project. Therefore, there would be no inconsistencies between the project and these federal and state laws and regulations.

The Authority is a state agency and is therefore not required to comply with local land use and zoning regulations; however, it has endeavored to design and build the California HSR System so that it is consistent with land use and zoning regulations. For example, the proposed build alternatives will incorporate IAMFs that require the contractor to prepare a plan to demonstrate how construction socioeconomic and community impacts will be maintained below applicable standards.

Appendix 3.1-A provides a complete consistency analysis of local plans and policies applicable to the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section. The Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would be consistent with all regional and local policies related to socioeconomics and communities but would be inconsistent with the following regional and local plan and policy:

- **City of Commerce 2020 General Plan Community Development Element, Policy 7.2:** The City of Commerce will oppose the over-concentration of public facilities and improvements that provide benefits to the region at large while adversely affecting the local community. The region at large must share both the benefits and the disadvantages of such uses and facilities.
  - **Inconsistent.** Shared Passenger Track Alternatives A and B would displace 115 businesses in Commerce, which represents the majority of business displacements for the project. There is a deficit of replacement properties in Commerce to accommodate the relocation of displaced businesses. Business displacements would occur in areas adjacent to the existing rail corridor and could affect the economic viability of industry in the rest of the city. The project would introduce benefits of improved accessibility and employment growth along the project corridor that could serve as an economic stimulant to surrounding communities, including Commerce. However, the project would disproportionately affect Commerce through business displacements. Therefore, the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives are inconsistent with the policy established by the City of Commerce.

Despite the inconsistency, the project is consistent with the majority of regional and local policies and plans. Although it may not be possible to meet all regional and local policies relevant to socioeconomics and communities as outlined in Table 3.12-1, IAMFs and mitigation measures will generally minimize socioeconomic and community impacts and the project would ultimately meet the overall objectives of the local policies.

3.12.4 Methods for Evaluating Impacts

The evaluation of impacts on socioeconomics and communities is a requirement of NEPA and CEQA. The following sections summarize the RSAs and the methods used to analyze impacts on socioeconomics and communities. As summarized in Section 3.12.1, Introduction, several other sections provide additional information related to socioeconomics and communities. As described

in the *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Community Impact Assessment* (Authority 2025a), information was verified by aerial photographs, geographic information system data sets, and field investigations.

3.12.4.1 Definition of Resource Study Areas

As defined in Section 3.1.5.4, Methods for Evaluating Impacts, RSAs are the geographic boundaries in which the Authority has conducted environmental investigations specific to each resource topic. This section considers RSAs as described below and summarized in Table 3.12-2, which provides a general definition and boundary description for the RSA. Impacts on communities and neighborhoods, including population, housing, business, and community facilities, would occur in or adjacent to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives footprint as a direct result of project construction and operation. Economic effects on fiscal revenues, job creation, and school district funding would have broad economic implications outside of the immediate project footprint; to accurately capture these effects, the RSA for economic impacts includes Los Angeles and Orange Counties.

Communities and Neighborhoods Resource Study Area

Figure 3.12-1 and Figure 3.12-2 depict the communities and neighborhoods direct and indirect RSAs by plotting the 0.5-mile buffer around the Shared Passenger Track Alternative footprints over a map of U.S. Census tracts. The RSA is in Los Angeles and Orange Counties. Therefore, discussion of regional demographics and housing characteristics uses census data for Los Angeles and Orange Counties and the following cities and census-designated places (CDP): Los Angeles, Vernon, Commerce, Bell, Montebello, Pico Rivera, West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, South Whittier CDP, La Mirada, Buena Park, Fullerton, Anaheim, and Orange.

Displacement and Relocation Resource Study Area

This analysis considers displacement and relocation impacts on surrounding communities. The RSA for the displacements analysis includes the project footprint for direct impacts. The right-of-way includes the areas needed for the project components, and portions of parcels beyond the necessary right-of-way that would need to be acquired for management and maintenance activities. Where the remaining portion of a parcel would be too small to sustain the parcel's current use without other major modifications, those acquisitions would be considered full acquisitions. Properties that would be acquired for the rights-of-way of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives are further described in the *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Draft Relocation Impact Report* (Authority 2025b).

The RSA for indirect impacts includes the surrounding neighborhoods, districts, communities, and cities. For the purposes of this analysis, the displacement and relocation RSA comprises all the cities and unincorporated communities where displacements would occur from construction of any of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. The replacement area is defined as the area containing the cities, neighborhoods, and communities affected by the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives footprints, and nearby cities, neighborhoods, and communities that may provide additional replacement site options.

Children's Health and Safety Resource Study Area

This analysis evaluates a variety of resource topics for their potential to result in health and safety effects on children. For the purposes of this analysis, children are defined as the population in the study area age 18 or younger. The RSA for this analysis includes schools, daycare facilities, and recreation areas where children are likely to congregate within 1,000 feet of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives footprints. The analysis considers the effects on children from traffic, air quality, noise and vibration, electromagnetic fields and electromagnetic interference, hydrology and water resources, hazardous materials and wastes, safety and security, and recreation.

Economic Resource Study Area

This section considers both regional and local economic impacts of the project, including impacts on city and county tax revenues, job creation, school district funding, and agricultural production. Therefore, the RSA for economic impacts is Los Angeles and Orange Counties. In this economic RSA, this analysis describes Anaheim, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, and Fullerton in detail because of their physical proximity to the proposed HSR station area and HSR station options. Potential effects on employment are evaluated for all of Los Angeles and Orange Counties.

Table 3.12-2 Definition of Socioeconomics and Communities Resource Study Areas

Resource Study Area	Definition
Communities and Neighborhoods	
RSA for direct impacts	The project footprint[1] and the area within 0.5-mile radius of the project centerline
RSA for indirect impacts	Direct impact RSA, plus the entirety of the census tracts at least partially included in the direct impact RSA
RSA for displacements and relocations	The displacement RSA is generally the project footprint, whereas the relocation RSA for indirect impacts encompasses surrounding communities and cities
RSA for children's health and safety	The project footprint and the surrounding areas up to 1,000 feet
Economics	
RSA	The combined areas of Los Angeles and Orange Counties

[1] The project footprint includes all areas required to build, operate, and maintain all permanent high-speed rail facilities, including permanent right-of-way, permanent utility and access easements, and temporary construction easements.
RSA = resource study area



Sources: Los Angeles City Bureau of Engineering 2015; Los Angeles County Assessor 2023; Orange County Assessor 2023; ESRI 2014a, 2014b

Figure 3.12-1 Communities and Neighborhoods Resource Study Areas for Direct and Indirect Impacts



Source: ESRI 2014a

Figure 3.12-2 Economic Effects Resource Study Area

3.12.4.2 Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features

The Shared Passenger Track Alternatives incorporate standardized HSR features to avoid and minimize impacts. These features are referred to as IAMFs and are considered to be part of the project. The Authority will incorporate IAMFs during project design and construction; therefore, the analysis of impacts of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in this section factors in applicable IAMFs. Appendix 2-A provides a detailed description of IAMFs that are included as part of the project design. The IAMFs differ from mitigation measures in that they are part of the project regardless of whether an impact is identified in this document. In contrast, mitigation measures may be available to further reduce, compensate for, or offset project impacts that the analysis identifies under NEPA or concludes are significant under CEQA. IAMFs applicable to socioeconomics and communities include:

- **SOCIO-IAMF#1, Construction Management Plan**, requires preparation of a Construction Management Plan that includes measures intended to minimize construction impacts on community residents and businesses.
- **SOCIO-IAMF#2, Compliance with Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act**, requires adherence to the Uniform Act to reduce potential socioeconomic impacts by providing relocation assistance for people displaced through right-of-way acquisition.
- **SOCIO-IAMF#3, Relocation Implementation Plan**, requires development of a relocation implementation plan to minimize the economic disruption related to relocation.

Other resource IAMFs applicable to impacts on socioeconomics and communities include:

- **AQ-IAMF#1:** Fugitive Dust Emissions
- **AQ-IAMF#2:** Selection of Coatings
- **AQ-IAMF#3:** Renewable Diesel
- **AQ-IAMF#4:** Reduce Criteria Exhaust Emissions from Construction Equipment
- **AQ-IAMF#5:** Reduce Criteria Exhaust Emissions from On-Road Construction Equipment
- **HMW-IAMF#5:** Demolition Plans
- **HMW-IAMF#6:** Spill Prevention
- **HMW-IAMF#7:** Storage and Transport of Materials
- **HMW-IAMF#8:** Permit Conditions
- **HMW-IAMF#9:** Environmental Management System
- **HMW-IAMF#10:** Hazardous Materials Plans
- **NV-IAMF#1:** Noise and Vibration
- **AVQ-IAMF#1:** Aesthetic Options
- **AVQ-IAMF#2:** Aesthetic Review Process
- **LU-IAMF#3:** Restoration of Land Used Temporarily During Construction
- **SS-IAMF#1:** Construction Safety Transportation Management Plan
- **SS-IAMF#2:** Safety and Security Management Plan
- **TR-IAMF#1:** Protection of Public Roadways During Construction
- **TR-IAMF#2:** Construction Transportation Plan
- **TR-IAMF#3:** Off-Street Parking for Construction-Related Vehicles
- **TR-IAMF#4:** Maintenance of Pedestrian Access
- **TR-IAMF#5:** Maintenance of Bicycle Access
- **TR-IAMF#6:** Restriction on Construction Hours
- **TR-IAMF#7:** Construction Truck Routes
- **TR-IAMF#8:** Construction During Special Events
- **TR-IAMF#11:** Maintenance of Transit Access
- **TR-IAMF#12:** Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety

In Section 3.12.6, each impact narrative describes how these IAMFs are applicable and, where appropriate, effective at avoiding or minimizing potential impacts to less-than-significant levels under CEQA.

3.12.4.3 Methods for Impact Analysis

This section describes the sources and methods the Authority used to analyze potential impacts from project implementation on socioeconomic and community resources. These methods apply to both NEPA and CEQA analyses unless otherwise indicated. Refer to Section 3.1.5.4 for a description of the general framework for evaluating impacts under NEPA and CEQA. Refer to Section 4.2, Methodology for Effects Analysis, of the *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Community Impact Assessment* (Authority 2025a), for information regarding the methods and data sources used in this analysis. Laws, regulations, and orders (refer to Section 3.12.2) that regulate socioeconomic and community resources were also considered in the evaluation of direct and indirect impacts on socioeconomic and community resources. For this analysis, baseline data were collected via field research, review of aerial photographs and geographic information system layers, collection of information from various databases such as U.S. Census Bureau and parcel data, and review of local planning documents and city websites. To characterize the communities and neighborhoods RSAs, American Community Survey (ACS) 2017–2021 5-Year Estimates data at the census block group level, which represents the finest geographical level of analysis possible, were used. Block groups are statistical divisions of census tracts, and generally defined to contain between 600 and 3,000 people. A block group consists of clusters of blocks in the same census tract; each census tract contains at least one block group (U.S. Census Bureau 2024).

The Authority considered indirect and direct impacts of construction and operation of the project on socioeconomics and communities. For project construction and operational actions that would result in impacts, feasible mitigation measures are identified to avoid or minimize impacts or to compensate for impacts. The analysis also includes reviews of data and impact analyses in other sections prepared for the Draft EIR/EIS, as noted in Section 3.12.1.

Disruption or Division of Established Communities

For the purpose of this analysis, a community is defined as “a population rooted in one place, where the daily life of each member involves contact with and dependence on other members” (Caltrans 2011). Community cohesion refers to the degree to which residents have a “sense of belonging” to their neighborhood, commitment to the community, or a strong attachment to neighbors, groups, and institutions, generally related to continued association over time. Community cohesion takes into consideration public access to community facilities and businesses in the surrounding area that residents rely on for their health and welfare and as a means to gather and interact with other members of the community.

According to the California Department of Transportation’s guidance for community impact assessment (Caltrans 2011) and community impact assessment template (Caltrans 2025), demographic indicators that correlate with a higher degree of community cohesion include:

- The percentage of the population that is ethnically homogenous (e.g., majority Hispanic). In general, homogeneity of the population contributes to higher levels of cohesion. Communities that are ethnically homogenous often speak the same language, hold similar beliefs, and share a common culture, and are therefore more likely to engage in social interaction on a routine basis.
- The percentage of housing units that are owner-occupied. Residents who are homeowners in a community are likely to be less mobile, more personally invested in their neighborhood because they have a financial stake in their community and having a stronger sense of belonging in their community.
- The percentage of the population that is age 65 and older. Residents age 65 and older are used as an indicator because elderly populations, including retirees, often tend to be more

involved in the community are especially sensitive to changes in the community. They are more likely to have more time for volunteering and participating in social organizations.

- The percentage of the population that is transit dependent. Transit-dependent populations tend to walk or use public transportation for travel and tend to be more active participants in the surrounding community compared to residents who travel by automobile. These populations would also be more susceptible to interruptions to the roadway network or transportation services during construction of the project.
- The percentage of the population that consists of long-term residents. Long-term residence often leads to stronger social ties and development of a stronger identity in the community compared to temporary or short-term residence.

To assess whether the project would cause disruption or division of established communities, or changes to community cohesion, the Authority considered whether construction and operation of the project would result in any of the following:

- Physical division of an established neighborhood that could isolate one part of a community from another through the physical removal of homes and businesses or construction of physical barriers to social interaction, circulation, and access (e.g., through closure of roads, bicycle routes, or pedestrian access)
- Disruption in access to community facilities or services as a result of acquisition and displacement of facilities, traffic detours, street closures, or loss of parking
- Physical deterioration of communities, defined as residential migration out of the community, extensive changes to the business environment of the community, or substantial reductions in revenue sources for local governments, as a result of the project
- Changes to the overall quality of life in a community or community character caused by indirect effects (not immediately related to the project, but may be indirectly caused by the project) related to traffic, noise and vibration, ambient air quality, utility interruptions, induced population growth, or aesthetic changes. This includes effects on children's health and safety
- Disruption to normal school operations or access to schools and associated facilities, as well as growth-related effects on existing school capacity and enrollment

Displacement and Relocation of Local Residents, Businesses, and Services

This analysis evaluated displacements by determining the extent to which the project would affect existing properties within the RSAs and identifying those properties where the current use would be precluded if the project were built. The Authority consulted the Los Angeles and Orange County Assessors records to identify uses at properties or portions of properties that would fall within the RSAs to identify those parcels or partial parcels that would be required to accommodate the project design (Los Angeles County Assessor 2023; Orange County Assessor 2023). Generally, full acquisitions were designated where a substantial portion of the structure or structures composing the property's principal dwelling or business facility would be in the area to be acquired for the HSR right-of-way or for an extended period during construction. Similarly, where a property's structures would not be affected, but any physical component critical to a property's intended use (such as parking, access, or open space used for storage of goods or equipment) would be acquired, the acquisition would be considered a full acquisition. The final full and partial parcel acquisition decisions would ultimately be determined on a case-by-case basis during the land acquisition phase of the project.

In addition to parcel data, the Authority incorporated aerial imagery into the geographic information system to identify where the project could affect a building, driveway, parking lot, or other key features of a property that may affect its existing use. Based on the worst-case extent of the potential effect, the Authority determined whether the acquisition would be a full or partial acquisition, and whether the occupant(s) of the parcel would be displaced by the project. The analysis also included the effects of displacement on employees of businesses affected by property acquisitions, as well as effects from relocated government and public services on

residents. The Authority consulted various commercial and residential real estate databases such as California Regional Multiple Listing Service, Costar, and RefUSA. U.S. Census data were also used as applicable to make relevant calculations related to the demographics and other characteristics of the affected environment.

What is a "displacement" and what is a "relocation"?

The term "displacement" refers to businesses and residences occupying property acquired for the project. The term "relocation" refers to the movement of affected businesses and residences into suitable replacement sites.

The Authority used these sources to determine the following:

- The number of residential units associated with each potentially acquired parcel
- The number of businesses associated with each affected parcel, including the type of business, and estimated number of employees
- The average number of residents per household in the area
- Current availability of suitable replacement sites for displaced residences and businesses

This detailed research enabled the analysis to identify the following:

- The number of residential units and occupants potentially displaced
- The number and type of commercial and industrial businesses that would be displaced as well as the number of employees displaced
- The availability of suitable replacement residences and business properties in the cities affected by the project. Replacement searches were filtered for residential, commercial, and industrial use types as applicable to ensure comparability; however, many displaced business facilities are anticipated to have special characteristics that would make finding suitable replacements more challenging. Therefore, it was important to determine if a substantial surplus of replacement sites is available to ensure that displaced businesses have the highest likelihood of being successfully relocated.

In the case of full acquisition, residences and businesses are assumed displaced and offered relocation assistance.

Refer to the *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Draft Relocation Impact Report* (Authority 2025b) for additional information on the specific methods and sources used to identify residential and business displacements.

Children's Health and Safety

This analysis evaluates the type of health and safety risks that could affect children during either construction or operation of the project. The RSA includes schools, daycare facilities, and recreation areas where children are likely to congregate within 1,000 feet of the project footprint. In these RSAs, the effects of noise, air quality, hazardous materials, EMF or EMI, and safety risks (e.g., along designated school walk routes) could affect children based on impact criteria for those resources. Refer to Appendix 3.12-F, Children's Health and Safety Risk Assessment, for additional information on the specific methods and sources used to identify potential children's health and safety impacts.

Economic

This analysis evaluates the economic effects of the project by assessing likely changes in property and sales tax revenue, employment, and school district funding. There is no agricultural land in production within the RSAs; therefore, there would be no economic effects on agricultural production. Therefore, economic effects on agriculture are not discussed further.

Property and Sales Tax Revenue Changes

The analysis estimated likely reduced property tax revenues based on the permanent property acquisitions.[1] The Authority estimated these potential effects quantitatively as the estimated reduction in property tax revenue for county and city budgets resulting from the permanent removal of privately owned properties from the tax rolls. Sales tax losses were estimated quantitatively for those displaced businesses that collect sales tax for products, goods, or services. Because suitable replacement locations are available in the taxing jurisdictions (cities and counties) where displacements occur, impacts on the taxing jurisdiction would be temporary. For displaced businesses identified as generating sales and use tax, the Authority estimated the businesses' annual sales tax revenue based on the average taxable sales per business, as reported by the State Board of Equalization for Fiscal Year (FY) 2021/2022 in Los Angeles County and Orange County for the project. The total estimated sales tax revenue associated with the potential business displacements in each jurisdiction was then compared to the total FY 2021/2022 sales tax bases in that jurisdiction. To evaluate the project's contribution to construction and operation-related sales tax gains, the analysis also calculated total local sales tax revenues generated from local purchases. Sales tax revenues during construction were derived using the sales tax rate for the appropriate county and the estimated local expenditures on materials and supplies for each year of construction and operation, as discussed in Section 3.12.6. Refer to the *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Community Impact Assessment* (Authority 2025a) for more details on the methodology used for this analysis.

It should be noted that the property tax revenue changes take a conservative approach that assumes that acquired property would be in public ownership. In reality, it is possible that some of the land would be in private ownership, in which case, changes in property tax revenues would be less pronounced. In addition, while economic benefits are difficult to quantify, research indicates that locating property near high-quality public transportation generally tends to have a positive effect on its property value (American Public Transportation Association 2019). Therefore, although not quantified as part of this study, the economic benefits of the project could contribute positively to property tax revenue changes.

Employment

To estimate short-term construction employment, the Authority used the Bureau of Economic Analysis Regional Input-Output Modeling System II (BEA 2015) and bill of goods method to estimate the region-wide potential direct, indirect, and induced job creation resulting from spending associated with the project in the construction sector. The Regional Input-Output Modeling System II model, which was created and is maintained by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, is widely used throughout the United States to estimate the impacts of policies, projects, and other kinds of economy activity. One issue that is important to address in economic impact modeling is to account for goods and services that are purchased within the RSAs versus those originating from outside the RSAs. Economists commonly use a "bill of goods" approach to address this concern. A bill of goods approach uses information on the purchases of goods and services (including labor) by the initially affected industry to specify purchases originating from within and outside of the RSAs. Long-term employment effects considered the economic growth effects resulting from initial construction, annual operations and maintenance, and growth associated with improvements to accessibility as outlined in the updated methodology guidelines released in February 2017 (WSP USA 2017). The Regional Input-Output Modeling System II modeling procedure, assumptions, and results are described in detail in Appendix 3.18-A, RIMS II Modeling Details.

Changes in School District Funding

Funding for California's kindergarten through 12 public schools comes from the state budget, local property taxes, and the federal government. Each school district has its own combination of

[1] The acquisition of temporary and permanent easements would not result in property tax losses because the landowner would retain fee interest in the land and would continue to pay property tax.

federal, state, and local sources, which indicates that each district would be affected differently by a change in local property tax revenue.

Of the various school district funding sources, the project has the potential to affect local property tax revenues by removing land acquired for right-of-way from the property tax assessment roll and to affect average daily attendance–based funding sources by relocating students outside of their current school districts. Therefore, the school district funding analysis focuses on the project's potential effects on these two revenue streams.

The analysis examined school district boundaries in the economic effects RSAs to determine the potential number of residential relocations in each school district. The Authority estimated the number of student displacements associated with each potentially displaced residential unit based on the Statewide Average Student Yield Factor[2] for unified school districts published by the California Office of Public School Construction, Form SAB 50-01, which is 0.7 student per dwelling unit. The appropriate student generation factor per household was multiplied by the number of residential relocations in each affected school district to determine the total potential number of student displacements in each district.

The Authority then took the total potential student displacements for each affected district and multiplied by each district's average daily attendance revenue per student for the 2021–2022 school year. Total average daily attendance revenue includes Local Control Funding Formula sources,[3] Principal Apportionment,[4] local property taxes, federal revenue, state revenue, and local revenue. Potentially reduced property tax revenues to local school districts were estimated for potential property acquisitions as a portion of the average daily attendance–based revenue. The Authority estimated these potential effects quantitatively as the estimated potential reduction in property tax revenue for local school district budgets resulting from the permanent removal of privately owned properties from the tax rolls. However, if the displaced households were to find replacement housing in their current school district, then there would be no impact on that school district's budgets. Information about displaced households and replacement sites can be found in the *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Draft Relocation Impact Report* (Authority 2025c).

The project would also result in benefits to school districts in the corridor through the provision of new HSR stations. New accessibility to transportation for HSR, along with local government planning for transit-oriented development in the vicinity of the HSR stations, would encourage redevelopment of higher density mixed uses (both residential and commercial), and these new developments would add to the tax bases for local school districts (Bay Area Council Economic Institute 2022). Although employment by itself does not contribute to property tax revenue, it could increase sales tax revenues from retail commercial. Although these benefits were not quantified as part of this analysis, it means that the school district funding analysis conducted for this project likely represents the worst-case scenario, and actual impacts on school district funding on implementation of the project would be lesser in severity.

3.12.4.4 Method for Evaluating Impacts Under NEPA

NEPA implementing procedures, regulations, and guidance provide the basis for evaluating project effects (as described in Section 3.1.1). The criteria of context and intensity are considered together when determining the severity of changes introduced by the project:

[2] The Statewide Average Student Yield Factor determines the elementary, middle, and high school pupils generated by new residential units in each grade category based on the historical student generation rates of new residential units built during the previous 5 years that are of a similar type of unit to those anticipated to be built in which the school district is located.

[3] Local Control Funding Formula sources include a combination of local property taxes and state aid.

[4] Principal Apportionment is a distribution of state aid based on a series of apportionment calculations that adjust the flow of state funds throughout the fiscal year as information becomes known.

- **Context:** For this analysis, the *context* includes existing land uses, patterns, and densities within the RSAs, as well as the proximity and sensitivity of the communities and neighborhoods along the project footprint to project construction and operations.
- **Intensity:** For this analysis, *intensity* is determined by assessing the degree to which the project would physically divide established neighborhoods, relocate key community businesses and industries, relocate large numbers of residences, affect the overall quality of life in a community, or reduce community cohesion. The analysis considers the duration of the effect, whether intermittent, temporary, or permanent.

This analysis covers project impacts related to disruption or division of established communities, as well as project impacts on the economy (i.e., impacts on employment, school district funding, agriculture economy, and property and sales tax revenue). In accordance with U.S. Presidential Executive Order 13045, the NEPA analysis also provides an assessment of potential environmental health and safety risks that may have a disproportionate impact on children.

3.12.4.5 Determining Significance Under CEQA

CEQA requires that an EIR identify the significant environmental impacts of a project (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126). One of the primary differences between NEPA and CEQA is that CEQA requires a threshold-based impact analysis. Under CEQA, significant impacts are determined by evaluating whether project impacts would exceed the significance threshold established for the resource (Section 3.1.5.4). The Authority is using the following thresholds to determine if a significant impact on biological resources, including aquatic resources and areas, would occur as a result of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives.

In accordance with Section 15064(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. However, if economic and social changes resulting from a project would cause or be indicative of physical environmental impacts, those resulting impacts could be significant. The Authority is using the following thresholds to determine if impacts on socioeconomics and community resources would result in significant impacts under CEQA. Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, the project would have a significant impact if it would:

- Physically divide an established community
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere
- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere
- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services including fire protection, police protection, school, parks, and other public facilities
- Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)

In accordance with Section 15064(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, *economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment.* Therefore, no CEQA significance criteria are provided for economic impacts. CEQA does, however, address the conversion of agricultural land to nonagricultural uses (refer to Section 3.14, Agriculture Farmlands and Forest Land, for that evaluation). For a more comprehensive discussion of the CEQA thresholds and the inter-relationships of the thresholds related to communities, the CEQA discussion of potential inducement of unplanned population

growth should only be discussed in Section 3.12, Socioeconomics and Communities, and not in Section 3.18, Regional Growth.

3.12.5 Affected Environment

This section describes the affected environment for socioeconomics and communities in the RSA. This information provides the context for the environmental analysis and evaluation of impacts. The communities and neighborhoods RSA falls within 15 communities, as defined in Section 3.12.4.1, Definition of Resource Study Areas, and presented on Figure 3.12-1. These include the cities and CDPs of Los Angeles, Vernon, Commerce, Bell, Montebello, Pico Rivera, West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, South Whittier CDP, and La Mirada in Los Angeles County, and Buena Park, Fullerton, Anaheim, and Orange in Orange County. In addition, as defined in Section 3.12.4.1, the economics RSA comprises the combined areas of Los Angeles and Orange Counties.

A summary of stakeholder issues and concerns from public outreach efforts related to community impacts, displacements and relocations, children's health, and economic impacts can be found in Chapter 9, Public and Agency Involvement.

3.12.5.1 Population Characteristics

Population characteristics presented in this section include total population and ethnicity, age distribution, income, household types, linguistic isolation, and disabilities. Overall, the communities in the RSA can be described as urban and suburban communities with substantial Hispanic populations that are typical to the Southern California region. City- and county-level demographic data are also summarized to provide regional context for the analysis.

Population and Ethnicity

Table 3.12-3 compares recent population estimates to projections of growth in the two counties included in the RSA and for the state of California. As indicated in Table 3.12-3, Los Angeles and Orange Counties grew at an annual average growth rate of 0.2 and 0.5 percent, respectively, over the period from 2010 to 2021 (U.S. Census Bureau 2010, 2021), and are expected to have growth rates of approximately -0.7 percent and 0.3 percent, respectively, from 2021 to 2040. Comparatively, the rest of the state of California is forecasted to have a relatively stagnant growth rate of about 0.1 percent between 2021 and 2040. This indicates that growth in Los Angeles County will be negative, while growth in Orange County will be more rapid than in other parts of the state. A more detailed discussion of growth rates in the RSA and corresponding cities is included in Section 3.18. In general, the average annual growth rates of cities in the project section were the same or less than the average annual growth rates of the counties in which they are located.

Table 3.12-3 Regional Population Growth: 2010–2040

Location	2010 Total Population	2021 Total Population	Percent Average Annual Growth Rate, 2010–2021	2040 Forecasted Population	Percent Average Annual Growth Rate, 2021–2040
California	37,253,956	39,455,353	0.5	40,106,449	0.1
Los Angeles County	9,818,605	10,019,635	0.2	9,306,759	-0.7
Orange County	3,010,232	3,182,923	0.5	3,283,811	0.3

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2010, 2021, Table P1 and DP05; California Department of Finance 2023

Table 3.12-4 provides the racial and ethnic characteristics of the counties and cities in the project section. The predominant racial/ethnic group in the project section is Hispanic. With the exceptions of the cities of Los Angeles, La Mirada, Buena Park, Fullerton, and Orange, the Hispanic population of the cities in the project section exceeds 50 percent of the total population of each city. Within the communities and neighborhoods RSA, Hispanic populations are also the

predominant racial/ethnic group. Commerce, Vernon, Pico Rivera, and West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP consist of populations that are over 90 percent Hispanic, indicating a highly ethnically homogenous population in these areas. Exceptions are the RSAs in the cities of Buena Park and Orange, which consist of 43.0 and 40.7 percent Hispanic populations, respectively. As generally discussed in the cities' respective general plan policies and goals, recent trends generally indicate diversification of racial and ethnic distribution in the RSA cities, with notable increases of minority populations.

Table 3.12-4 Race and Ethnicity Characteristics by Percentage (2021)

Location	White	Black/ African American	Hispanic of All Races	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Asian	Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
California	35.8	5.4	39.5	0.3	14.7	0.3	0.4	3.6
Los Angeles County	**25.5**	**7.6**	**48.7**	**0.2**	**14.6**	**0.2**	**0.4**	**2.8**
Los Angeles	28.1	8.3	48.4	0.2	11.6	0.1	0.5	2.9
Vernon	5.8	3.0	90.2	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Commerce	2.6	0.7	94.8	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.1	0.5
Bell	6.9	2.4	89.0	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.2	0.5
Montebello	6.1	0.6	79.6	0.1	12.7	0.0	0.3	0.6
Pico Rivera	4.7	0.9	89.9	0.1	3.9	0.1	0.2	0.2
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP	7.8	0.2	88.9	0.1	2.5	0.1	0.1	0.4
Norwalk	10.9	4.4	69.0	0.1	13.3	0.8	0.3	1.3
Santa Fe Springs	12.1	3.7	74.9	0.2	7.9	0.1	0.0	1.3
La Mirada	29.8	1.5	43.9	0.2	21.5	0.0	0.1	3.0
South Whittier CDP	12.7	0.6	78.2	0.5	5.9	0.3	0.6	1.0
Orange County	**39.0**	**1.6**	**34.0**	**0.1**	**21.1**	**0.3**	**0.3**	**3.5**
Buena Park	22.9	2.5	39.0	0.0	32.0	0.2	0.0	3.3
Fullerton	32.2	2.1	38.3	0.2	23.9	0.2	0.3	2.8
Anaheim	23.2	2.5	54.0	0.1	17.1	0.4	0.3	2.5
Orange	41.5	1.3	39.1	0.3	16.3	0.8	0.2	4.3
Communities and Neighborhoods RSA								
Los Angeles RSA	10.7	10.2	63.1	0.1	13.7	0.2	0.4	1.6
Vernon RSA	5.8	3.0	90.2	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Commerce RSA	3.0	1.3	93.4	0.0	1.7	0.1	0.2	0.2
Bell RSA	10.9	6.8	80.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.5	0.9
Montebello RSA	2.7	1.0	89.9	0.2	3.0	0.0	0.6	0.0
Pico Rivera RSA	5.8	1.3	90.3	0.0	2.0	0.2	0.0	0.4

Location	White	Black/ African American	Hispanic of All Races	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Asian	Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP RSA	5.6	2.1	91.5	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.5
Norwalk RSA	18.7	8.1	56.8	0.1	13.9	0.9	0.1	1.5
Santa Fe Springs RSA	7.7	3.2	81.1	0.7	6.2	0.0	0.1	0.9
La Mirada RSA	24.5	1.3	55.8	0.5	15.5	0.0	0.3	2.2
South Whittier CDP RSA	7.4	4.0	74.6	1.5	11.6	0.0	0.2	0.7
Buena Park RSA	16.5	2.7	43.0	0.0	35.2	0.2	0.2	2.2
Fullerton RSA	25.4	2.0	53.6	0.2	15.3	0.5	0.1	2.8
Anaheim RSA	13.8	1.5	69.9	0.0	12.6	0.3	0.2	1.7
Orange RSA	30.4	3.5	40.7	0.0	15.5	1.8	0.0	8.1

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2021
CDP = census-designated place; RSA = resource study area

Age Distribution

Table 3.12-5 presents the population age distribution in the counties and cities in the project section. The age distribution for the RSA follows regional trends, with the highest percentage of the population falling between 18 and 64 years of age. The percentage of the population under age 18 within the RSA is not substantially different than the reference cities. Similarly, the proportions of elderly within the RSA are not substantially different than the rest of the reference cities. Median ages within the RSA range from 28.1 years in Vernon to 44.8 years in Bell.

Table 3.12-5 Population Age Characteristics (2021)

Location	Percentage Under 18 Years of Age	Percentage 18 to 64 Years of Age	Percentage 65 and Over Years of Age	Median Age (years)
California	**22.8**	**62.8**	**14.4**	**37.0**
Los Angeles County	**21.6**	**64.7**	**13.7**	**37.0**
Los Angeles	20.3	66.8	12.9	36.2
Vernon	36.3	48.2	15.5	28.1
Commerce	21.4	59.5	19.1	37.6
Bell	27.6	62.8	9.6	32.0
Montebello	21.7	62.0	16.3	37.4
Pico Rivera	21.2	63.2	15.6	39.0
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP	22.5	64.4	13.1	36.1
Norwalk	23.6	63.1	13.3	35.5
Santa Fe Springs	22.4	62.9	14.7	37.0

Location	Percentage Under 18 Years of Age	Percentage 18 to 64 Years of Age	Percentage 65 and Over Years of Age	Median Age (years)
La Mirada	18.8	62.1	19.1	41.7
South Whittier CDP	24.3	65.1	10.6	34.0
Orange County	**22.0**	**63.2**	**14.8**	**38.5**
Buena Park	22.7	63.4	13.9	36.6
Fullerton	23.1	63.7	13.2	35.4
Anaheim	23.4	64.8	11.8	35.3
Orange	20.7	65.6	13.7	36.0
Communities and Neighborhoods RSA				
Los Angeles RSA	16.7	73.5	9.8	35.5
Vernon RSA	36.8	48.9	14.2	28.1
Commerce RSA	23.9	63.5	12.6	36.0
Bell RSA	15.5	67.0	17.6	44.8
Montebello RSA	25.2	65.8	8.9	34.3
Pico Rivera RSA	21.3	63.8	14.9	38.2
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP RSA	25.7	60.7	13.6	33.9
Norwalk RSA	20.0	64.1	15.9	38.1
Santa Fe Springs RSA	22.6	65.5	11.9	35.6
La Mirada RSA	23.4	59.7	16.8	40.2
South Whittier CDP RSA	20.9	68.4	10.7	35.6
Buena Park RSA	23.8	64.8	11.4	35.1
Fullerton RSA	25.8	64.5	9.7	34.8
Anaheim RSA	25.3	68.1	6.6	31.8
Orange RSA	17.3	73.2	9.5	35.6

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2021, Table B01001
CDP = census-designated place; RSA = resource study area

Income

Table 3.12-6 compares income and poverty characteristics of the communities and neighborhoods RSA (by city) to the reference counties and the cities. Median household incomes in Vernon, Commerce, and Bell are over $10,000 lower than the county average. Bell, in particular, has a median household income over $25,000 lower than the county average. In general, areas within the RSA have lower than the median income in the rest of the city. In the cities, the percentage of the population below poverty ranges from 5.3 to 16.4 apart from outliers in Vernon and Bell. The small overall population of Vernon makes it difficult to provide meaningful comparison to the rest of the county. The poverty rate in Bell (25.5) and the city of Los Angeles (24.3) exceeds that of other cities by nearly 10 percent. All RSA populations except Bell, Montebello, Santa Fe Springs, and La Mirada report higher poverty rates than their reference cities, indicating that the population as a whole is notably more impoverished than surrounding communities. For more discussion regarding low-income populations, refer to Chapter 5.

Table 3.12-6 Household Income and Family Poverty Characteristics (2021)

Location	Median Household Income: Dollars	Percent of Population Below the Poverty Level
California	**$84,097**	**12.3**
Los Angeles County	**$76,367**	**13.9**
Los Angeles	$69,778	16.6
Vernon	$62,000	0.0
Commerce	$58,226	14.8
Bell	$51,183	23.3
Montebello	$66,584	11.4
Pico Rivera	$78,056	10.0
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP	$83,692	11.0
Norwalk	$83,217	8.9
Santa Fe Springs	$75,086	11.5
La Mirada	$97,672	5.5
South Whittier CDP	$85,579	8.7
Orange County	**$100,485**	**9.9**
Buena Park	$90,503	9.8
Fullerton	$92,718	12.5
Anaheim	$81,806	13.0
Orange	$102,125	10.3
Communities and Neighborhoods RSA		
Los Angeles RSA	$59,323	24.3
Vernon RSA	$62,000	0.0
Commerce RSA	$59,573	16.4
Bell RSA	$55,288	25.5
Montebello RSA	$71,310	8.5
Pico Rivera RSA	$78,463	10.3
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP RSA	$69,531	14.9
Norwalk RSA	$78,976	10.9
Santa Fe Springs RSA	$70,916	10.3
La Mirada RSA	$97,469	5.3
South Whittier CDP RSA	$68,423	14.7
Buena Park RSA	$74,918	12.2
Fullerton RSA	$85,490	14.5
Anaheim RSA	$77,299	15.2

Location	Median Household Income: Dollars	Percent of Population Below the Poverty Level
Orange RSA	$108,097	14.5

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2021
CDP = census-designated place; RSA = resource study area

Households

Table 3.12-7 presents household characteristics of the RSA communities compared to the counties and cities in the project section. Household characteristics in the communities and neighborhoods RSA are generally consistent with the reference community cities. RSAs in Commerce, Montebello, Pico Rivera, West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP, Santa Fe Springs, and La Mirada consist of over 10 percent more family households, and correspondingly lower nonfamily households. The RSA in the city of Orange was the only area where the percentage of nonfamily households was over 5 percent more than the reference city. ACS 2017–2021 5-year estimates for average family size were not available at the block group level within the RSA.

Table 3.12-7 Household Characteristics (2021)

Location	Number of Households	Average Household Size	Average Family Size	Percent of Total Households			
				Family Household	Married Couple Household	Female Householder (No Husband Present)	Nonfamily Household
California	**13,217,586**	**2.92**	**3.50**	**68.6**	**49.5**	**12.9**	**31.4**
Los Angeles County	**3,342,811**	**2.9**	**3.6**	**66.3**	**44.6**	**14.7**	**33.7**
Los Angeles	1,384,851	2.8	3.6	59.0	38.4	13.8	41.0
Vernon	88	3.7	4.3	80.7	29.5	50.0	19.3
Commerce	3,466	3.6	4.1	77.1	51.0	16.3	22.9
Bell	8,775	3.9	4.2	80.8	45.2	25.4	19.2
Montebello	19,119	3.3	3.7	77.1	43.9	22.3	22.9
Pico Rivera	16,996	3.7	4.1	79.6	53.5	17.5	20.4
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP	6,891	3.8	4.2	82.5	58.4	15.9	17.5
Norwalk	26,353	3.8	4.2	83.2	57.2	16.8	16.8
Santa Fe Springs	5,539	3.4	3.9	76.2	47.5	22.7	23.8
La Mirada	14,679	3.1	3.5	79.8	60.2	14.0	20.2
South Whittier CDP	15,533	3.8	4.2	81.7	57.1	17.5	18.3
Orange County	**1,057,592**	**3.0**	**3.5**	**71.1**	**54.2**	**11.5**	**28.9**
Buena Park	24,074	3.5	3.7	81.6	57.6	16.6	18.4
Fullerton	46,434	3.0	3.5	71.1	54.5	10.6	28.9
Anaheim	103,570	3.3	3.8	72.6	50.6	15.2	27.4
Orange	43,421	3.0	3.5	71.6	53.2	12.4	28.4

Location	Number of Households	Average Household Size	Average Family Size	Percent of Total Households			
				Family Household	Married Couple Household	Female Householder (No Husband Present)	Nonfamily Household
Communities and Neighborhoods RSA within Census Block Groups							
Los Angeles RSA	13,851	2.8	-	57.8	5.5	2.1	42.2
Vernon RSA	88	3.7	-	81.8	0.0	1.1	18.2
Commerce RSA	564	3.7	-	90.0	25.1	6.8	10.0
Bell RSA	1,033	3.2	-	79.2	26.9	4.6	20.8
Montebello RSA	2,669	3.9	-	98.2	25.5	5.0	1.8
Pico Rivera RSA	7,382	3.7	-	91.9	39.9	11.3	8.1
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP RSA	2,004	4.4	-	95.3	33.0	13.5	4.7
Norwalk RSA	3,990	3.7	-	93.1	42.6	9.3	6.9
Santa Fe Springs RSA	7,736	3.3	-	87.4	30.3	10.8	12.6
La Mirada RSA	3,504	3.5	-	94.1	50.3	10.3	5.9
South Whittier CDP RSA	3,733	3.7	-	81.5	24.2	5.4	18.5
Buena Park RSA	9,350	3.3	-	86.7	25.7	4.3	13.3
Fullerton RSA	22,322	3.2	-	80.6	29.3	3.0	19.4
Anaheim RSA	22,997	3.6	-	79.8	23.2	3.3	20.2
Orange RSA	3,662	2.7	-	64.2	18.7	3.9	35.8

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2021, Table B11001
CDP = census-designated place; RSA = resource study area

Linguistic Isolation

Table 3.12-8 presents the percentage of households that are LEP households in the counties and cities in the project section. Bell reports the highest levels of linguistic isolation at 26.7 percent of the population. However, linguistic isolation in the communities and neighborhoods RSAs is generally lower than each corresponding reference city as a whole. RSA populations in Los Angeles and Vernon report much higher levels of linguistic isolation than the rest of the reference city, over 10 percent. LEP households within the RSA generally represent a larger proportion of the population than the reference communities. Provision of language material and translation would be available at public outreach activities, as applicable per outreach area.

Table 3.12-8 Limited English Proficiency Households (2021)

Location	Total Households	Limited English Proficiency Households	Percent
California	**12,717,801**	**1,210,285**	**9.5**
Los Angeles County	**3,263,069**	**448,505**	**13.7**
Los Angeles	1,342,761	211,518	15.8
Vernon	16	0	0
Commerce	3,498	627	17.9
Bell	9,008	2,404	26.7
Montebello	19,816	4,329	21.8
Pico Rivera	16,606	2,213	13.3
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP	6,897	681	9.9
Norwalk	27,225	4,098	15.1
Santa Fe Springs	4,931	680	13.8
La Mirada	14,325	1,279	8.9
South Whittier CDP	15,153	1,450	9.6
Orange County	**1,009,353**	**93,579**	**9.3**
Buena Park	23,130	4,351	18.8
Fullerton	45,031	4,857	10.8
Anaheim	99,670	13,080	13.1
Orange	42,680	3,325	7.8
Communities and Neighborhoods RSA			
Los Angeles RSA	13,851	3,567	25.8
Vernon RSA	88	10	11.4
Commerce RSA	564	101	17.9
Bell RSA	1,033	241	23.3
Montebello RSA	2,669	429	16.1
Pico Rivera RSA	7,382	633	8.6
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP RSA	2,004	243	12.1
Norwalk RSA	3,990	362	9.1
Santa Fe Springs RSA	7,736	730	9.4
La Mirada RSA	3,733	331	8.9
South Whittier CDP RSA	3,504	506	14.4
Buena Park RSA	9,350	1,258	13.5
Fullerton RSA	22,322	1,937	8.7
Anaheim RSA	22,997	2,325	10.1

Location	Total Households	Limited English Proficiency Households	Percent
Orange RSA	3,662	170	4.6

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2021, Table B16002
CDP = census-designated place; RSA = resource study area

Disabilities

Table 3.12-9 provides the percentage of individuals reporting a disability, self-care limitation, or low-mobility issue in the counties and cities in the project section. The city with the highest rate of disability status of people over the age of 65 is Montebello (41.2 percent), while the lowest rate of disability status is found in La Mirada (25.9 percent). Within the communities and neighborhoods RSA, Montebello, Norwalk, and West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP have over 10 percent higher proportions of people aged 65 and over with disability status than their respective reference community cities. Much like the reference communities, the percentage of the population with disability status is much higher for people aged 65 and over.

Table 3.12-9 Disability Status (2021)

Location	Ages 5 to 64		Age 65 and over	
	Population with Disability	Percentage with Disability	Population with Disability	Percentage with Disability
California	**2,265,029**	**7.3**	**1,864,807**	**33.4**
Los Angeles County	**538,775**	**6.7**	**462,454**	**34.4**
Los Angeles	217,284	6.9	180,137	36.6
Vernon[1]	16	6.2	15	29.4
Commerce	1,016	10.7	788	33.2
Bell	1,992	7.1	1,298	40.5
Montebello	3,646	7.5	4,143	41.2
Pico Rivera	2,662	5.3	2,930	31.1
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP	1,424	6.6	1,108	32.5
Norwalk	5,378	6.6	4,649	34.8
Santa Fe Springs	960	6.5	872	31.5
La Mirada	1,854	5.0	2,322	25.9
South Whittier CDP	2,758	5.6	1,972	31.7
Orange County	**141,973**	**5.6**	**135,534**	**29.0**
Buena Park	4,685	7.0	3,975	34.7
Fullerton	7,297	6.4	5,088	27.7
Anaheim	16,639	5.8	13,852	34.6
Orange	6,109	5.6	5,330	28.2
Communities and Neighborhoods RSA				
Los Angeles RSA	2,628	6.0	1,672	35.3
Vernon[1] RSA	16	5.8	13	29.4

Location	Ages 5 to 64		Age 65 and over	
	Population with Disability	Percentage with Disability	Population with Disability	Percentage with Disability
Commerce RSA	156	9.5	96	30.7
Bell RSA	587	7.0	301	42.2
Montebello RSA	668	6.6	281	30.0
Pico Rivera RSA	1,544	6.3	925	24.9
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP RSA	483	8.6	215	17.9
Norwalk RSA	1,146	4.8	925	36.6
Santa Fe Springs RSA	267	4.3	817	22.8
La Mirada RSA	441	5.7	645	31.0
South Whittier CDP RSA	695	6.2	393	26.8
Buena Park RSA	1,715	7.1	1,248	35.1
Fullerton RSA	3,656	5.0	1,979	28.8
Anaheim RSA	3,739	4.1	1,929	36.5
Orange RSA	353	6.0	387	42.9

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2021, Table B18101
[1] Vernon is an industrial city with a small residential population consisting of approximately 326 individuals. Population demographics and calculations may be atypical for Los Angeles County and can result in anomalies when comparing data to other jurisdictions and at differing scales.
CDP = census-designated place; RSA = resource study area

Community

Demographic indicators that correlate with community cohesion, as described in Section 3.12.4, are summarized in Table 3.12-10 for the communities and neighborhoods RSA (U.S. Census Bureau 2021). Percentages of the RSA that are higher than the average for the county in which the city is located are footnoted in the table below. Communities in Los Angeles, Fullerton, and Orange exhibit two or fewer indicators of community cohesion. The RSA communities in Vernon, Commerce, Bell, Montebello, South Whittier CDP, Buena Park, and Anaheim exhibit either three or four indicators, or a moderate level of community cohesion. The RSA communities in Pico Rivera, West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, and La Mirada exhibit five indicators or a high level of community cohesion. The more indicators exhibited by a RSA community, the higher the likelihood of strong community cohesion.

Table 3.12-10 Community Cohesion Indicators by Community and Neighborhoods Resource Study Area (2021)

RSA by City	Hispanic/ Latino Population Percentage[1]	Percentage Owner-Occupied Residences	Percentage Population Age 65+	Percentage Transit-Dependent Population[2]	Percentage Long-Term Residents (moved in 1999 or earlier)[3]
Los Angeles County	**48.7**	**46.2**	**13.7**	**22.6**	**24.2**
Los Angeles RSA	63.1[4]	14.3	9.8	35.1[4]	18.1
Vernon RSA	90.2[4]	2.2	14.2[4]	0.0	3.3
Commerce RSA	93.4[4]	42.0	12.6	28.7[4]	34.9[4]

RSA by City	Hispanic/ Latino Population Percentage[1]	Percentage Owner-Occupied Residences	Percentage Population Age 65+	Percentage Transit-Dependent Population[2]	Percentage Long-Term Residents (moved in 1999 or earlier)[3]
Bell RSA	80.0[4]	44.6	17.6[4]	20.6	44.6[4]
Montebello RSA	89.9[4]	40.1	8.9	23.7[4]	27.9[4]
Pico Rivera RSA	90.3[4]	67.1[4]	14.9[4]	21.0	39.4[4]
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP RSA	91.5[4]	63.2[4]	13.6	37.1[4]	28.8[4]
Norwalk RSA	56.8[4]	67.4[4]	15.9[4]	20.6	34.4[4]
Santa Fe Springs RSA	81.1[4]	52.9[4]	11.9	27.7[4]	26.4[4]
La Mirada RSA	55.8[4]	73.5[4]	16.8[4]	12.5	35.5[4]
South Whittier CDP RSA	74.6[4]	37.4	10.7	24.9[4]	18.1
Orange County	**39.0**	**57.0**	**14.8**	**3.0**	**14.4**
Buena Park RSA	43.0[4]	39.0	11.4	19.0[4]	17.4
Fullerton RSA	53.6[4]	42.8	9.7	13.3	19.4
Anaheim RSA	69.9[4]	35.4	6.6	22.2[4]	16.5
Orange RSA	40.7[4]	25.8	9.5	12.6	19.4

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2021
[1] Persons of Hispanic/Latino Origin may be of any race.
[2] The transit-dependent population was calculated by taking the number of residents aged 15 and over (as reported in Table B01001), subtracting the number of persons living in group quarters (as reported in Table B26001), subtracting the number of vehicles available (as reported in Table B25046), and then dividing the difference by the population aged 15 and over.
[3] Includes those residents who moved into their current residence in 1999 or earlier.
[4] Percentages for the RSA in each city that are higher than the average for the county in which the city is located.
CDP = census-designated place; RSA = resource study area

In addition to demographics, the availability of community facilities that support community interactions can serve as indicators of community cohesion. Table 3.12-11 provides a summary of the number and types of community facilities in the communities and neighborhoods RSA in each city in the project section. The RSA communities of Bell, Vernon, South Whittier CDP, and Montebello have the lowest number of community facilities within the RSA. Facilities within the Vernon RSA are limited to one fire station. There are three places of worship and two schools within the RSA in Montebello. South Whittier CDP features two places of worship and two parks within the RSA. Although it could be attributed to being larger cities, the number and diversity of community facilities in the RSA for Los Angeles, Fullerton and Anaheim could indicate a higher level of cohesion than the demographic data suggest. In addition to the facilities listed in Table 3.12-11, the communities on the southern end of the project section (La Mirada, Fullerton, and Anaheim), in particular, have numerous existing and proposed bikeways that provide additional opportunities for community interactions.

Table 3.12-11 Number of Community Facilities by Facility Type in the Communities and Neighborhoods Resource Study Area (2023)

City	Police and Fire	Education[1]	Parks and Recreation	Museums and Libraries	Medical and Social Services	Place of Worship	Other Facilities[2]	Total
Los Angeles	9	26	7	6	10	13	19	90
Vernon	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Commerce	1	4	2	1	3	3	3	17
Bell	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Montebello	-	2	-	-	-	3	-	5
Pico Rivera	2	8	1	1	1	6	-	19
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP	-	7	-	1	-	1	1	10
Santa Fe Springs	2	4	1	-	2	3	1	13
Norwalk	1	3	2	2	1	2	1	12
La Mirada	-	8	3	-	-	3	-	14
South Whittier CDP	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	4
Buena Park	1	8	1	-	3	6	-	19
Fullerton	4	17	10	1	3	20	4	59
Anaheim	1	11	6	1	1	10	2	32
Orange	-	-	-	-	1	2	2	5

Sources: ESRI 2018; City of Los Angeles 2024d; City of Vernon 2024b; City of Commerce 2024b; City of Montebello 2024c; City of Pico Rivera 2024; City of Norwalk 2024b; City of Santa Fe Springs 2024; City of La Mirada 2024b; City of Whittier 2024; City of Buena Park 2024; City of Fullerton 2024; City of Anaheim 2024; City of Orange 2024b; County of Orange 2024b; County of Los Angeles 2024
[1] Includes adult education facilities, charter schools, colleges, early childhood education facilities, private schools, and public schools
[2] Includes bus terminals, court houses, city halls, and post offices.
CDP = census-designated place; RSA = resource study area

3.12.5.2 Housing

This section describes housing characteristics in the RSA, including housing types, occupancy characteristics, foreclosure rates, and tenure. These characteristics are useful for understanding the availability of suitable housing in areas where residential property displacements could occur under the project.

The predominant housing type across the RSA is single-family residential, with an average household size ranging from 2.7 to 4.4 persons. This subsection discusses housing characteristics, including housing types, occupancy, and tenure that influence the character of the community.

Housing Types

Table 3.12-12 provides the total number of housing units and proportion of housing unit types that are available in the communities and neighborhoods RSA. Housing characteristics and trends of

the region (Los Angeles and Orange Counties and affected cities) are presented for context. Comparing the total number and type of housing units in cities to the RSA provides a metric that conveys the community character in the RSA. Most of the cities in the project section have high proportions of single-family housing units, with the exception of Vernon and Anaheim, where single-family housing units only account for 33.3 and 49.9 percent of housing units, respectively. Housing unit type distribution in the communities and neighborhoods RSA generally follows the same trends, with single-family housing units making up over 50 percent of the housing stock in each RSA city except Los Angeles, Vernon, Anaheim, and Orange. The RSA in Pico Rivera and La Mirada has an exceptionally high percentage of single-family homes (80.2 percent and 83.7 percent, respectively). Additionally, multifamily unit distributions in the RSA in Los Angeles, Buena Park, and Orange are over 10 percent higher than the reference cities.

Table 3.12-12 Housing Unit Type Characteristics (2021)

Location	Total Housing Units	Percentage Single-Family (1 Unit in Structure)	Percentage Multifamily (2 or more Units in Structure)	Percentage Mobile Home
California	**14,328,539**	**64.8**	**31.5**	**3.6**
Los Angeles County	**3,578,801**	**55.6**	**42.7**	**1.7**
Los Angeles	1,503,915	43.0	54.6	0.6
Vernon	90	33.3	68.2	0.0
Commerce	3,529	74.5	25.4	0.6
Bell	8,935	59.1	36.8	4.7
Montebello	20,040	57.1	43.3	1.6
Pico Rivera	17,388	79.5	18.5	2.5
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP	7,007	86.9	7.6	5.7
Norwalk	27,128	78.9	19.9	1.7
Santa Fe Springs	5,713	72.2	26.7	1.9
La Mirada	15,000	82.7	16.3	1.4
South Whittier CDP	15,931	80.7	19.2	0.6
Orange County	**1,121,753**	**63.7**	**33.7**	**2.7**
Buena Park	24,934	66.5	32.5	2.1
Fullerton	48,877	60.9	38.8	2.1
Anaheim	108,652	49.9	49.3	3.0
Orange	45,308	65.7	32.6	3.0
Communities and Neighborhoods RSA				
Los Angeles RSA	15,105	22.3	68.7	0.5
Vernon RSA	90	31.1	66.7	0.0
Commerce RSA	11,913	66.3	30.3	0.3
Bell RSA	1,064	61.1	35.2	0.0

Location	Total Housing Units	Percentage Single-Family (1 Unit in Structure)	Percentage Multifamily (2 or more Units in Structure)	Percentage Mobile Home
Montebello RSA	2,786	60.2	35.3	0.0
Pico Rivera RSA	7,474	80.2	18.6	0.0
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP RSA	2,086	78.3	17.4	0.4
Norwalk RSA	4,110	77.8	17.0	2.3
Santa Fe Springs RSA	7,963	72.4	23.3	1.5
La Mirada RSA	3,618	83.7	8.6	4.6
South Whittier CDP RSA	3,813	62.2	33.2	2.5
Buena Park RSA	9,592	53.6	43.4	0.0
Fullerton RSA	23,293	54.8	37.8	3.1
Anaheim RSA	25,018	39.2	48.1	4.4
Orange RSA	4,043	31.9	53.7	5.0

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2021, Table DP04
RSA Census block groups were used to aggregate the data for each city/jurisdiction.
CDP = census-designated place; RSA = resource study area

Housing Occupancy

Table 3.12-13 provides the total housing units available in the counties and cities and the percentage of housing units that are owner-occupied, renter-occupied, or vacant. With the exception of Los Angeles, cities studied have higher occupancy rates than their respective counties. Occupancy characteristics in Vernon are considered outliers because the city has 90 total housing units, which are largely owned by the City of Vernon. The percentage of housing units that are owner-occupied is considerably lower in the cities of Los Angeles and Bell than the rest of Los Angeles County, indicating that a substantial affordability gap exists between the affordability of homes and median household income.

In the communities and neighborhoods RSA by city, apart from the RSA in the city of Los Angeles, vacancy rates are generally similar to or less than the vacancy rates of 6.6 and 5.7 in Los Angeles and Orange Counties, respectively. RSAs in Los Angeles, Commerce, Santa Fe Springs, South Whittier CDP, Buena Park, Anaheim, and Orange have between 10 and 33.5 percent lower owner-occupied housing than their respective reference cities, and correspondingly higher renter-occupied housing rates. This indicates that the housing stock in the RSA in these areas is likely occupied by lower-income households. Home ownership rates in the communities and neighborhoods RSA in La Mirada, Norwalk, and Pico Rivera are only 4 percent lower than their reference cities, and are much higher than the home ownership rates in the rest of the RSA.

Table 3.12-13 County and City Housing Unit Occupancy Characteristics (2021)

Location	Total Housing Units	Percent Owner-Occupied Housing Units	Percent Renter-Occupied Housing Units	Percent Total Occupied Housing Units	Percent Vacant Housing Units
California	**14,328,539**	**55.5**	**44.5**	**92.2**	**7.8**
Los Angeles County	**3,578,801**	**46.2**	**53.8**	**93.4**	**6.6**
Los Angeles	1,503,915	36.9	63.1	92.1	7.9
Vernon	90	2.3	97.7	97.8	2.2
Commerce	3,529	57.6	42.4	98.2	1.8
Bell	8,935	30.3	69.7	98.2	1.8
Montebello	20,040	44.2	55.8	95.4	4.6
Pico Rivera	17,388	69.2	30.8	97.7	2.3
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP	7,007	74.2	25.8	98.3	1.7
Norwalk	27,128	66.8	33.2	97.1	2.9
Santa Fe Springs	5,713	65.5	34.5	97.0	3.0
La Mirada	15,000	77.4	22.6	97.9	2.1
South Whittier CDP	15,931	64.9	35.1	97.5	2.5
Orange County	**1,121,753**	**57.0**	**43.0**	**94.3**	**5.7**
Buena Park	24,934	56.4	43.6	96.6	3.4
Fullerton	48,877	53.0	47.0	95.0	5.0
Anaheim	108,652	46.5	53.5	95.3	4.7
Orange	45,308	59.3	40.7	95.8	4.2
Communities and Neighborhoods RSA					
Los Angeles RSA	15,105	14.3	77.4%	91.7	8.3
Vernon RSA	90	2.2	95.6	97.8	2.2
Commerce RSA	564	42.0	55.7	97.7	2.3
Bell RSA	1,064	44.6	52.4	97.1	2.9
Montebello RSA	2,786	40.1	55.7	95.8	4.2
Pico Rivera RSA	7,474	67.1	31.6	98.8	1.2
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP RSA	2,086	63.2	32.9	96.1	3.9
Norwalk RSA	4,110	67.4	29.6	97.1	2.9
Santa Fe Springs RSA	7,963	52.9	44.2	97.1	2.9
La Mirada RSA	3,618	73.5	23.4	96.8	3.2
South Whittier CDP RSA	3,813	37.4	60.5	97.9	2.1

Location	Total Housing Units	Percent Owner-Occupied Housing Units	Percent Renter-Occupied Housing Units	Percent Total Occupied Housing Units	Percent Vacant Housing Units
Buena Park RSA	9,592	39.0	58.5	97.5	2.5
Fullerton RSA	23,293	42.8	53.0	95.8	4.2
Anaheim RSA	25,018	35.4	56.6	91.9	8.1
Orange RSA	4,043	25.8	64.7	90.6	9.4

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2021, Table DP04
RSA Census block groups were used to aggregate the data for each city/jurisdiction.
CDP = census-designated place; RSA = resource study area

Housing Tenure

Table 3.12-14 provides the percentage of owner-occupied housing units in the counties and cities in the project section occupied by the same resident based on the year that the resident moved in. The general median build year for homes in the area ranges from the mid-1960s to mid-1970s. Trends in housing tenure are similar across the project section. The highest percentage of housing units is typically occupied by residents that moved in between 2015 and 2018, and the percentage generally declines within earlier and later time periods. Vernon is an outlier because it is an industrial city with a small resident population, 328 individuals in 2021, and therefore has a low number of total housing units in the city.

Table 3.12-14 provides the percentage of owner-occupied housing units in the reference counties and cities occupied by the same resident based on the year that resident moved in. Available block group data for the RSAs had slightly different date ranges than available county and city data; therefore, Table 3.12-15 provides the percentage of owner-occupied housing units in the RSA occupied by the same resident based on the year that resident moved in. However, within the communities and neighborhoods RSA, trends in housing tenure are similar to trends described above for counties and cities. The highest percentage of housing units in the RSA is typically occupied by residents that moved in between 2010 and 2018 or between 2000 and 2009, and the percentage generally declines within earlier time periods. The exception is Vernon, where 85.7 percent of residents moved in between 2010 and 2018, which is due to the low total amount of housing available.

Table 3.12-14 Reference Community Housing Unit Tenure, Percentage of Owner-Occupied Housing Units (2021)

Location	Moved in 2019 or later	Moved in 2015 to 2018	Moved in 2010 to 2014	Moved in 2000 to 2009	Moved in 1990 to 1999	Moved in 1989 or earlier
California	**9.3**	**28.5**	**19.7**	**20.7**	**11.3**	**10.6**
Los Angeles County	**8.5**	**26.5**	**20.1**	**20.7**	**12.4**	**11.8**
Los Angeles	9.5	28.3	20.8	19.7	11.7	9.9
Vernon	9.1	56.8	19.3	9.1	1.1	4.5
Commerce	1.7	15.2	16.7	23.4	15.4	27.5
Bell	4.7	29.0	20.4	22.9	14.6	8.5
Montebello	6.5	23.9	21.6	17.8	11.8	18.4
Pico Rivera	4.3	15.0	18.8	22.9	15.1	23.9

Location	Moved in 2019 or later	Moved in 2015 to 2018	Moved in 2010 to 2014	Moved in 2000 to 2009	Moved in 1990 to 1999	Moved in 1989 or earlier
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP	2.3	16.7	20.3	23.7	15.5	21.7
Norwalk	4.7	20.3	18.4	24.6	15.4	16.5
Santa Fe Springs	6.1	23.7	22.2	18.1	14.1	15.9
La Mirada	5.3	19.7	16.0	20.1	16.7	22.2
South Whittier CDP	5.5	20.8	19.1	23.4	13.5	17.7
Orange County	**10.0**	**28.5**	**18.5**	**20.0**	**12.4**	**10.5**
Buena Park	8.1	26.4	17.5	22.2	12.8	13.0
Fullerton	10.1	30.0	17.2	20.2	10.3	12.1
Anaheim	9.2	28.7	21.1	20.0	12.4	8.7
Orange	9.3	26.5	17.4	21.5	13.0	12.3

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2021, Table B25038
CDP = census-designated place; RSA = resource study area

Table 3.12-15 Resource Study Area Housing Unit Tenure, Percentage of Owner-Occupied Housing Units (2021)

City[1]	Moved in 2019 or later	Moved in 2010 to 2018	Moved in 2000 to 2009	Moved in 1990 to 1999	Moved in 1989 or earlier
Los Angeles	11.0	44.6	26.3	11.0	7.1
Vernon	4.6	85.7	6.4	0.9	2.4
Commerce	2.9	39.4	22.8	17.9	17.0
Bell	1.1	29.1	25.2	31.3	13.3
Montebello	8.0	41.2	22.9	16.0	11.9
Pico Rivera	3.4	33.3	24.0	17.5	21.9
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP	0.3	43.4	27.5	11.7	17.1
Norwalk	1.3	44.3	20.1	16.8	17.6
Santa Fe Springs	3.2	45.7	24.6	14.4	12.0
La Mirada	6.4	36.3	21.8	15.4	20.1
South Whittier CDP	3.5	51.2	27.2	12.9	5.2
Buena Park	13.9	51.3	17.4	9.7	7.7
Fullerton	8.6	51.0	21.0	9.0	10.4
Anaheim	7.9	52.7	22.9	10.3	6.2
Orange	14.0	57.3	9.3	12.2	7.2

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2021, Table B25038
[1] RSA Census block groups were used to aggregate the data for each city/jurisdiction.
CDP = census-designated place; RSA = resource study area

3.12.5.3 Local Economy

This section describes county and city employment status, unemployment rates, and employment by industry. It also covers county revenue generated by property tax levies and sales and use taxes, as well as sources of school district funding.

Employment

Employment characteristics are discussed in more detail in Section 3.18 and summarized in this section.

Table 3.12-16 presents the number of employed and unemployed persons in the RSA counties, along with the unemployment rate. As summarized in more detail in Section 3.18, since 2010, the unemployment rate for Los Angeles County has dropped drastically from 12.5 percent to 8.9 percent in 2021. This decrease is mirrored at both the county and city levels with the exception of Vernon. From 2016 to 2022, the civilian labor force increased in California but decreased slightly in Los Angeles and Orange Counties. The cities in the RSA in Orange County had lower unemployment rates than the state average. In 2021, all the cities in the RSA in Los Angeles County had higher unemployment rates than the state except for Santa Fe Springs.

Table 3.12-16 Labor Force Characteristics for Los Angeles and Orange Counties

Location	Indicator	2016	2021	2022
State of California	Civilian labor force	19,012,000	18,973,400	19,252,000
	Percent unemployment rate	5.5%	7.3%	4.2%
Los Angeles County	Civilian labor force	5,018,900	4,993,500	4,984,800
	Percent unemployment rate	5.3%	8.9%	4.9%
Orange County	Civilian labor force	1,597,400	1,560,700	1,590,900
	Percent unemployment rate	4.1%	6.0%	3.2%

Source: EDD 2023

Table 3.12-17 provides employment by industry in the RSA counties. Between 2010 and 2021, total employment by industry increased by 615,200 jobs (15 percent for the 11-year period or 1.4 percent annually) in Los Angeles County and 212,000 jobs (15 percent for the 11-year period or 1.4 percent annually) in Orange County. During this period, employment increased in several sectors in both Los Angeles and Orange Counties: construction; retail trade; transportation and warehousing utilities; information; finance, insurance, real estate rental and leasing; professional, scientific, management, and administration; and education, health care, and social assistance. During this period, employment declined in the agricultural, forestry, fishing, hunting, and mining sector in both Los Angeles and Orange Counties. In Orange County, employment declined in the wholesale trade sector and increased in the public administration and “other services” sectors. In Los Angeles County, employment declined in the public administration and “other services” sectors and increased in the wholesale trade sector.

Table 3.12-17 Regional Employment by Industry for Los Angeles and Orange Counties 2010–2021

Employment Sector	Los Angeles County			Orange County		
	2010	2021	Numeric Change (2010–2021)	2010	2021	Numeric Change (2010–2021)
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting and mining	9,300	6,200	-3,100	4,100	2,400	-1,700
Construction	103,700	149,000	45,300	68,400	102,200	33,800
Manufacturing	380,500	313,100	-67,400	151,100	149,800	-1,300
Wholesale trade	201,900	202,600	700	75,900	75,600	-300
Retail trade	386,200	396,100	9,900	141,300	143,400	2,100
Transportation and warehousing, utilities	155,600	215,200	59,600	26,700	31,100	4,400
Information	192,300	208,800	16,500	21,700	24,000	2,300
Finance, insurance, real estate rental & leasing	211,300	213,200	1,900	103,700	117,100	13,400
Professional, scientific, management, and administration[1]	519,300	630,100	110,800	250,700	321,700	71,000
Education, health care, and social assistance	671,800	844,400	172,600	169,400	237,300	67,900
Leisure & hospitality[2]	384,100	434,200	50,100	168,700	180,400	11,700
Other services	136,800	135,700	-1,100	42,200	47,500	5,300
Public administration	579,600	560,200	-19,400	152,300	155,700	3,400
Total	**3,932,400**	**4,547,600**	**615,200**	**1,376,200**	**1,588,200**	**212,000**

Sources: EDD 2025
[1] Includes waste management services.
[2] Includes arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services

Fiscal Conditions

Property taxes in California are collected by counties and allocated according to state law to cities, the counties, special districts, redevelopment agencies, and school districts in the county from which they are collected. Local governments impose property taxes on real property based on its value. Table 3.12-18 and Table 3.12-19 present general property tax levies in Los Angeles and Orange Counties for FY 2017/2018 and FY 2021/2022. The following discussion compares the FY 2017/2018 property tax revenues to those levied in FY 2021/2022.

Assessed property values in Los Angeles County rose to roughly $1.8 trillion between FY 2017/2018 and FY 2021/2022 as a result of re-assessed property values. Correspondingly, property taxes levied experienced an increase from roughly $16.8 billion in FY 2017/2018 to roughly $20.9 billion in FY 2021/2022, an increase of about 24 percent.

Trends in property tax revenues were similar in Orange County. Both property values and property tax levies increased between FY 2017/2018 and FY 2021/2022. Rising trends indicate

that the region could respond particularly positively to the economic benefits of being near the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives (American Public Transportation Association 2019).

Table 3.12-18 General Property Tax Levies by County for Fiscal Year 2017/2018

County	Net Taxable Assessed Value[1]	Property Tax Allocations and Levies					Average Tax Rate (%)
		City	County[2]	School[3,4]	Other Districts	Total	
Los Angeles	1.4 trillion	2.4 billion	3.4 billion	7.9 billion	3.1 billion	16.8 billion	1.175
Orange	560.8 billion	606.0 million	325.3 million	3.7 billion	1.3 billion	6.0 billion	1.069

Source: California Department of Tax and Fee Administration 2019
Detail may not compute to total because of rounding.

Table 3.12-19 General Property Tax Levies by County for Fiscal Year 2021/2022

County	Net Taxable Assessed Value[1]	Property Tax Allocations and Levies					Average Tax Rate (%)
		City	County[2]	School[3,4]	Other Districts	Total	
Los Angeles	1.8 trillion	3.0 billion	4.3 billion	9.7 billion	3.9 billion	20.9 billion	1.169
Orange	686.5 billion	731.1 million	388.7 million	4.5 billion	1.7 billion	7.3 billion	1.067

Source: California Department of Tax and Fee Administration 2019
Detail may not compute to total because of rounding.

The California State Board of Equalization distributes local tax revenues, less an administrative fee, to the cities and counties on a quarterly basis. As presented in Table 3.12-20, total revenue distributions to Los Angeles County increased by approximately 35 percent while distributions to Orange County increased by approximately 40 percent between FY 2017/2018 and FY 2021/2022.

Within the RSA, municipalities experienced growth in distributed revenues to varying degrees. The cities of Los Angeles, Vernon, Commerce, Bell, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, La Mirada, Buena Park, Fullerton, and Anaheim experienced growth of over 20 percent.

Table 3.12-20 Local Sales and Use Taxes Revenues Distributed to Counties and Cities (Fiscal Years 2017/2018 and 2021/2022)

Jurisdiction	Distributed Revenues		Percent Change
	FY 2017/2018	FY 2021/2022	
Los Angeles County	**$62,664,102**	**$84,525,059**	**34.9**
Los Angeles	$530,500,168	$687,365,593	29.6
Vernon[1]	$7,419,418	$11,128,232	50.0
Commerce	$20,367,359	$25,208,575	23.8
Bell	$2,500,329	$3,801,049	52.0
Montebello	$13,283,890	$14,774,305	11.2
Pico Rivera	$9,043,379	$7,729,829	-14.5
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP[1]	--	--	--

Jurisdiction	Distributed Revenues		Percent Change
	FY 2017/2018	FY 2021/2022	
Norwalk	$10,694,178	$15,142,787	41.6
Santa Fe Springs	$24,837,253	$37,987,571	52.9
La Mirada	$10,556,350	$14,556,525	37.9
South Whittier CDP[1]	--	--	--
Orange County	**$7,618,572**	**$10,625,716**	**39.5**
Buena Park	$20,943,000	$33,213,784	58.6
Fullerton	$21,279,747	$28,908,414	35.8
Anaheim	$79,115,228	$95,521,525	20.7
Orange	$41,760,076	$56,775,521	35.9

Sources: California Department of Tax and Fee Administration 2019, 2023; City of Buena Park 2020
[1] Data unavailable for Los Angeles County unincorporated areas
CDP = census-designated place; FY = Fiscal Year

School District Funding

The communities and neighborhoods RSA includes portions of school districts that provide school services from kindergarten through high school.


Figure 3.12-3, sheets 1 and 2, depicts school district boundaries. Table 3.12-21 lists the school districts that are partially in the communities and neighborhoods RSA, the cities and communities served by those school districts, the average daily attendance during the 2021–2022 school year, and the total revenue received by each school district during FY 2021/2022. Student enrollment trends within the RSA in this subsection have either remained stagnant or declined marginally over the past 5 years, which is generally consistent with the rest of the state (California Department of Education 2023). Revenues derived from property tax and average daily attendance funding sources are broken out.

Table 3.12-21 School District Revenue in the Communities and Neighborhoods Resource Study Area (Fiscal Year 2021/2022)

School District	RSA Communities within School District	Average Daily Attendance	Average Daily Attendance-Based[1] Revenue	Property Tax[2]	Total[3]
Los Angeles Unified School District	Los Angeles	380,372	$3,295,035,103	$1,551,062,902	$9,673,873,222
Los Nietos Elementary School District	West Whittier–Los Nietos	1,191	$8,723,894	$4,755,477	$25,274,023
Whittier Union High School District	West Whittier–Los Nietos, La Mirada, Santa Fe Springs	9,879	$59,756,803	$33,957,175	$201,295,600


School District	RSA Communities within School District	Average Daily Attendance	Average Daily Attendance-Based[1] Revenue	Property Tax[2]	Total[3]
Little Lake City Elementary School District	Santa Fe Springs, Norwalk	3,598	$20,997,039	$9,137,718	$60,419,857
South Whittier Elementary School District	La Mirada	2,146	$15,809,211	$6,888,890	$43,486,241
El Rancho Unified School District	Pico Rivera	6,812	$44,486,784	$15,796,085	$117,549,299
Montebello Unified School District	Los Angeles, Commerce, Montebello, Pico Rivera	19,685	$152,704,729	$53,873,540	$511,910,474
ABC Unified School District	Norwalk	17,580	$85,880,128	$42,360,921	$292,968,503
Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District	Norwalk, La Mirada	14,230	$91,223,611	$39,367,621	$268,389,759
Fullerton Joint Union High School District	Buena Park, Fullerton	12,450	$54,758,413	$83,870,430	$199,636,053
Buena Park Elementary School District	Buena Park	3,701	$23,877,075	$22,420,090	$71,545,756
Fullerton Elementary School District	Fullerton	11,118	$49,011,977	$60,080,804	$184,609,137
Anaheim Union High School District	Anaheim	26,052	$154,330,668	$121,890,256	$488,687,827
Anaheim Elementary School District	Anaheim	13,291	$93,799,983	$103,998,690	$296,948,001
Orange Unified School District	Orange	22,218	$63,967,158	$173,871,024	$358,718,302

Source: Education Data Partnership 2023
[1] Includes revenues allocated to local school districts from the state based on ADA per Education Code Section 42238.
[2] Includes revenues derived from local property taxes.
[3] Total revenues include revenues derived from Local Control Funding Formula sources, federal, other state, and other local revenues.
ADA = average daily attendance; RSA = resource study area



Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2021; Los Angeles City Bureau of Engineering 2016; ESRI 2024

Figure 3.12-3 School District Boundaries, Sheet 1 of 2



Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2021; Los Angeles City Bureau of Engineering 2016; ESRI 2024

Figure 3.12-3 School District Boundaries, Sheet 2 of 2

3.12.6 Environmental Consequences

3.12.6.1 Overview

This section discusses the potential impacts on socioeconomic and community resources from construction and operation of the project alternatives and station options. The project would not affect agricultural resources. Both temporary and permanent impacts of construction are discussed under one impact statement. Each resource category addresses potential impacts from the No Project Alternative and the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. For this resource topic, any differences in the impacts for the alternatives and station options will be described in the analysis.

Project features, including IAMFs, design standards, and compliance with the Authority's project design guidelines and technical memoranda, will avoid or minimize direct and indirect project effects on socioeconomics and communities. The Authority will prepare a Construction Management Plan that includes measures that minimize impacts on community residents and businesses (**SOCIO-IAMF#1**). The Authority will adhere to the Uniform Act to reduce potential socioeconomic impacts by providing relocation assistance for people displaced through right-of-way acquisition (**SOCIO-IAMF#2**). The Authority will develop a relocation implementation plan to minimize the economic disruption related to relocation (**SOCIO-IAMF#3**). Other IAMFs listed in Section 3.12.4.2 are also applicable.

The IAMFs differ from mitigation measures in that they are part of the project. In contrast, mitigation measures may be available to further reduce, compensate for, or offset project impacts that the analysis identifies under NEPA or concludes are significant under CEQA.

The impacts of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives are described and organized in Section 3.12.6.3 as follows:

Construction Impacts

- Impact SO-1: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Construction
- Impact SO-2: Residential Displacements and Relocations
- Impact SO-3: Business Displacements and Relocations
- Impact SO-4: Physical Deterioration
- Impact SO-5: Job Creation During Construction
- Impact SO-6: Changes in School District Funding
- Impact SO-7: Property Value Changes and Property Tax Losses
- Impact SO-8: County and City Sales Tax Effects
- Impact SO-9: Impacts on Children's Health and Safety from Construction

Operational Impacts

- Impact SO-10: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities During Operations
- Impact SO-11: Job Creation During Operations
- Impact SO-12: Impacts on Children's Health and Safety from Operations
- Impact SO-13: Unplanned Growth from Operations

3.12.6.2 No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, recent development trends are anticipated to continue, leading to ongoing socioeconomic and community impacts. The No Project Alternative represents the existing conditions of the RSA, and as it would exist without the HSR system at the horizon year (2040). Under the No Project Alternative, the existing rail corridor would continue to be a division between some communities adjacent to the rail corridor. The job creation, other beneficial economic activity, and improvements to community connectivity in new grade-separated areas that would occur under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would likely not occur under the No Project Alternative.

Under the No Project Alternative, the Southern California Association of Governments' *2024–2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy* (SCAG 2024) would

encourage both compact development and greater investment in local transit modes as a means of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. These plans include provisions to reduce these emissions and are considered by cities and counties during planning and zoning deliberations to comply with the CEQA requirement to mitigate the impacts of planning and zoning decisions on greenhouse gas emissions.

The No Project Alternative assumes that currently known programmed and funded improvements to the intercity transportation system (highway, Amtrak, and regional rail) and reasonably foreseeable local land development projects with funding sources identified would be developed by 2040. The No Project Alternative includes many planned projects that would likely be implemented by the year 2040. Chapter 2, Alternatives, describes the No Project Alternative in depth. Section 3.19, Cumulative Impacts, provides foreseeable future development projects in the RSA that could affect socioeconomics and communities. These foreseeable future development projects include small and large residential and mixed-use developments, a commercial retail center, industrial projects, and transportation projects. The No Project Alternative could result in other transportation improvement projects (e.g., road widening or construction of new roadways) that may be implemented in the future to meet growing regional transportation needs.

These projects could result in impacts on communities and neighborhoods (including displacements and relocations), minority and low-income populations, and local and regional economies (e.g., school district funding and county and city property and sales tax revenues). Projects requiring discretionary action under the No Project Alternative would be subject to environmental review through which impacts associated with these projects would be addressed.

These projects include bridge replacement, highway expansion, grade separation, and utility improvement projects that could result in impacts similar to those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives with regard to temporary construction impacts (e.g., noise, vehicle delay, and traffic detours) and property or easement acquisition. Although these actions would introduce impacts similar to those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, improvements would occur at different locations and the degree of impacts would vary. Property acquisitions for new developments that displace residences and businesses could have impacts on local government revenue similar to those of the project if displacements cause losses in school district funding, property tax, or sales and use tax revenue. In addition, commercial developments for new business, residential, or mixed-use development could provide new housing and job opportunities and additional tax revenues to communities in the project section. These development and infrastructure projects could temporarily or permanently during construction, or permanently during operations, disrupt or divide established communities as a result of increased traffic congestion, increased noise and vibration, air quality deterioration, degradation of visual quality, and increased health and safety risks. Cities and counties in the region would evaluate the specific impacts of future projects in the course of applicable environmental review. In general, the job creation, other beneficial economic activity, and improvements to community connectivity in new grade-separated areas that would occur under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would likely not occur under the No Project Alternative.

3.12.6.3 Project Impacts

Construction, operations, and maintenance are evaluated for community cohesion, children's health and safety, displacements and relocations, and economic impacts. Project construction would involve demolition of existing structures, clearing, and grubbing; reduction of permeable surface area; handling, storing, hauling, excavating, and placing fill; possible pile driving; and construction of aerial structures, bridges, road and parking lot modifications, utility upgrades and relocations, HSR electrical systems, and railbeds. Project operation would include the operation of trains, inspection and maintenance along the track and railroad right-of-way, as well as on the structures, fencing, power system, train control, electric interconnection facilities, and communications. Refer to Chapter 2 for more details on construction, operations, and maintenance.

Construction of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would temporarily disrupt access to residences, businesses, and community and public facilities. All of these would also experience

localized transportation, noise and vibration, and visual quality impacts. However, because the communities are currently adjacent to an existing transportation corridor, the additional construction traffic, noise and vibration, air quality, and visual changes would not substantially affect community character and cohesion. Project operation could result in permanent disruptions of established communities by displacing residents, businesses, and community and public facilities. The following sections separately describe each construction and operational impact for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives.

Construction Impacts

Impact SO-1: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Construction

Infrastructure and transportation projects can create physical barriers that isolate parts of communities, impede visibility, and restrict existing travel paths. Such barriers or divisions can decrease cohesiveness in a community by displacing residents or businesses, disrupting social networks, and reducing access to community facilities. Even if a project does not create a new barrier, the exacerbation of existing divisions would generally weaken community cohesion. In the following analysis, impacts are analyzed to determine their potential to disrupt or divide established communities. The analysis is structured around the following topic areas:

- Residential and business displacements
- Air quality
- Noise and vibration
- Visual quality
- Traffic congestion and pedestrian safety
- Community access and cohesion

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

Project construction would cause temporary disruption to communities near construction activities and staging areas during construction and permanent impacts related to business and residential displacements as a result of construction. Impacts would be most disruptive in residential areas and to community facilities and business districts that have normal hours of operation coinciding with construction work hours. Impacts involving the disruption or division of existing communities related to permanent displacements, air quality, noise and vibration, visual quality, traffic and pedestrian safety, and community access and cohesion are discussed below.

Residential and Business Displacements

As much as possible, construction activities would be limited to the project right-of-way. However, property acquisitions for project construction would result in permanent removal of 3 residential units and 256 businesses; these are discussed further in Impact SO-2 and Impact SO-3.

All residential displacements would occur in the vicinity of the proposed Pioneer Boulevard grade separation in the southwest neighborhood of West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP. However, Pioneer Boulevard and the existing rail corridor already divide the existing residential neighborhoods. Because project construction would be limited to widening this existing barrier, these displacements would not create a new division of existing communities.

The majority of the business displacements would result from the modifications to Hobart Yard and Commerce Yard in Commerce and Vernon. The remaining business displacements would result primarily from Metrolink station relocations and grade separations. Appendix 3.12-E presents locations of business displacements. Based on the locations of the displaced businesses in an industrial area adjacent to an existing rail corridor, these property acquisitions would not physically divide communities or isolate one community from another. Although several businesses would be relocated in this area, they represent a small proportion of the much larger commercial and industrial area spanning the cities of Los Angeles, Vernon, and Commerce, and would not substantially disrupt the larger existing district. For detailed information regarding residential and businesses displacements, refer to the *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Draft Relocation Impact Report* (Authority 2025c).

Air Quality

As discussed in Section 3.3, construction activities would involve use of heavy equipment and trucks, which in turn would cause temporary direct and indirect emissions of air pollutants that could result in localized elevated criteria pollutant concentrations, inhalation health risks related to diesel particulate matter and particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$), and odors. Demolition activities could release asbestos and lead-based paint, which could present health hazards; however, project design and compliance with existing asbestos and lead-based paint handling and disposal standards would prevent exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Sensitive receptors within 1,000 feet of the project footprint are identified in Table 3.3-9 and discussed further in Section 3.3. Construction would be temporary and impacts at any particular place and time would depend on the specific construction activity, equipment and vehicle usage, schedule, and proximity to sensitive receptors.

AQ-IAMF#1, **AQ-IAMF#2**, **AQ-IAMF#3**, **AQ-IAMF#4**, and **AQ-IAMF#5** include implementing a fugitive dust control plan, use of low-volatile-organic-compound architectural coatings, and use of Tier-4 compliant construction equipment. These methods have proven to be effective in reducing criteria pollutants, greenhouse gases, and toxic air contaminant emissions. With incorporation of these IAMFs, all localized concentrations of carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter (PM_{10}), $PM_{2.5}$, and sulfur dioxide, including background concentrations, would be below their respective thresholds, guidelines, or standards. Accordingly, localized impacts on air quality would not divide or disrupt existing communities in the RSA.

In addition to localized air quality impacts, construction would affect regional air quality from emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO_X) in excess of South Coast Air Quality Management District daily significance thresholds. Although construction-period emissions of NO_X would exceed daily significance thresholds, changes in regional air quality would not obstruct established travel routes or change community character to an extent that would physically divide or isolate the existing communities in the RSA. In addition, the emissions would not degrade community character because they would be either less than the General Conformity *de minimis* levels (carbon monoxide, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and sulfur dioxide) or will be offset through **AQ-MM#1, Offset Project Construction Emissions in the South Coast Air Basin through South Coast Air Quality Management District Emissions Offsets Program**, to below the General Conformity *de minimis* levels (NO_X). Additionally, with implementation of **AQ-MM#2, Requirements for Use of Zero-Emission or Near-Zero-Emission Vehicles and Off-Road Equipment to Reduce Construction Emissions**; and **AQ-MM#3, Reduce the Potential Impact of Stationary Sources**, construction emissions will be minimized. Changes in regional air quality would be diffused across a broad area and therefore would not noticeably alter neighborhood character.

Noise and Vibration

Temporary noise and vibration increases can cause annoyance and disruption to communities by affecting community character. As discussed in Section 3.4, construction would require mechanical equipment that would generate temporary noise and vibration increases for various durations at any given location, depending on the construction activity. Incorporation of **NV-IAMF#1**, which requires following Federal Transit Administration and FRA guidelines for minimizing noise and vibration effects at sensitive receptors during construction, would reduce the effects of construction noise and vibration on communities. Refer to Section 3.4 for details about noise impacts and distances to sensitive receptors. Although construction could occur for various durations around sensitive receptors, the likelihood of a sensitive receptor to be within the minimum distance to experience a noise impact for the entirety of that period is low. In addition, the highest noise-generating activities, such as pile driving, would only occur sporadically and not span the entire construction period.

Overall, because of communities' proximity to and familiarity with noise levels associated with the existing rail corridor, construction noise and vibration would not considerably alter community character in a way that would create disruption to or physically divide the communities.

Visual Quality

As discussed in Section 3.16, elements introduced during construction activities (e.g., construction materials, equipment, and on-site workers) and at construction staging areas

(e.g., stored material and equipment) would result in visual changes to communities adjacent to the project footprint. On completion of construction at a given location, construction equipment will be removed, and construction staging areas and temporary structures will be dismantled (**LU-IAMF#3**). Primary viewer groups include employees, business patrons, and travelers on local roadways. As defined in Section 3.16, these user groups are considered lower sensitivity based on the anticipated viewer exposure and awareness to the visual environment. The 26th Street LMF would be in an existing industrial area and construction would not have a significant impact on visual character. Temporary visual changes from construction would not create a physical division that would obstruct established paths of travel or isolate existing communities from each other. Therefore, given the viewers' proximity to and familiarity with the existing rail corridor, these temporary visual changes would not considerably alter community character in a way that would disrupt or physically divide established communities.

Traffic Congestion and Pedestrian Safety

As discussed in Sections 3.2, the permanent roadway modifications, such as the grade separations, would cause increased delays at intersections and roadway segments in surrounding areas, which could cause disruption to the community. Similarly, temporary lane or road closures, traffic detours, and increased truck trips and traffic from construction may increase congestion. Temporary roadway closures during construction are summarized in Table 3.2-18 in Section 3.2. Construction of the 26th Street LMF would not result in impacts related to traffic and circulation patterns. These temporary transportation effects could disrupt vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit circulation patterns in proximity to construction sites and cause vehicle delay during the construction period. Depending on the duration for long-term closure operations, trip delays may exceed 30 minutes per vehicle (Authority 2025c). Construction-related congestion may increase delays but would not physically divide existing communities. **TR-IAMF#2** will reduce conflicts with construction-related traffic and maintain access during construction through implementation of a Construction Transportation Plan. In addition, the Authority's Construction Management Plan (**SOCIO-IAMF#1**) will direct street users around the construction, enabling them to access commercial destinations. Although project construction would disrupt residents, businesses, and individual property owners, these effects would be temporary and would not disrupt or divide the community.

Actions that may affect pedestrians during the construction period include sidewalk closures, crosswalk closures, or pedestrian rerouting. In addition, in some locations law enforcement, fire, and emergency services could experience increased response times because of construction-related road closures, detours, and increased construction-related traffic congestion. Emergency vehicles may encounter delays while accessing construction sites, particularly sites where roadway grade is being raised or lowered on roadways crossing the project section. **SOCIO-IAMF#1** will ensure property access for local businesses, residences, and emergency services and minimize impacts on local and regional bus routes during construction. **SS-IAMF#1**, **TR-IAMF#2**, **TR-IAMF#4**, **TR-IAMF#5**, **TR-IAMF#6**, **TR-IAMF#8**, **TR-IAMF#11**, and **TR-IAMF#12** will reduce conflicts with construction-related traffic and maintain pedestrian access during construction through implementation of a Construction Transportation Plan. These IAMFs will reduce emergency vehicle delays, reduce or avoid safety impacts of construction traffic hazards on pedestrians, and ensure that construction activities do not create barriers to pedestrian access. With these IAMFs, construction would not affect pedestrian safety in a way that would physically divide or disrupt established communities.

Community Access and Cohesion

Community facilities provide important services to members of a community, help create a sense of cohesion, or otherwise have local importance as neighborhood assets, and can have historical, cultural, and social meaning to members of the community. Community facilities include childcare, places of worship, education facilities, government facilities, health and mental health facilities, libraries, parks and recreation, public safety facilities, and social services. Community facilities in the communities and neighborhoods RSA are listed in Appendix 3.12-B and their locations are depicted on figures in Appendix 3.12-C. There would be no displacements of community facilities identified in Appendix 3.12-B. Access to community facilities will be

maintained during construction as required by **SOCIO-IAMF#1**, but could be temporarily modified during construction, potentially inconveniencing patrons. In addition, **SO-MM#2, Implement Measures to Reduce Impacts Associated with the Division of Communities**, will minimize project impacts on public facilities through a program of outreach to community organizations in affected neighborhoods. Through **SO-MM#2**, the Authority will conduct workshops that will provide communities opportunities to identify design and use options that could strengthen community cohesion and be compatible with the existing community character.

Construction activities could be particularly disruptive to community facilities and institutions that have normal hours of operation that coincide with construction work hours. Potential conflicts with special events, such as festivals, conventions, or sporting events at Angel Stadium, will be handled with additional traffic-handling measures, including (but not limited to) police officers directing traffic, special event parking, traffic cone placement, and use of shoulder lanes for through traffic (**TR-IAMF#8**). In addition, project construction would relocate the Commerce and Buena Park Metrolink stations and modify the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs and Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Stations. Access to these stations would be altered during HSR construction but maintained to minimize impacts on community travel patterns and cohesion.

In some instances, construction of grade separations would result in temporary disruptions to existing communities and neighborhoods. Specifically, construction of the proposed Pioneer Boulevard undercrossing would result in community disruptions, because this area of West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP is developed and contiguous on both sides of the rail corridor. The existing crossing is a vital connection between the neighborhoods on either side of the rail corridor and provides access to Pioneer High School. Although the Cerritos Avenue grade separation is not in a residential area, Cerritos Avenue provides access to the Salvation Army Emergency Center and Anaheim Adult Rehabilitation Center. Similarly, the Lakeland Road partial grade separation is not in a residential area but provides access to multiple community facilities in northeast Norwalk, including the California Conservation Corps, Metropolitan State Hospital Museum, Norwalk Community Hospital, and Southern Youth Correctional Reception Center and Clinic.

Construction of grade-separation improvements would be phased so that vehicular, bicycle, pedestrian, and emergency access across the existing rail corridor would be maintained. However, construction of the grade separation would still result in a new physical barrier to the community by permanently displacing residents and temporarily modifying community access. **SO-MM#1, Implement Measures to Reduce Impacts Associated with the Division of Residential Neighborhoods**, will reduce permanent impacts on community cohesion from residential displacements by making efforts to locate suitable replacement properties for displaced residents and taking measures to purchase vacant land or buildings in the area for those who wish to remain in the immediate vicinity.

Construction of the Pioneer Boulevard grade separation would have permanent impacts on the community because direct access to Rivera Road would be removed. This would create a new physical barrier that affects access for residents in the existing neighborhoods adjacent to Rivera Road. To maintain paths of travel between these communities, a new roadway that loops west and south just north of the crossing would provide access from Pioneer Boulevard to Rivera Road. **SO-MM#2** will reduce community division impacts from grade-separation construction by evaluating the community's modified access, including the effectiveness of providing overcrossings or undercrossings of the HSR track, to allow continued use of community facilities and connectivity during construction. As part of **SO-MM#2**, the Authority will also conduct community workshops about the future use of the area beneath the rail guideway, where these would exist. These meetings will provide the community with an opportunity to identify design and use options that could strengthen community cohesion and be compatible with the existing community character. The Authority will be responsible for implementing the measures to reduce impacts through project design and through the long-term management of the measures. By implementing measures identified by the affected communities, **SO-MM#1** and **SO-MM#2** will effectively mitigate impacts on community cohesion. Grade-separation construction activities at the Norwalk Boulevard, Los Nietos Road, and State College Boulevard crossings would have

lesser effects on communities, because these areas have fewer residential areas and community facilities. However, this portion of Anaheim is a major employment center. Construction would temporarily affect business access in the Platinum Triangle, although access would be maintained.

After grade separations are built and opened, bus lines that currently cross at-grade railroad crossings would operate with less delay. Passing trains and active grade-crossing safety equipment would no longer cause travel delays. This would be a beneficial effect on community cohesion by providing improved vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities that connect communities on either side of the rail corridor.

Overall, construction would temporarily affect individuals and property owners near the limits of construction. Because construction activities would generally occur along the existing rail right-of-way, construction would not affect community cohesion by physically dividing or isolating one community from another.

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

With the LMF at 15th Street, construction impacts on community disruption or division would be similar to those described for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, with the exception of several additional LMF-related construction impacts occurring in Los Angeles, as described below.

Residential and Business Displacements

There would be no residential displacements associated with either LMF, so impacts from residential displacements would be the same as those of Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. Acquisitions associated with the LMF at 15th Street would displace an additional 18 businesses when compared to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A (a total of 274 businesses). Based on the locations of the displaced businesses in an industrial area adjacent to an existing rail corridor, these property acquisitions would not physically divide communities or isolate one community from another. Although several businesses would be relocated in this area, they represent a small proportion of the much larger commercial and industrial area spanning the cities of Los Angeles and Commerce and would not substantially disrupt the larger existing district. Property acquisitions would not displace community facilities.

Air Quality

Construction impacts on regional and localized air quality would be similar to those described for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, with the differences resulting from Shared Passenger Track Alternative B's development of the 15th Street LMF instead of the 26th Street LMF.

According to Table 3.3-14 (Shared Passenger Track Alternative A) and Table 3.3-20 (Shared Passenger Track Alternative B), the total construction emissions would be slightly greater for Shared Passenger Track Alternative B, because it covers a larger area for the 15th Street LMF and requires a larger amount of excavation and haul trips to remove excavated material. Emissions of reactive organic gases, nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ would be less than the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency General Conformity *de minimis* levels applicable to the South Coast Air Basin. Emissions of NO_X would exceed the General Conformity *de minimis* level applicable to the South Coast Air Basin. As discussed for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, changes in regional air quality would not degrade community character because they would be either less than the General Conformity *de minimis* levels (carbon monoxide, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and sulfur dioxide) or will be offset through **AQ-MM#1** to below the General Conformity *de minimis* levels (NO_X). Additionally, with implementation of **AQ-MM#2** and **AQ-MM#3**, construction emissions will be minimized. Changes in regional air quality would be diffused across a broad area and therefore would not noticeably alter neighborhood character.

Noise and Vibration

Construction impacts on noise and vibration would be the same as those described for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. There are no additional sensitive receptors near the 15th Street LMF, so impacts on community division and disruption would be the same as for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A.

Traffic and Pedestrian Safety

Construction impacts related to traffic and pedestrian safety would be the same as those described for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. The LMF location would not change impacts related to traffic and circulation patterns and no additional impacts on traffic are anticipated. Therefore, impacts on community division and disruption would be the same as for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A.

Visual Quality

The LMF at 15th Street would be in a developed, industrial area. Its impact on visual quality would not disrupt or divide the existing community. Elements introduced during construction activities (e.g., construction materials, equipment, on-site workers) and at construction staging areas (e.g., stored material and equipment) would result in visual changes to communities adjacent to the project footprint. On completion of construction at a given location, construction equipment would be removed, and construction staging areas and temporary structures would be dismantled. Primary viewer groups include employees, business patrons, and travelers on local roadways. As defined in Section 3.16, these user groups are considered to have lower sensitivity based on the anticipated viewer exposure and awareness to the visual environment. Temporary visual changes from construction would not obstruct established paths of travel and would not hinder existing communities' ability to communicate with each other. Therefore, given the viewers' proximity to and familiarity with the existing rail corridor, these temporary visual changes would not considerably alter community character in a way that would disrupt or physically divide established communities.

Community Access and Cohesion

The nature of impacts on community access and cohesion would be similar to those described for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, but would occur instead at the LMF location at 15th Street. Because both LMF options would be in developed, industrial areas, their locations would have minimal impacts on community access and cohesion. Overall, construction activities would affect individuals and property owners near the limits of construction, but the effects on community cohesion and character would be temporary. Because construction activities would generally occur along the existing rail right-of-way, construction would not affect community cohesion by physically dividing or isolating one community from another.

High-Speed Rail Station Options

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs

With inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option, impacts would be the same as those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area, except for air quality, as described in more detail below.

Residential and Business Displacements

Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would be in the same area that would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, and would not displace any additional or different residential units or businesses. Therefore, impacts from residential and business displacements would be the same as those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area and would not physically divide or isolate one community from another.

Air Quality

Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would result in slightly higher regional emissions compared to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A or B without the HSR station option. Refer to Tables 3.3-16, 3.3-17, 3.3-22, and 3.3-23 for specific details on construction emissions. Emissions of NO_X would exceed the General Conformity *de minimis* level applicable to the South Coast Air Basin. Even with the NO_X exceeding daily significance thresholds during construction, changes in regional air quality would not obstruct communities' established travel routes or change community character to an extent that would physically divide or isolate the existing communities in the RSA. In addition, as discussed for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, changes in regional air quality would not degrade community character because they would be either less than the General Conformity *de minimis* levels (carbon monoxide, PM_{10},

$PM_{2.5}$, and sulfur dioxide) or will be offset through **AQ-MM#1** to below the General Conformity *de minimis* levels (NO_X). Additionally, with implementation of **AQ-MM#2** and **AQ-MM#3**, construction emissions will be minimized. Changes in regional air quality would be diffused across a broad area and therefore would not noticeably alter the neighborhood's character.

Maximum local air quality construction impacts would be the same as for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives because the maximum impacts would occur with construction of track and other infrastructure and not at the stations. All localized concentrations of carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and sulfur dioxide, including background concentrations, would be less than their respective thresholds, guidelines, or standards; therefore, impacts on local air quality would not divide or disrupt existing communities in the RSA.

Noise and Vibration

Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would be in the same area that would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, and there are no noise-sensitive receptors in the station area.

Traffic and Pedestrian Safety

Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would be in the same area that would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, and there would not be additional temporary road closures or detours or additional affected intersections or roadway segments.

Visual Quality

Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would include the same types of construction activities as for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. These HSR station elements are also similar to the other project elements that would be built in the station area (e.g., modified Metrolink platform, station plaza, and Metrolink parking) and there would not be different or additional visual changes compared to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. Design standards will be implemented to reduce potential impacts through a collaborative, context-sensitive design process to help integrate structures in communities and reduce the intrusiveness of built elements (**AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2**). These visual changes to nearby communities and neighborhoods would not physically divide existing communities.

Community Access and Cohesion

Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would be in the same area that would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. Overall, construction activities would affect individuals and property owners near the limits of construction, but the effects on community cohesion and character would be temporary. Because construction activities would generally occur along the existing rail right-of-way, construction would not affect community cohesion by disrupting, physically dividing, or isolating one community from another.

<u>High-Speed Rail Station Option: Fullerton</u>

With inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option, impacts would be the same as those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area, except for business displacements and air quality, as described in more detail below. Construction of the Fullerton HSR Station Option would not result in a disruption to or division of communities.

Residential and Business Displacements

No residential displacements are required for the Fullerton HSR Station Option. Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would displace nine additional businesses. The businesses include automotive, fitness, warehousing, and brewing facilities. Based on the locations of the displaced businesses in a commercial area adjacent to an existing rail corridor, these property acquisitions would not physically divide communities or isolate one community from another.

Air Quality

Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would result in slightly higher emissions compared to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A or B without an HSR station option. Refer to Tables 3.3-16, 3.3-17, 3.3-22, and 3.3-23 for specific details on construction emissions. Emissions of NO_X would exceed the General Conformity *de minimis* level applicable to the South Coast Air Basin. Even with the NO_X exceeding daily significance thresholds during construction, changes in regional air quality would not obstruct communities' established travel routes or change community character to an extent that would physically divide or isolate the existing communities in the RSA. In addition, as discussed for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, changes in regional air quality would not degrade community character because they would be either less than the General Conformity *de minimis* levels (carbon monoxide, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and sulfur dioxide) or will be offset through **AQ-MM#1** to below the General Conformity *de minimis* levels (NO_X). Additionally, with implementation of **AQ-MM#2** and **AQ-MM#3**, construction emissions will be minimized. Changes in regional air quality would be diffused across a broad area and therefore would not noticeably alter neighborhood character.

Maximum local air quality construction impacts would be the same as for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives because the maximum impacts would occur with construction of track and other infrastructure and not at the stations. All localized concentrations of carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and sulfur dioxide, including background concentrations, would be less than their respective thresholds, guidelines, or standards; therefore, impacts on local air quality would not divide or disrupt existing communities in the RSA.

Noise and Vibration

During construction of the Fullerton HSR Station Option, temporary exposure to noise impacts would be similar to those for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the vicinity of the station area. However, because the construction area for this HSR station option would be greater than the area that would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, additional sensitive receivers could be affected by construction noise. **NV-IAMF#1** requires the contractor to document how federal guidelines for minimizing noise and vibration would be employed when construction is occurring near sensitive receivers (such as hospitals, residential neighborhoods, and schools). Overall, because of communities' proximity to and familiarity with noise levels associated with the existing rail corridor, construction noise and vibration would not create a new disruption to or physical division of the communities.

Traffic and Pedestrian Safety

Construction of the Fullerton HSR Station Option would be in a larger area that would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, but there would not be additional temporary road closures or detours or additional affected intersections or roadway segments. Therefore, impacts in the station area would not physically divide the existing community.

Visual Quality

Construction of the Fullerton HSR Station Option would include the same types of construction activities as for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. These HSR station elements are also similar to the other project elements that would be built in the station area (e.g., new Metrolink/Amtrak platform and station plaza), and there would not be different or additional visual changes compared to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. These visual changes to nearby communities and neighborhoods could disrupt communities, but would not be severe enough to disrupt paths of travel or physically divide the community. The station area is an existing transit facility, so the addition of the Fullerton HSR Station Option would not result in a change to community character that would physically divide or cause a disruption to the community.

Community Access and Cohesion

Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would be in a larger area than would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, but would not result in additional impacts on community access and cohesion. Overall, construction activities would affect

individuals and property owners near the limits of construction, but the effects on community cohesion and character would be temporary. Because construction activities would generally occur along the existing rail right-of-way, construction would not affect community cohesion by physically dividing or isolating one community from another.

CEQA Conclusion

In the context of CEQA, this analysis addresses the potential for the project to physically divide established communities. Construction impacts related to air quality, noise and vibration, traffic and pedestrian safety, and visual quality may disrupt residents and motorists but would not physically divide communities. **SOCIO-IAMF#1** will ensure property access for local businesses, residences, and emergency services, and minimize impacts on local and regional bus routes during construction. **SS-IAMF#1**, **TR-IAMF#1**, **TR-IAMF#2**, **TR-IAMF#3**, **TR-IAMF#4**, **TR-IAMF#5**, **TR-IAMF#6**, **TR-IAMF#7**, **TR-IAMF#8**, **TR-IAMF#11**, and **TR-IAMF#12** will reduce conflicts with construction-related traffic and maintain access during construction through implementation of a Construction Transportation Plan. As described in other resource sections, construction impacts related to land use, safety, noise, and air quality that may disrupt communities will be minimized through **LU-IAMF#3**, **NV-IAMF#1**, **AQ-IAMF#1**, **AQ-IAMF#2**, **AQ-IAMF#3**, **AQ-IAMF#4**, and **AQ-IAMF#5**.

Grade separation construction would significantly affect community cohesion and access by permanently displacing residents and temporarily modifying community access. Therefore, CEQA requires mitigation. **SO-MM#1** will reduce permanent impacts on community cohesion from residential displacements by making efforts to locate suitable replacement properties for displaced residents and taking measures to purchase vacant land or buildings in the area for those who wish to remain in the immediate vicinity. Through **SO-MM#2**, the Authority will minimize project impacts associated with the division of existing communities through a program of outreach to homeowners, residents, land owners, business owners, community organizations, and local officials in affected neighborhoods. The Authority will evaluate the community's modified access, including the effectiveness of providing overcrossings or undercrossings of the HSR track, to allow continued use of community facilities and connectivity during construction. As part of **SO-MM#2**, the Authority will also conduct community workshops about the future use of the area beneath the rail guideway, where these would exist. The Authority will be responsible for implementing the measures to reduce impacts through project design and through the long-term management of the measures. This involves documenting the desired design concepts, incorporating them into the final design, and facilitating ongoing maintenance. **SO-MM#2** will reduce community division by providing the community with an opportunity to identify design and use options that could strengthen community cohesion and be compatible with the existing community character. By implementing measures identified by the affected communities, **SO-MM#1** and **SO-MM#2** will effectively mitigate impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Impact SO-2: Residential Displacements and Relocations

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

The proposed route closely follows the existing Los Angeles – San Luis Obispo – San Diego Rail Corridor, with most of the planned facility falling within the existing railroad right-of-way. Land use along the corridor is primarily industrial with warehouses, manufacturing facilities, and rail-related uses dominating the majority of adjacent properties. As a result, the project would affect relatively few residential properties considering its scale.

The project would displace three single-family residential units in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP (Table 3.12-22) and no multifamily residential units. An estimated 12 residents would be displaced from single-family residential units.

Table 3.12-22 Single-Family Residential Displacements

Location	Residential Units Displaced	Estimated Residents to Be Displaced
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP	3	12

Sources: LandVision 2023; U.S. Census Bureau 2021; Google Earth 2023; Google Street View 2023
CDP = census-designated place

An analysis of suitable replacement housing finds that a sufficient number of comparable replacement residences are available in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP. Table 3.12-23 provides the gap analysis of single-family residential displacements.

Table 3.12-23 Gap Analysis of Single-Family Residential Displacements

Location	Single-Family Residential Units Displaced	Residential Units Available	Size of Surplus
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP[1]	3	84[1]	81

Sources: LandVision 2023; CRMLS 2023; Google Earth 2023; Google Street View 2023
[1] This number represents the available single-family residential replacement sites in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP, South Whittier CDP, and the city of Whittier combined.
CDP = census-designated place

The estimate of replacement housing stock available is based on current market conditions and vacancy rates. It is possible that a decrease in vacancy rates at the time of acquisition could result in a reduced number of available replacement sites; however, the abundance of replacement sites currently available relative to the number of anticipated displacements suggests there should be no issue finding replacement sites. In addition, IAMFs included in the project require individualized relocation assistance for displaced residents (**SOCIO-IAMF#2** and **SOCIO-IAMF#3**).

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

Because the LMF locations do not have associated residential displacements, the residential displacements and relocations for Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would be the same as for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, specifically involving displacement of three single-family residential units and 12 residents in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP.

High-Speed Rail Station Options

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs

With inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option, impacts would be the same as those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would be in the same area that would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, and would not result in residential displacements.

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Fullerton

With inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option, impacts would be the same as those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would be in a larger area than would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, but would not result in residential displacements.

CEQA Conclusion

Although the project would displace three single-family residential units in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP, impacts would be minimized with incorporation of **SOCIO-IAMF#2** and **SOCIO-IAMF#3**, because there is an anticipated surplus of replacement sites for the displaced residents and there will be relocation assistance provided. The project would not require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because there are sufficient residential replacement properties, and impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, CEQA does not require mitigation.

Impact SO-3: Business Displacements and Relocations

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

Based on the prevailing property use types in the project footprint, a much higher number of commercial and industrial properties would be displaced by the project relative to residential properties. The project would displace an estimated 256 businesses (commercial and industrial). These displacements correspond to an estimated 2,948 displaced employees. Table 3.12-24 provides a breakdown of the total commercial and industrial business displacements throughout the corridor.

Table 3.12-24 Commercial and Industrial Displacements for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

City	Businesses Displaced	Estimated Employees Displaced
Los Angeles County	**178**	**2,310**
Los Angeles	-	-
Vernon	37	911
Commerce	115	1,101
Bell	--	--
Montebello	2	82
Pico Rivera	1	9
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP	--	--
Norwalk	--	--
Santa Fe Springs	17	178
South Whittier CDP	--	--
La Mirada	6	29
Orange County	**78**	**638**
Buena Park	12	262
Fullerton	23	97
Anaheim	43	279
Orange	--	--
Total	**256**	**2,948**

Sources: Reference USA 2023; Costar 2023; Google Earth 2023; Google Street View 2023
CDP = census-designated place

Los Angeles County

The majority of commercial and industrial displacements would occur in Los Angeles County. The project would displace 178 businesses, resulting in an estimated 2,310 displaced employees.

The largest number of business and employee displacements would occur in Commerce and Vernon, resulting from work in the Hobart Yard area to accommodate HSR facilities and reconfigured freight rail infrastructure. There would be an estimated 115 displaced businesses and 1,101 displaced employees in Commerce and an estimated 37 displaced businesses and 911 displaced employees in Vernon. Although several businesses would be relocated in this area, they represent a small proportion of the much larger industrial area spanning the cities of Los Angeles, Vernon, and Commerce, and would not substantially disrupt the larger existing district.

Remaining Los Angeles County commercial and industrial displacements would occur in Montebello (2 businesses and 82 employees), Pico Rivera (1 business and 9 employees), Santa Fe Springs (17 businesses and 178 employees), and La Mirada (6 businesses and 29 employees).

Orange County

Commercial and industrial displacements combined in Orange County are estimated to be 78, with a total of 638 displaced employees. The largest number of business displacements would occur in Anaheim, with an estimated 43 displaced businesses and 279 displaced employees. The remaining displacements would occur in Buena Park (12 businesses and 262 employees) and Fullerton (23 businesses and 97 employees). In Buena Park, several large industrial facilities employing between 25 and 100 employees each would be displaced, accounting for the relatively high number of displaced employees.

Table 3.12-25 provides the distribution of commercial and industrial displacements in each city by property category.

Table 3.12-25 Commercial and Industrial Displacements by City and Category

City	Commercial	Industrial	Total
Los Angeles County	**92**	**86**	**178**
Los Angeles	--	--	--
Vernon	19	18	37
Commerce	58	57	115
Bell	--	--	--
Montebello	--	2	2
Pico Rivera	--	1	1
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP	--	--	--
Norwalk	--	--	--
Santa Fe Springs	9	8	17
South Whittier CDP	--	--	--
La Mirada	6	--	6
Orange County	**21**	**57**	**78**
Buena Park	--	12	12
Fullerton	13	10	23
Anaheim	8	35	43
Orange	--	--	--
Total	**113**	**143**	**256**

Sources: Reference USA 2023; Costar 2023; Google Earth 2023; Google Street View 2023
CDP = census-designated place

Table 3.12-26 presents the total available commercial and industrial properties for lease and sale. This analysis assumes the relative proportion of properties for lease and for sale approximately corresponds to the proportion of owner-occupied and tenant-occupied displacements. The actual number of owner- versus tenant-occupied displacements would be verified at the time relocation interviews are performed.

Table 3.12-26 Inventory of Available Commercial and Industrial Properties for Lease and for Sale

City	Commercial	Industrial
Los Angeles County	**1,589**	**900**
Los Angeles[1]	1,379	530
Vernon	3	80
Commerce	15	74
Bell	14	6
Montebello	23	22
Pico Rivera	20	15
Whittier area[2]	67	16
Norwalk	39	9
Santa Fe Springs	9	120
La Mirada	20	28
Orange County	**258**	**194**
Buena Park	20	23
Fullerton	46	37
Anaheim	123	100
Orange	69	34

Source: Costar 2023
[1] Los Angeles here includes the following zip codes: 90012, 90013, 90021, 90023, 90033.
[2] Whittier area here refers to West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP, South Whittier CDP, and the city of Whittier.
CDP = census-designated place

Table 3.12-27 presents the results of the gap analysis for commercial businesses and Table 3.12-28 provides the gap analysis for industrial businesses. A comparative analysis between the inventory of available commercial and industrial units and number of displaced businesses finds there are sufficient replacement units to accommodate the displaced businesses in each of the respective cities, except for Vernon and Commerce. Vernon has a deficit of 16 commercial units, and Commerce has a deficit of 43 commercial units.

Table 3.12-27 Gap Analysis of Commercial Displacements

City	Businesses Displaced	Commercial Units Available	Surplus (Deficit)
Los Angeles County	**92**	**1,589**	**1,497**
Los Angeles	--	1,379[1]	1,379
Vernon	19	3	-16
Commerce	58	15	-43
Bell	--	14	14
Montebello	--	23	23
Pico Rivera	--	20	20

City	Businesses Displaced	Commercial Units Available	Surplus (Deficit)
Whittier	--	67[2]	67
Norwalk	--	39	39
Santa Fe Springs	9	9	0
La Mirada	6	20	14
Orange County	**21**	**258**	**237**
Buena Park	--	20	20
Fullerton	13	46	33
Anaheim	8	123	115
Orange	--	69	69

Sources: Reference USA 2023; Costar 2023; Google Earth 2023; Google Street View 2023
[1] This represents the number units available in the following zip codes in Los Angeles: 90012, 90013, 90021, 90023, 90033.
[2] This represents the number of units available in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP, South Whittier CDP, and the city of Whittier.
CDP = census-designated place

Table 3.12-28 Gap Analysis of Industrial Displacements

City	Businesses Displaced	Industrial Units Available	Surplus (Deficit)
Los Angeles County	**86**	**900**	**814**
Los Angeles	--	530[1]	530
Vernon	18	80	62
Commerce	57	74	17
Bell	--	6	6
Montebello	2	22	20
Pico Rivera	1	15	14
Whittier	--	16[2]	16
Norwalk	--	9	9
Santa Fe Springs	8	120	112
La Mirada	--	28	28
Orange County	**57**	**194**	**137**
Buena Park	12	23	11
Fullerton	10	37	27
Anaheim	35	100	65
Orange	--	34	34

Sources: Reference USA 2023; Costar 2023; Google Earth 2023; Google Street View 2023
[1] This represents the number units available in the following zip codes in Los Angeles: 90012, 90013, 90021, 90023, 90033.
[2] This represents the number of units available in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP, South Whittier CDP, and the city of Whittier.
CDP = census-designated place

Property acquisitions for the construction of the project would result in the following displacements and relocation opportunities:

- In Vernon, there is a surplus of suitable industrial replacement sites and a deficit of suitable commercial replacement sites for the 18 industrial displacements and 19 commercial displacements.
- In Commerce, there is a surplus of suitable industrial replacement sites and a deficit of suitable commercial replacement sites for the 57 industrial displacements and 58 commercial displacements.
- In Montebello, there is a surplus of suitable replacement sites for the two industrial displacements.
- In Pico Rivera, there is a surplus of suitable replacement sites for the one industrial displacement.
- In Santa Fe Springs, there is a surplus of suitable replacement sites for the nine commercial and eight industrial displacements.
- In La Mirada, there is a surplus of suitable commercial replacement sites for the six commercial displacements.
- In Buena Park, there is a surplus of suitable replacement sites for the 12 industrial displacements.
- In Fullerton, there is a surplus of suitable replacement sites for the 13 commercial displacements.
- In Anaheim, there is a surplus of suitable replacement sites for the 8 commercial displacements and 35 industrial displacements.

The effect of displacing businesses and employees would be temporary in jurisdictions where there is a surplus of replacement sites for displaced businesses. In Commerce and Vernon, where there is currently a deficit of replacement sites, effects could be long term. However, suitable relocation sites for those businesses have been identified in surrounding cities with similar zoning and land use for commercial businesses—Montebello, Bell, Norwalk, Whittier, and Los Angeles. As presented in Table 3.12-27, there is a surplus of 23 suitable replacement sites in Montebello, 14 in Bell, 9 in Norwalk, 16 in Whittier, and 1,379 in Los Angeles. Given the nature of many businesses near the rail corridor, certain commercial or industrial businesses and employees may rely on being close to specialized customers or suppliers and may need special considerations when relocating. Ideally, replacement sites would be close enough to avoid putting an undue burden on employees who would need to travel from their homes to the new business location. Incorporation of **SOCIO-IAMF#3** will provide relocated business owners with individualized relocation assistance with the objective of minimizing the permanent closure of businesses and the economic disruptions to displaced businesses, and will provide regulatory compliance assistance to businesses that require complex permitting to relocate.

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B follows the same project alignment and shares most of the same project features and operational assumptions as Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, except for the location of the LMF. When compared to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would displace nine additional industrial businesses and nine additional commercial businesses in Los Angeles. These additional displacements are related to the 15th Street LMF. As presented in Table 3.12-29 and Table 3.12-30, Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would displace an estimated total of 274 commercial and industrial businesses. These displacements correspond to an estimated 3,781 displaced employees.

Table 3.12-29 Commercial and Industrial Displacements for Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

City	Businesses Displaced	Estimated Employees Displaced
Los Angeles County		
Los Angeles	18	833
Vernon	37	911
Commerce	115	1,101
Bell	--	--
Montebello	2	82
Pico Rivera	1	9
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP	--	--
Norwalk	--	--
Santa Fe Springs	17	178
South Whittier CDP	--	--
La Mirada	6	29
Total	**196**	**3,143**
Orange County		
Buena Park	12	262
Fullerton	23	97
Anaheim	43	279
Orange	--	--
Total	**78**	**638**
Grand Total	**274**	**3,781**

Sources: Reference USA 2023; Costar 2023; Google Earth 2023; Google Street View 2023
CDP = Census-Designated Place

Table 3.12-30 Commercial and Industrial Displacements by City and Category for Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

City	Commercial	Industrial	Total
Los Angeles County			
Los Angeles	9	9	18
Vernon	19	18	37
Commerce	58	57	115
Bell	--	--	--
Montebello	--	2	2
Pico Rivera	--	1	1
West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP	--	--	--
Norwalk	--	--	--

City	Commercial	Industrial	Total
Santa Fe Springs	9	8	17
South Whittier CDP	--	--	--
La Mirada	6	--	6
Total	**101**	**95**	**196**
Orange County			
Buena Park	--	12	12
Fullerton	13	10	23
Anaheim	8	35	43
Orange	--	--	--
Total	**21**	**57**	**78**
Grand Total	**122**	**152**	**274**

Sources: Reference USA 2023; Costar 2023; Google Earth 2023; Google Street View 2023
CDP = Census-Designated Place

Table 3.12-26 presents the inventory of available commercial and industrial properties for lease and sale. Table 3.12-31 and Table 3.12-32 present the results of the gap analysis for commercial and industrial businesses, respectively. Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would have the same impacts as Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, with a deficit of 16 commercial units in Vernon and 43 commercial units in Commerce.

Table 3.12-31 Gap Analysis of Commercial Displacements for Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

City	Businesses Displaced	Commercial Units Available	Surplus (Deficit)
Los Angeles County	**101**	**1,589**	**1,488**
Los Angeles	9	1,379[1]	1,370
Vernon	19	3	-16
Commerce	58	15	-43
Bell	--	14	14
Montebello	--	23	23
Pico Rivera	--	20	20
Whittier	--	67[2]	67
Norwalk	--	39	39
Santa Fe Springs	9	9	0
La Mirada	6	20	14
Orange County	**21**	**258**	**237**
Buena Park	--	20	20
Fullerton	13	46	33
Anaheim	8	123	115

City	Businesses Displaced	Commercial Units Available	Surplus (Deficit)
Orange	--	69	69

Sources: Reference USA 2023; Costar 2023; Google Earth 2023; Google Street View 2023
[1] This represents the number units available in the following zip codes in Los Angeles: 90012, 90013, 90021, 90023, 90033.
[2] This represents the number of units available in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP, South Whittier CDP, and the city of Whittier.
CDP = census-designated place

Table 3.12-32 Gap Analysis of Industrial Displacements for Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

City	Businesses Displaced	Industrial Units Available	Surplus (Deficit)
Los Angeles County	**95**	**900**	**805**
Los Angeles	9	530[1]	521
Vernon	18	80	62
Commerce	57	74	17
Bell	--	6	6
Montebello	2	22	20
Pico Rivera	1	15	14
Whittier	--	16[2]	16
Norwalk	--	9	9
Santa Fe Springs	8	120	112
La Mirada	--	28	28
Orange County	**57**	**194**	**147**
Buena Park	12	23	11
Fullerton	10	37	27
Anaheim	35	100	65
Orange	--	34	34

Sources: Reference USA 2023; Costar 2023; Google Earth 2023; Google Street View 2023
[1] This represents the number units available in the following zip codes in Los Angeles: 90012, 90013, 90021, 90023, 90033.
[2] This represents the number of units available in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP, South Whittier CDP, and the city of Whittier.
CDP = census-designated place

High-Speed Rail Station Options

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs
With inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option, impacts would be the same as those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would be in the same area that would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, and would not result in additional business displacements.

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Fullerton
With inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option, impacts would be similar to those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would be in a larger area than would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, and would displace five additional commercial businesses and four additional industrial businesses in Fullerton. A comparative analysis between the inventory of

available industrial units (presented in Table 3.12-26) and number of displaced businesses finds there are sufficient replacement units to accommodate displaced properties, even with the nine additional displacements.

CEQA Conclusion

In accordance with Section 15064(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, "economic and social changes resulting from the project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment." Therefore, no CEQA conclusions are made related to displacements and relocations of businesses. Section 15064(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines also notes that "economic or social changes may be used…to determine that a physical change shall be regarded as a significant effect on the environment." Refer to Impact SO-4 for an evaluation of how the economic or social changes related to project construction could result in physical deterioration in the communities along the project alignment.

Impact SO-4: Physical Deterioration

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

Physical deterioration occurs when residential properties are abandoned, commercial districts lose viability because of store closures, or the condition of public facilities declines from a lack of government resources. Physical deterioration could be caused by residential migration out of the community, extensive changes to the business environment of the community, or substantial reductions in property and tax revenue sources for local governments.

As discussed in Impact SO-2, there would be three residential displacements in the southwest neighborhood of West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP. Suitable relocation sites have been identified for these displacements. Given the low number of residential displacements and the availability of replacement sites, these displacements are not expected to lead to considerable residential migration out of the southwest neighborhood of West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP. Therefore, the project would not result in physical deterioration from residential migration.

As discussed in Impact SO-3, Shared Passenger Track Alternative A would result in 256 business displacements. Suitable relocation sites have been identified in all affected cities except for Commerce and Vernon. Physical deterioration would not occur in cities where suitable relocation sites have been identified to accommodate the relocation of commercial and industrial businesses in these cities. Identifying suitable relocation sites would limit physical deterioration by avoiding business closures, sustaining employment, ensuring that vacant infrastructure is used, and retaining business-generated tax revenues.

There is a deficit of replacement units to accommodate displaced properties in Commerce and Vernon (Impact SO-3). Because at least 43 displaced commercial businesses would not be able to relocate in Commerce and 16 displaced commercial businesses would not be able to relocate in Vernon, these displacements could lead to the loss of the long-term viability of these commercial districts. However, suitable relocation sites for those businesses have been identified in surrounding cities with similar zoning and land use for commercial businesses—Montebello, Bell, Norwalk, Whittier, and Los Angeles. Incorporation of **SOCIO-IAMF#3** will provide relocated business owners with individualized relocation assistance with the objective of minimizing the permanent closure of businesses and the economic disruptions to displaced businesses, and will provide regulatory compliance assistance to businesses that require complex permitting to relocate. Providing individualized relocation assistance and identifying suitable replacement units would ensure that commercial activity remains in the areas where displacements occur and enable businesses to remain open with minimal disruption. Therefore, physical deterioration from changes to the business environment would not occur.

As discussed in Impact SO-8, the project could result in a temporary loss of sales and use tax revenue in the cities where business displacements would occur. These losses are expected to be temporary because, based on the surplus of available commercial and industrial property, many of the businesses displaced could relocate within the same tax jurisdiction. Where relocation sites are available, there would not be substantial permanent reductions in tax revenue sources for local governments.

The greatest potential for permanent revenue loss is in Commerce and Vernon, where there would be a larger number of business displacements and a deficit of replacement sites. If all businesses are able to relocate to the available units, the deficit of 43 and 16 commercial units in Commerce and Vernon would result in sales and use tax loss of 1.21 and 1.74 percent, respectively. This estimate represents the minimum sales and use tax loss by assuming all displaced businesses are able to relocate to every available replacement unit in Commerce or Vernon. The maximum potential sales and use tax loss would occur if none of the displaced businesses are able to relocate to the available replacement units; this would be 2.52 and 4.04 percent in Commerce and Vernon, respectively. There would also be a temporary increase in sales tax revenues during construction to help offset the estimated losses in Commerce and Vernon (Impact SO-8). Given the small percentage of total revenues that would be lost because of project displacements, which would be offset at least partially by the increase in sales tax revenues during construction, the overall effect of these revenue losses would be small and therefore not anticipated to lead to physical deterioration of government facilities.

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

Impacts would be similar to those described for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, with additional impacts at the 15th Street LMF site. Eighteen additional business relocations in Los Angeles are anticipated for construction of the 15th Street LMF. **SOCIO-IAMF#3** will provide relocated business owners with individualized relocation assistance with the objective of minimizing the permanent closure of businesses and the economic disruptions to displaced businesses. As described above, suitable relocation sites have been identified to accommodate the relocation of commercial and industrial businesses in Los Angeles. Displacements would therefore not result in considerable residential migration out of a community or introduce changes to the business environment. These impacts would not result in the closure of key businesses that would reduce the viability of a commercial district.

As discussed in Impact SO-8, Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would result in an additional loss of sales and use tax of $108,947 in the city of Los Angeles when compared to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. This represents 0.02 percent of Los Angeles's total sales tax revenue for FY 2021/2022. Given the small percentage of total revenues that would be lost because of project displacements, which would be offset at least partially by the increase in sales tax revenues during construction, the overall effect of these revenue losses would be small, and are therefore not anticipated to lead to physical deterioration of government facilities. Consequently, the project is not anticipated to result in the physical deterioration of communities in the area.

High-Speed Rail Station Options

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs

With inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option, impacts would be the same as those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would be in the same area that would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, and would not result in additional displacements that could lead to physical deterioration.

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Fullerton

With inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option, impacts would be similar to those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would be in a larger area than would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, and would displace five additional commercial businesses and four additional industrial businesses in Fullerton. **SOCIO-IAMF#3** will provide relocated business owners with individualized relocation assistance with the objective of minimizing the permanent closure of businesses and the economic disruptions to displaced businesses. Providing individualized relocation assistance and identifying suitable replacement units would ensure that industrial and commercial activity remains in the areas where displacements occur and enable businesses to remain open with minimal disruption. Therefore, physical deterioration from changes to the business environment would not occur.

As discussed in Impact SO-8, the additional business relocations required for the Fullerton HSR Station Option would result in an additional loss of sales and use tax in the amount of $66,865 in Fullerton. As mentioned above, permanent losses are expected to be substantially less than this estimate because, based on the surplus of available commercial and industrial property, many of the businesses displaced could relocate within the same tax jurisdiction. Because the potential losses represent a small percentage of total revenue (0.007 percent of Fullerton's total sales and tax use revenue) and there would also be a temporary increase in sales tax revenues during construction to help offset the temporary estimated losses, it is not anticipated that these reductions would lead to physical deterioration of government facilities. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in the physical deterioration of communities in the area.

CEQA Conclusion

Suitable relocation sites have been identified to accommodate the relocation of residential, commercial, and industrial businesses in all cities except for Vernon and Commerce. For business displacements in Vernon and Commerce, suitable relocation sites for businesses have been identified in surrounding cities with similar zoning and land use for businesses. Incorporation of **SOCIO-IAMF#3** will provide relocated business owners with individualized relocation assistance with the objective of minimizing the permanent closure of businesses and the economic disruptions to displaced businesses. Providing individualized relocation assistance and identifying suitable replacement units would ensure that commercial activity remains in the areas where displacements occur and enable businesses to remain open with minimal disruption. Therefore, displacements would not result in physical deterioration from considerable residential migration out of a community or reduction of long-term viability of a business district. In addition, although relocations from project construction could result in temporary decreases in tax revenues, there would also be a temporary increase in sales tax revenues from construction spending. Therefore, there would not be substantial reductions in revenue sources for local governments that could lead to physical deterioration. Consequently, CEQA does not require mitigation.

Impact SO-5: Job Creation During Construction

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

Construction of Shared Passenger Track Alternative A has the potential to stimulate short-term employment, and would create 31,950[5] additional direct, indirect, and induced job-years in Los Angeles and Orange Counties.[6] Of the total created annual job-years, 15,300 would be direct and 16,650 would be indirect or induced. Table 3.12-33 presents the employment effects for each year of construction. Given the number of unemployed workers in the RSA, as discussed in Section 3.12.6.1, Overview, there would be an ample supply of local residents to fill many of the new jobs, which would reduce the number of jobs needing to be filled by new residents and the resulting population, housing, and public service effects.

[5] Employment effects are rounded up to the nearest 10 jobs, and totals may not add because of rounding. Job estimates were scaled to reflect an estimate for savings that could be reasonably accrued from standard value engineering review. The savings estimate is based on actual Authority engineering design review of the project section. More detail on the type of refinements considered as value engineering is found in the Preliminary Engineering for Project Definition General Notes.

[6] An "annual job-year" is equivalent to one person fully employed for 1 year.

Table 3.12-33 Employment Impacts During Construction[1] (in Annual Job-Years[2]) of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives

Employment[3]	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	Total
Direct	1,060	1,750	2,400	2,400	2,790	2,790	2,110	15,300
Indirect and induced	1,160	1,900	2,610	2,610	3,040	3,040	2,290	16,650
Total	**2,220**	**3,650**	**5,010**	**5,010**	**5,830**	**5,830**	**4,400**	**31,950**

Source: BEA 2015
[1] Regional Input-Output Modeling System II multipliers for the two-county resource study area were used in the analysis of employment gains.
[2] In the Regional Input-Output Modeling System II model, one annual job-year is equivalent to one job held by one person over 1 year's duration. This metric can account for both full-time and part-time jobs.
[3] Employment effects are rounded up to the nearest 10 jobs, and totals may not add because of rounding. Job estimates were scaled to reflect an estimate for savings that could be reasonably accrued from standard value engineering review. The savings estimate is based on actual California High-Speed Rail Authority engineering design review of the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section. More detail on the type of refinements considered as value engineering is found in the Preliminary Engineering for Project Definition General Notes.

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

Because the LMF location would not affect construction employment estimates, short-term job creation impacts for Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would be the same as those of Shared Passenger Track Alternative A.

High-Speed Rail Station Options

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs

With inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option, impacts on job creation from construction-related employment would be similar to those of Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, with higher construction-related employment.

Construction of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option would create an additional estimated 840 total annual job-years, with 400 direct and 440 indirect and induced annual job-years in construction. During each of the peak years of construction (2035 and 2036), project-related expenditures in the RSA were estimated to support 150 annual job-years, accounting for 70 direct jobs and 80 indirect and induced jobs. Table 3.12-34 presents the employment effects for each year of construction.

Table 3.12-34 Employment Impacts During Construction[1] (in Annual Job-Years[2]) of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs High-Speed Rail Station Option

Employment	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	Total
Direct	30	40	70	70	70	70	50	400
Indirect and induced	30	50	70	70	80	80	60	440
Total	**60**	**90**	**140**	**140**	**150**	**150**	**110**	**840**

Source: BEA 2015
[1] Regional Input-Output Modeling System II multipliers for the two-county resource study area were used in the analysis of employment gains.
[2] In the Regional Input-Output Modeling System II model, one annual job-year is equivalent to one job held by one person over 1 year's duration. This metric can account for both full-time and part-time jobs.

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Fullerton

With inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option, impacts on job creation from construction-related employment would be similar to those of Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, with higher construction-related employment.

Construction of the Fullerton HSR Station Option would create an additional estimated 1,740 total annual job-years, with 820 direct and 920 indirect and induced annual job-years in construction. During each of the peak years of construction (2035 and 2036), project-related expenditures in the RSA were estimated to support 310 annual job-years, accounting for 150 direct jobs and

160 indirect and induced jobs. Table 3.12-35 presents the employment effects for each year of construction.

Table 3.12-35 Employment Effects During Construction (in Annual Job-Years) of the Fullerton High-Speed Rail Station Option

Employment	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	Total
Direct	60	90	130	130	150	150	110	820
Indirect and induced	60	110	150	150	160	160	130	920
Total	**120**	**200**	**280**	**280**	**310**	**310**	**240**	**1,740**

Source: BEA 2015
[1] Regional Input-Output Modeling System II multipliers for the two-county resource study area were used in the analysis of employment gains.

CEQA Conclusion

In accordance with Section 15064 of the State CEQA Guidelines, "economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant impacts on the environment." In addition, no secondary impacts related to increased population are anticipated because local residents would fill the new jobs, as stated above. Accordingly, this section does not provide CEQA significance conclusions or mitigation related to regional employment.

Impact SO-6: Changes in School District Funding

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

Construction of the project could affect school district funding in the economics RSA, including potentially increased school district costs for operation of bus routes as a result of traffic congestion during construction. Changes to the routing of school buses during construction could occur as a result of localized changes in circulation and access, but these changes would be limited to minor roadways in primarily industrial areas. Permanent roadway modifications associated with the project are not anticipated to result in out-of-direction travel for school buses, and, consequently, no impacts on fuel costs for school districts are anticipated.

Project construction would also result in the displacement of residential units in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP. Table 3.12-36 identifies the number of residential units, the estimated student population that could be displaced, and the percentage of the student population that could be displaced from each school district in or adjacent to the project footprint. The project could displace 0.018 percent of the student population (approximately two students) from the school districts in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP.

Table 3.12-36 Student Displacements by School District: Fiscal Year 2021/2022

School District	Residential Units Displaced	Estimated Number of Students Displaced	School District Enrollment/ Average Daily Attendance[1]	Percentage of Student Population Displaced
Los Nietos Elementary School District/Whittier Union High School District	3	2	11,070	0.018

Source: California Department of Education 2023
[1] Information is for Fiscal Year 2021/2022.
School district student displacement was estimated for the high school district of each city only.
Number of students displaced rounded to the nearest whole number.

The estimated revenue losses for the school district in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP are presented in Table 3.12-37. The project could result in school district revenue losses of $34,256 in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP. Revenue losses represent 0.02 percent of total revenue in the affected school district.

Table 3.12-37 School District Revenue Losses: Fiscal Year 2021/2022

School District	Estimated ADA Revenue Loss	Estimated Property Tax Revenue Loss	Total Revenue Loss	Total Revenue	Estimated Revenue Loss as a Percentage of Total Revenue
Los Nietos Elementary School District/Whittier Union High School District	$12,991	$21,265	$34,256	$226,569,623	0.02

Source: California Department of Education 2023
ADA funding includes Local Control Funding Formula sources, state aid/Principal Apportionment, federal revenue, state revenue, and local revenue.
ADA = average daily attendance

Because there was a surplus of residential units available in the West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP at the time that this study was prepared, it is likely that affected residents would be able to relocate within the same school districts. This could offset or eliminate revenue losses because of reductions in average daily attendance. Even if students do not relocate within the same school districts, the estimated revenue loss of 0.02 percent would not represent a noticeable change to the school district's revenue.

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

Impacts on school district funding in the economics RSA, including potentially increased school district costs for operation of bus routes as a result of traffic congestion during construction, would be the same as those of Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. Construction of the 15th Street LMF is not anticipated to result in out-of-direction travel for school buses and, consequently, no impacts on fuel costs for school districts are anticipated.

In addition, because there are no residential displacements associated with either LMF site, residential relocations and student displacement would be the same for Shared Passenger Track Alternative B as for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A.

High-Speed Rail Station Options

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs

With inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option, impacts would be the same as those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would be in the same area that would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, and would not displace additional residences and consequently student populations. Permanent roadway modifications associated with this station option are not anticipated to result in out-of-direction travel for school buses, and, as a result, no impacts on fuel costs for school districts are anticipated.

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Fullerton

With inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option, impacts would be the same as those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would be in a larger area than would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, but would not displace additional residences and consequently student populations. Permanent roadway modifications associated with this station option are not anticipated to result in out-of-direction travel for school buses, and, as a result, no impacts on fuel costs for school districts are anticipated.

CEQA Conclusion

In accordance with Section 15064(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, "economic and social changes resulting from the project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment." Because there are no economic effects on school districts anticipated, there would be no corresponding secondary physical impacts. Therefore, this section does not provide CEQA significance conclusions or mitigation related to school district funding.

Impact SO-7: Property Value Changes and Property Tax Losses

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

Property Tax Loss from Relocations

The estimated long-term, annual property tax revenue loss from acquisitions represents 0.48 percent ($4,716,925) of total property tax revenue of the affected jurisdictions in FY 2020/2021 ($975,338,189). Of the affected local jurisdictions, Vernon would incur the largest annual property tax revenue loss ($1,556,045), followed by Commerce ($1,134,862), Anaheim ($820,330), and Santa Fe Springs ($623,196). Property tax losses in the remaining cities would represent a small percentage (less than 1.7 percent) of total revenue collected in these jurisdictions. Further information about property tax losses can be found in the *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Community Impact Assessment* (Authority 2025a).

Property Values

Construction of the project has the potential to affect property values in the RSA. Short-term changes in property values associated with construction would be limited to residential and business parcels near to the project section. Noise, traffic, and other effects associated with construction could negatively affect property values in adjacent areas in the short term if current or future residents experience or perceive reductions in quality of life or obstructions to daily business operations. Longer-term property value changes, positive or negative, are more difficult to predict because of other factors that affect property values, including diverse consumer preferences and fluctuations in the economy. Property adjacent to the project may be perceived as less valuable to current or future users after construction. However, development of the project section and the growth in employment supported by its operations could result in positive effects on property values, because workers may place a premium on living close to the HSR system to reduce their commuting time.

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

When compared to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would result in an additional loss of approximately $1,628,888 in annual property tax revenue in the city of Los Angeles. Despite this increase, this only represents a 0.24 percent loss in property tax revenue for the City of Los Angeles. This increase is due in part to the full acquisition of high-value industrial properties, including Rexford Industrial and Santa Fe 15 Property LLC. Property tax losses for Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would be highest in Los Angeles ($1.6 million), Vernon ($1.6 million), and Commerce ($1.1 million). Property tax losses in the remaining cities would represent a small percentage of total revenue collected in these jurisdictions. Further information about property tax losses can be found in the *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Community Impact Assessment* (Authority 2025a).

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B's impact on property values would be the same as discussed for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, with the exception of the location of the LMF. The 15th Street LMF would be in an industrial area and its construction would be consistent with the surrounding industrial land uses; because the LMF would not represent a divergence from the industrial environment, it is not expected to affect property values of the surrounding areas.

High-Speed Rail Station Options

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs

With inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option, impacts would be the same as those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would be in the same area that would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, and would not require additional acquisitions that would result in additional property tax impacts. Impacts on property values would be similar to those described for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. Furthermore, there is the potential for additional positive effects on property values from the station, because workers may place a premium on living close to the HSR system to reduce their commuting time.

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Fullerton

With inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option, impacts would be similar to those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would be in a larger area than would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, but would displace five additional commercial businesses and four additional industrial properties; however, the estimated long-term, annual property tax revenue loss for these properties is estimated at $48,639, which represents a minimal increase in property tax revenue loss when compared to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. Impacts on property values would be similar to those described for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. There is the potential for additional positive effects on property values from the station, because workers may place a premium on living close to the HSR system to reduce their commuting time.

CEQA Conclusion

In accordance with Section 15064(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, “economic and social changes resulting from the project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment.” In addition, there are no secondary physical impacts anticipated from changes in property value or tax revenues. Therefore, no CEQA conclusions are made related to economic impacts.

Impact SO-8: County and City Sales Tax Effects

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

A temporary increase in sales tax revenues is expected for Los Angeles and Orange Counties and the communities in the region because of project construction. This increase would result from spending on construction equipment and materials. Unless specifically exempted, transactions for tangible assets related to HSR would be subject to sales tax. Increases in sales tax revenues are estimated at $1.0 million for Los Angeles County and $514,000 for Orange County. The sales tax revenue generated from construction spending, including construction worker spending in the community, would increase local government revenues during the construction period.

As discussed in Impact SO-3, the project would result in business displacements, which would result in sales and use tax revenue losses for local jurisdictions as those properties are removed from the property tax assessment roll. In most jurisdictions, sales and use tax losses would be temporary because the losses would be limited to the time it takes businesses to relocate. An adequate supply of replacement properties is available to relocate displaced businesses in all cities except Vernon and Commerce. However, if a business relocates to a different tax jurisdiction or fails to reopen, losses could be permanent.

California imposes a statewide base sales and use tax rate of 7.25 percent, collected by the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration. As of 2021, 6.00 percent of the sales and use tax revenues goes to state funds, 1.00 percent is allocated to the city of sale or use, and the remaining 0.25 percent goes to the county transportation fund. The Counties of Los Angeles and Orange also collect district taxes of 1.50 percent and 0.50 percent, respectively. Therefore, the sales and use tax losses would affect both city and county tax revenues.

As presented in Table 3.12-38, the estimated county sales and use tax losses for Los Angeles and Orange County total $2,320,003. The estimate includes losses from the 0.25 percent sales and use tax allocated to the county from the statewide sales and use tax, plus the district tax of 1.50 percent for Los Angeles County and 0.50 percent for Orange County. The revenue loss represents 0.08 percent of the total county sales and use tax revenues for FY 2021/2022.

The estimated city sales and use tax losses total $2,010,932 in annual sales and use tax revenue in the cities where business displacements would occur. The estimate includes losses from the 1.0 percent sales and use tax allocated to cities from the statewide sales and use tax, as described above. The revenue loss represents 0.2 percent of total sales tax revenue for affected cities in FY 2021/2022. The greatest potential for revenue loss is in Commerce, Vernon, and Anaheim, where there would be a larger number of business displacements.

Permanent losses are expected to be substantially less than the estimates in Table 3.12-38 because most businesses displaced along the corridor could relocate in the same tax jurisdiction

(city or county) based on the surplus of available commercial and industrial property. In addition, **SOCIO-IAMF#3** will minimize the permanent closure of businesses and the economic disruption to owners within the limits established by law and regulation.

Table 3.12-38 Estimated Changes in Sales and Use Tax Revenue for Cities and Counties

Jurisdiction	Total Sales and Use Tax Revenue[1]	Estimated Sales and Use Tax Loss[2]	Percent Sales and Use Tax Loss
Counties[3]			
Los Angeles County	$3,852,856,059	$1,998,827	0.09
Orange County	$636,527,716	$434,621	0.06
Total	**$4,489,383,775**	**$2,320,003**	**0.08**
Cities[4]			
Vernon	$11,128,232	$223,946	4.04
Commerce	$34,246,575	$1,044,072	2.52
Montebello	$14,774,305	$12,105	0.12
Pico Rivera	$24,175,937	$12,105	0.06
Santa Fe Springs	$37,987,571	$102,894	0.27
La Mirada	$14,655,652	$36,316	0.18
Buena Park	$33,213,784	$89,153	0.27
Fullerton	$28,908,414	$170,877	0.59
Anaheim	$98,442,089	$319,465	0.32
Total	**$984,898,152**	**$2,010,932**	**0.20**

Source: California Department of Tax and Fee Administration 2023

[1] Includes 2021/2022 allocations to cities from the 1.0 percent local sales and use tax, and payments to special districts (equal to 0.5 percent of taxable sales in Commerce, 1.0 percent of taxable sales in Pico Rivera, and 1.0 percent of taxable sales in La Mirada).

[2] Sales tax losses are associated with the displacement of sales tax-generating businesses in each jurisdiction.

[3] Represents the 0.25 percent sales and use tax allocated to the county from the statewide sales and use tax, plus the district tax of 1.50 percent for Los Angeles County and 0.50 percent for Orange County.

[4] Represents the 1.0 percent sales and use tax allocated to the city from the statewide sales and use tax.

Construction of HSR station facilities at ARTIC, including the proposed new parking structure, would displace 30 commercial businesses located at one property at 1725 S Douglass Road, which is a commerce center consisting of offices, warehousing, and distribution facilities. These displacements would result in sales and use tax loss of $222,883, which represents 0.04 percent of Anaheim's total sales and use tax revenue for FY 2021/2022 ($98,442,089). These losses would not be perceptible to Anaheim residents because they represent a small percentage of total tax revenues. In addition, a temporary increase in sales tax revenue is expected as a result of construction of the station site. Based on county sales tax rates, the estimated increase in tax revenues from construction of the ARTIC HSR platform and station facilities is estimated at $106,000 for Orange County. Therefore, the increase in tax revenue from construction of the ARTIC HSR platform and station facilities would help offset tax losses.

In addition, tax revenue losses would not be perceptible to residents in affected jurisdictions because the losses would be a small percentage of total revenue. There would also be a temporary increase in sales tax revenues during construction to help offset the estimated temporary losses.

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

Compared to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, the additional business relocations required for the 15th Street LMF would result in an additional loss of sales and use tax of $108,947 in the city of Los Angeles. This represents 0.02 percent of Los Angeles's total sales tax revenue for FY 2021/2022. As mentioned above, permanent losses are expected to be substantially less than this estimate because, based on the surplus of available commercial and industrial property, many of the businesses displaced could relocate within the same tax jurisdiction. In addition, tax revenue losses would not be perceptible to residents in affected jurisdictions because the losses are a small percentage of total revenue and there would also be a temporary increase in sales tax revenues during construction to help offset the estimated temporary losses.

High-Speed Rail Station Options

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs

With inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option, impacts would be similar to those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, with additional spending on construction equipment and materials to build the station elements. There would be a slightly larger temporary increase in sales tax revenues in Los Angeles County. Therefore, the sales tax revenue generated from construction spending, including construction worker spending in the community, would increase local government revenues during the construction period.

Because the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option would not result in additional business displacements, the sales and tax use changes would be the same as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives.

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Fullerton

With inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option, impacts would be similar to those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, with additional spending on construction equipment and materials to build the HSR station elements. There would be a slightly larger temporary increase in sales tax revenues in Orange County. Therefore, the sales tax revenue generated from construction spending, including construction worker spending in the community, would increase local government revenues during the construction period.

The five additional commercial business and four additional industrial business relocations required for the Fullerton HSR Station Option would result in an additional loss of sales and use tax in the amount of $66,865 in Fullerton. As mentioned above, permanent losses are expected to be substantially less than this estimate because, based on the surplus of available commercial and industrial property, many of the businesses displaced could relocate within the same tax jurisdiction. The tax revenue losses would not be perceptible to Fullerton residents because the losses are a small percentage of total revenue (the additional loss represents only 0.007 percent of Fullerton's total sales and tax use revenue), and there would also be a temporary increase in sales tax revenues during construction to help offset the temporary estimated losses.

CEQA Conclusion

In accordance with Section 15064(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, "economic and social changes resulting from the project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment." In addition, no secondary physical impacts are anticipated from changes in county and city sales tax revenues. Therefore, no CEQA conclusions are made related to economic impacts.

Impact SO-9: Impacts on Children's Health and Safety from Construction

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

The potential for project construction to result in impacts on children's health and safety is evaluated in Appendix 3.12-F. As discussed in the appendix, Shared Passenger Track Alternative A is not anticipated to result in a substantial risk to children's health and safety with the incorporation of IAMFs and implementation of mitigation measures. The project would not affect products or substances (i.e., water, soil, and food) that a child is likely to ingest, use, be exposed to, or encounter. Overall, after incorporation of IAMFs and implementation of mitigation, no residual impacts on children's health and safety are expected from construction in the project section. Construction-related impacts that could affect children's health and safety (e.g., traffic

effects on bus routes and children bicycling and walking to school, air emissions, noise/vibrations, and use of hazardous materials in proximity to schools) are described further below.

As discussed in Section 3.2, local roadway modifications and construction activities may temporarily disrupt circulation patterns in some communities, potentially including school bus transportation routes and the safety of children bicycling or walking to school. **TR-IAMF#2** requires preparation of a Construction Transportation Plan before construction to provide information ensuring the safety of school children and advising school district of construction activities. The Construction Transportation Plan will require advance notification to the local school district of construction activities and rigorously maintained traffic control at all school bus loading zones, to provide for the safety of school children. In addition, the Construction Transportation Plan will include review of existing or planned Safe Routes to Schools with both school districts and emergency responders. The Construction Transportation Plan will incorporate roadway modifications that maintain existing traffic patterns and fulfill response route and access needs during project construction and HSR operations. Therefore, traffic impacts on children's health and safety during construction would be minimized to the extent practicable.

As discussed in Section 3.3, construction activities could result in a substantial amount of fugitive dust emissions and increased criteria pollutant emissions, which could have potential localized impacts on children in the vicinity of construction projects. Refer to Section 3.3 for the location of sensitive receivers, including schools within 1,000 feet of the project. **AQ-IAMF#1**, **AQ-IAMF#3**, **AQ-IAMF#4**, and **AQ-IAMF#5** will minimize impacts related to air quality, but would not reduce impacts completely. Implementation of **AQ-MM#1**, **AQ-MM#2**, and **AQ-MM#3** will further reduce impacts on air quality during construction. Even with implementation of mitigation measures, emissions of NO_X from construction equipment and vehicles would continue to exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District daily significance thresholds. Additionally, construction would contribute a significant level of regional air pollution in the South Coast Air Basin. However, because these air quality impacts are regional, there would not be a localized impact on children's health and safety. Therefore, construction-period air quality impacts on children's health and safety would be minimized to the extent practicable.

As discussed in Section 3.4, construction would occur near residences, parks, schools, childcare facilities, and other facilities where children congregate and would subject these facilities to temporary noise impacts. Construction noise could temporarily disrupt children's learning ability and lead to increased stress, which could, in turn, affect children's health. Incorporation of **NV-IAMF#1** and implementation of **N&V-MM#1, Construction Noise Mitigation Measures**, will reduce the effects of construction noise and vibration on communities, including schools and areas where children congregate. In addition, **N&V-MM#2, Construction Vibration Mitigation Measures**, will further minimize impacts on sensitive buildings from vibration, which may include schools and areas where children congregate. Therefore, noise impacts on children's health and safety during construction would be minimized to the extent practicable.

As discussed in Section 3.10, project construction would involve the handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of a school, which could affect children's health and safety (Impact HMW-6). Such activities could result in accidental spills or the release of hazardous waste and materials, resulting in temporary hazards to children. Impacts could occur from transporting hazardous materials on freight rail and truck routes designated for transport of hazardous materials, including the West Bank, BNSF Railway San Bernardino Subdivision, incidental freight line, Interstate 5, Interstate 10, State Route 60, U.S. Highway 101, Interstate 105, Interstate 605, Interstate 710, State Route 22, State Route 57, and State Route 91. Schools and places where children congregate within 0.25 mile of these transport routes could be affected if there are accidental spills or the release of hazardous waste and materials. However, state and federal regulations include stringent precautions for transport, handling, and disposal of hazardous materials (**HMW-IAMF#7**). In addition, project design measures and permit conditions for transport, labeling, containment, cover, and other best management practices for storage and handling of hazardous materials during construction will be incorporated via **HMW-IAMF#8** as part of the project design. Regulatory and permit requirements will apply near school sites to prevent accidental release of hazardous materials during transport, use, storage, or disposal.

Prior to construction, the Authority will prepare a soil management plan and provide it to the contractor to facilitate development of a Construction Management Plan that addresses spill prevention and a response plan identifying response measures to be deployed in the event of an accidental release with **HMW-IAMF#6**. Additionally, the Authority will prepare a demolition plan during project design that will address proper handling, transport, and disposal of hazardous waste that could result from project demolition (**HMW-IAMF#5**). These measures will avoid the potential for an inadvertent release of hazardous materials and minimize the effects should a release occur in proximity to schools or places where children congregate. **HMW-MM#1**, **Limit Use of Extremely Hazardous Materials Near Schools During Construction**, limits the use of extremely hazardous substances in quantities equal to or greater than the state threshold quantity specified pursuant to subdivision (j) of Section 25532 of the Health and Safety Code (as defined in 40 CFR Part 355.61) within 0.25 mile of a school. Prior to construction activities, signage will be installed to delimit work areas within 0.25 mile of a school, informing the contractor not to bring extremely hazardous substances into the area. This mitigation measure for hazardous materials is consistent with California Public Resources Code Section 21151.4 and will be effective in reducing the effect of hazardous materials in proximity to schools.

HMW-IAMF#5 through **HMW-IAMF#8** and **HMW-MM#1** will reduce the risk of hazardous material release within 0.25 mile of a school or childcare facility. Therefore, there would not be an adverse impact on children's health and safety related to hazardous waste and materials.

As discussed in Section 3.11, construction could temporary disturb soil, resulting in airborne transmission of the fungus that causes Valley fever. **SS-IAMF#2** requires the Authority to prepare and implement a Valley fever action plan. The Valley fever action plan would minimize impacts on children's health and safety to the maximum extent possible.

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

As discussed in Appendix 3.12-F, with the LMF location at 15th Street, impacts on children's health and safety would be the same as those described for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, because the communities and neighborhoods RSA includes all the same schools and facilities where children may gather. As discussed above, after incorporation of IAMFs and implementation of mitigation, no residual impacts on children's health and safety are expected from construction in the project section. There would be no adverse impacts on children's health and safety.

High-Speed Rail Station Options

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs

With inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option, impacts on children's health and safety would be the same as those described for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area, because the communities and neighborhoods RSA includes all the same schools and facilities where children may gather. After incorporation of IAMFs and implementation of mitigation, no residual impacts on children's health and safety are expected from construction in the project section. There would be no adverse impacts on children's health and safety.

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Fullerton

With inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option, impacts on children's health and safety would be the same as those described for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area, because the communities and neighborhoods RSA includes all the same schools and facilities where children may gather. After incorporation of IAMFs and implementation of mitigation, no residual impacts on children's health and safety are expected from construction in the project section. There would be no adverse impacts on children's health and safety.

CEQA Conclusion

There is no specific requirement in California for analysis of children's health impacts, separate from that of other individuals. Therefore, this section does not provide CEQA significance conclusions related to specific impacts on children.

Operational Impacts

Impact SO-10: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities During Operations

Infrastructure and transportation projects can create physical barriers that isolate parts of a community, impede visibility, and restrict existing travel paths. Even if a project does not create a new barrier, the exacerbation of existing divisions would generally weaken community cohesion. In the following analysis, impacts are analyzed to determine their potential to disrupt or divide established communities. The analysis is structured around the following topic areas:

- Air quality
- Noise and vibration
- Visual Quality
- Traffic and pedestrian safety
- Community access and cohesion

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A operations would result in the following impacts related to air quality, noise and vibration, visual quality, traffic and pedestrian safety, and community cohesion that could disrupt or physically divide existing communities within the RSA.

Air Quality

As covered in Section 3.3, it is possible that project operation at Hobart Yard could pose health risk from exposure to diesel particulate matter. To help mitigate this impact, the Authority would implement **AQ-MM#4, Requirement of a Future Operational Health Risk Assessment**, which requires an operational health risk assessment to be conducted prior to the commencement of project operations. If the future operational health risk assessment determines that impacts are below the South Coast Air Quality Management District project-level thresholds, no additional on-site or off-site mitigation measure would be required. In this case, there would not be a risk from exposure to diesel particulate matter emissions from operational air quality. Because the Hobart Yard area is highly industrialized with limited residential presence, this impact would not disrupt or divide existing communities within the RSA.

In addition, project operation and the LMF would produce criteria pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions. Emissions associated with operations would be a result of combustion sources used primarily for space heating, facility landscaping, emergency generators, energy consumption for facility lighting, minor solvent and paint usage, employee traffic, passenger traffic, and train inspections, tests, verifications, and train maintenance.

However, overall operation of the HSR stations, maintenance facilities, and train movements would result in a net regional decrease in emissions of criteria pollutants. These decreases would be beneficial to the communities in the South Coast Air Basin and would help the basin meet its attainment goals for ozone and particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$). Furthermore, the project would improve regional traffic conditions by reducing traffic congestion and reducing regional vehicle miles traveled. Therefore, the project would improve air quality in communities by reducing emissions of criteria pollutants and mobile-source air toxics. These effects would not disrupt or physically divide any established communities.

Communities would not be affected by potentially odorous emissions from train operation because the trains would be powered from the regional electrical grid. Odorous emissions associated with operation at the HSR station and LMF operation would be similar to or less severe than odors from other commercial and industrial activities that would occur in these areas under the No Project Alternative. Therefore, air quality impacts would not affect community character in a way that would disrupt or physically divide existing communities.

Noise and Vibration

Operational noise levels are predicted to exceed noise impact criteria at residential locations along the project section, which could cause annoyance and result in an indirect impact on community cohesion. Noise levels from project operation would depend on the number of trains per day, speed of the trains, track configuration, and distance of receivers to the tracks. As

discussed in Section 3.4, operation of HSR trains would result in operational noise levels exceeding the severe impact criteria at 59 residences and moderate impact criteria at 443 residences in the project section. Noise impacts would remain in the following neighborhoods: McCampbell neighborhood in Pico Rivera (Rio Hondo channel to Rosemead Boulevard) and central Anaheim (Wilhelmina Street to Santa Ana Street). In addition, operational vibration would result in a permanent impact for 517 residences in the project section in the following neighborhoods: McCampbell neighborhood in Pico Rivera (Rio Hondo channel to Rosemead Boulevard), northeast Buena Park (Brea Creek to Dale Street), and central Anaheim (from Orangethorpe Avenue to Vermont Street). These impacts would result from the proximity of the receivers to the proposed track and the speed of the train and may cause disruption to the communities adjacent to the rail corridor.

As mentioned in Section 3.13, Impact LU-5, historical land use patterns around the corridor suggest that existing, ongoing train noise does not curtail the continued use of residential, commercial, or recreational land uses. Consequently, although communities would experience residual noise and vibration impacts, the moderate noise and vibration increases would not disrupt the existing community. In addition, because these impacts would occur along the existing rail corridor that already divides these communities, noise and vibration impacts would not create a new physical barrier that divides communities.

Visual Quality

As discussed in Section 3.16, built elements of the project would introduce visual changes throughout the project section. However, the presence of the train cars themselves would be limited in both frequency and duration. Therefore, although they would be temporarily visible, because of the established presence of other train cars on the existing railway, train operations would not contribute to significant visual quality impacts that would disrupt or physically divide established communities. The project would contribute to increases in nighttime light levels because various buildings and facilities would be lit through the night to facilitate work safety and security. However, as discussed in Section 3.13, Impact LU-5, historical land use patterns suggest that the light associated with rail uses does not curtail the continued use of residential, commercial, or recreational land uses around the corridor. Therefore, the nighttime lighting changes would not disrupt the existing community.

The project would comply with applicable state statutes and guidelines concerning visual quality and aesthetics to ensure that the visual changes would be compatible with the existing visual character and that visual resources are not substantially altered or damaged. However, substantial aesthetic degradation resulting would still occur from operational activities and the moving and stationary security features (protective barriers, signage, and signal lights) on the four historic bridges. The protective barriers would be on top of the bridges to prevent objects and people from entering the right-of-way, and would not obstruct sidewalks, bike lanes, or vehicle lanes. Although the visual changes to the historic bridges would result in aesthetic degradation, the operational elements causing the visual changes would not obstruct established travel routes and therefore would not physically divide existing communities.

Traffic and Pedestrian Safety

As discussed in Section 3.2, although operations would improve the regional transportation system, it would also result in delays at some intersections and roadway segments along the project alignment and near HSR stations. These effects would be caused by the additional trips to and from the station areas related to HSR station operations, and ambient growth of permanently relocated trips that would result from changes in the roadway network. The *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Transportation Technical Report* (Authority 2025c) includes additional data and analysis on traffic effects for Phase 1 HSR service. Access between communities would be maintained, but delays could disrupt or slow down paths of travel for community residents. However, because the existing rail corridor already divides communities, added delays from HSR operations would not create a new physical division of established communities.

Community Access and Cohesion

Project operation would increase regional access and connectivity, especially for communities with a station. Because the communities within the RSA are already adjacent to an existing rail

corridor, operational impacts related to traffic, noise and vibration, and air quality would not result in a perceptible change to the overall quality of life or community character in a way that would physically divide communities.

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

Air Quality
Impacts related to air quality would be the same as those described for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. The LMF location does not change the analysis for operational air quality impacts for Shared Passenger Track Alternative B as compared to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. The project would improve air quality in communities by reducing emissions of criteria pollutants and mobile-source air toxics. These effects would not disrupt or physically divide any established communities.

Noise and Vibration
Impacts related to noise and vibration would be the same as those described for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A; therefore, noise and vibration impacts would not create a new physical barrier that divides communities.

Visual Quality
As discussed in Section 3.16, because the 15th Street LMF would be next to an existing rail yard in an area that is very industrialized, the scale and size of the proposed LMF would not substantially alter or degrade visual character. The visual changes would not obstruct established travel routes and therefore would not physically divide or disrupt communities.

Traffic and Pedestrian Safety
As discussed in Section 3.2, the LMF would not generate a substantial number of trips during operation of the project. Impacts for Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would be the same as those described for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. Therefore, because the existing rail corridor already divides communities, the delays from project operation would not create a new physical division of established communities.

Community Access and Cohesion
The project would include grade crossings and improvements to bicycle and pedestrian facilities that would improve community access. In addition, project operation would increase regional access and connectivity, especially for communities with a station. Because the communities within the RSA are already adjacent to an existing rail corridor, operational impacts related to displacements, traffic, noise and vibration, and air quality would not result in perceptible change to the overall quality of life or community character that would disrupt or divide the community.

High-Speed Rail Station Options

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs
With inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option, impacts would be the same as those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area, except for air quality and transportation, as described below. Operation of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option would not result in a disruption to or physical division of communities.

Air Quality

Operation of the HSR station would add a small amount of pollutant emissions to those described for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives; refer to Table 3.3-29 for further details). However, overall, operation of the system with inclusion of the HSR stations would result in a net regional decrease in emissions of criteria pollutants. Therefore, impacts would not result in a physical division or disruption of existing communities.

Noise and Vibration

Operational noise and vibration would be the same as those described for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. Train speeds would be slower at the station, which lowers noise and vibration levels, but there are no additional noise-sensitive receptors in the station area. Therefore, noise and vibration impacts would not result in physical division or disruption of existing communities.

Visual Quality

The HSR station elements are similar to the other project elements that would be built in the station area (e.g., modified Metrolink platform, station plaza, and Metrolink parking) and the visual changes would be similar to those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. As discussed in Section 3.16, operation of HSR would introduce visual changes in the project section that could disrupt communities and neighborhoods. Visual changes would not result in changes to community travel routes that would physically divide or disrupt communities and neighborhoods within the RSA.

Traffic and Pedestrian Safety

As discussed in Section 3.2, additional intersections and roadway segments would be affected with inclusion of the HSR station option. The delays at these areas could disrupt established communities by disrupting paths of travel for community residents. However, because the existing rail corridor already divides communities, the delays from project operation would not create a new physical division of established communities.

Community Access and Cohesion

Operation of the HSR station option would increase regional access and connectivity, especially for communities near the station. Because the communities within the RSA are already adjacent to an existing rail corridor, operational impacts related to traffic, noise and vibration, visual quality, and air quality would not result in perceptible change to the overall quality of life or community character that would divide or disrupt the community.

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Fullerton

With inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option, impacts would be the same as those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area, except for air quality and transportation, as described below. Operation of the Fullerton HSR Station Option would not disrupt or physically divide communities.

Air Quality

Operation of the Fullerton HSR Station Option would add a small amount of pollutant emissions to those described for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives; refer to Table 3.3-29 for further details. However, overall, operation of the HSR system with inclusion of the station option would result in a net regional decrease in emissions of criteria pollutants. Therefore, impacts would not result in physical division or disruption of existing communities.

Noise and Vibration

Operational noise and vibration would be similar to that described for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. Train speeds would be slower at the station, which lowers noise and vibration levels, but there are no additional noise-sensitive receptors in the station area. Therefore, noise and vibration impacts would not result in physical division or disruption of existing communities.

Traffic and Pedestrian Safety

As discussed in Section 3.2, additional intersections and roadway segments would be affected with inclusion of the HSR station option. The delays at these areas could disrupt established communities by disrupting paths of travel for community residents. However, because the existing rail corridor already divides communities, the delays from the project would not create a new physical division of established communities.

Visual Quality

As discussed in Section 3.16, the Fullerton HSR Station Option would appear to be a visual expansion of the existing Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Station, because the HSR platform would be built directly west of the existing station. However, the HSR station elements are similar to the other project elements that would be built in the station area (e.g., new Metrolink/Amtrak platform and station plaza) and the visual changes would be similar to those of the Shared Passenger

Track Alternatives. As discussed in Section 3.16, operation of HSR would introduce visual changes in the project section that could disrupt communities and neighborhoods. Visual changes would not result in changes to community travel routes that would physically divide or disrupt communities and neighborhoods within the RSA.

Community Access and Cohesion

Operation of the HSR station option would increase regional access and connectivity, especially for communities near the station. Because the communities within the RSA are already adjacent to an existing rail corridor, operational impacts related to displacements, traffic, noise and vibration, and air quality would not result in perceptible change to the overall quality of life or community character that would divide or disrupt the community.

CEQA Conclusion

Air quality impacts are beneficial and would not affect communities in a way that would physically divide existing communities. Although there would be substantial aesthetic degradation of historic bridges as a result of project operation, there would be no physical division of an established community as a result of these visual changes. Traffic impacts during project operation on adjoining and nearby roadways would be direct and continual but would not physically divide an established community, because access would be maintained. Operational noise levels are predicted to exceed noise impact criteria at residential locations along the project section, which could cause annoyance and result in disruption to established communities. However, the existing communities are already adjacent to a rail corridor and the moderate increase would not represent such a substantial change to community character as to physically divide the community. Therefore, disruption or physical division of existing communities during operations would be less than significant.

Impact SO-11: Job Creation During Operations

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

Ongoing project operation and maintenance would result in employment growth and add direct jobs, which would benefit Los Angeles and Orange Counties. In addition, indirect and induced jobs associated with improvements to accessibility provided by the project can result in long-term dynamic economic impacts, such as enhanced labor market accessibility, increased business travel and transactions, direct transport cost savings, improved business and worker productivity, and the support of tourism and other important service sectors requiring patron accessibility.

As discussed in more detail in Section 3.18, long-term employment is predicted to increase as a result of ongoing HSR operations and maintenance. When considered on an annual basis, 680 jobs would be added to the region by 2040. These estimated increases in jobs account for both the direct jobs resulting from HSR operations and maintenance as well as indirect and induced jobs. Table 3.12-39 presents the direct, indirect, and induced jobs that would be created by 2040 from HSR operations and maintenance.

Table 3.12-39 Direct, Indirect, and Induced Jobs in the Region by 2040[1,2]

County	Direct	Indirect and Induced	Total[3]
Los Angeles and Orange Counties	210	470	**680**

Source: BEA 2015

[1] Regional Input-Output Modeling System II (BEA 2017) multipliers for the two-county resource study area in this subsection were used in the analysis of employment gains.

[2] In the Regional Input-Output Modeling System II model, one annual job-year is equivalent to one job held by one person over 1 year's duration. This metric can account for both full-time and part-time jobs.

[3] Employment impacts are rounded up to the nearest 10 jobs. Totals may not sum because of rounding.

For further clarification please refer to Table 3.18-14 in Section 3.18.

The majority of jobs resulting from HSR operations and maintenance would be in the transit and ground passenger transportation sector, which includes jobs related to train operations, dispatching, maintenance of equipment, and maintenance of infrastructure.

In the long term, the HSR system would result in job creation from improvements in accessibility in areas surrounding stations. For example, improvements in accessibility can result in long-term economic effects, such as enhanced labor market accessibility, increased business travel and transactions, direct transport cost savings, improved business and worker productivity, and stimulate economic growth via support of tourism and other important service sectors requiring patron accessibility. As the region moves toward building communities that are more compact and transit oriented, projects like Shared Passenger Track Alternative A that provide new transit infrastructure could spur investments into more housing stock in the vicinity of the corridor, although these decisions would be made at the discretion of the local governing jurisdiction (SCAG 2024).

The analysis of job creation from increased accessibility considered a future time horizon of 2040 in an attempt to fully capture employment increases that could be attributed to improved accessibility. Employment growth caused by increased accessibility is forecast to add 4,900 jobs in the region by 2040.

Projected employment growth and the creation of an estimated 680 direct, indirect, and induced annual job-years in Los Angeles and Orange Counties by 2040, and an additional 4,900 job-years in Los Angeles County as a result of increased accessibility by 2040, would provide benefits for the local economy. Given that the increase in jobs is small relative to the total employment in the two-county region, it is assumed that these jobs can be absorbed by local workers and would not cause impacts related to permanent population increases or the need for increased housing or services.

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

As the same number of employees would be needed for the LMF operation regardless of its location, the LMF location does not affect employment estimations.

High-Speed Rail Station Options

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs

With inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option, impacts would be similar to those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives.[7] As discussed in Section 3.18, the majority of jobs resulting from HSR operation and maintenance would be in the economic sector of transit and ground passenger transportation, which includes jobs related to train operations, dispatching, maintenance of equipment, and maintenance of infrastructure. Projected job creation from project operation and increased accessibility would provide benefits to the local economy.

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Fullerton

With inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option, impacts would be similar to those described for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. As discussed in Section 3.18, the majority of jobs resulting from HSR operation and maintenance would be in the economic sector of transit and ground passenger transportation, which includes jobs related to train operations, dispatching, maintenance of equipment, and maintenance of infrastructure. Projected job creation from project operation and increased accessibility would provide benefits to the local economy.

CEQA Conclusion

In accordance with Section 15064(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, “economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant impacts on the environment.” Therefore, this section does not provide CEQA significance conclusions or mitigation related to regional employment.

Impact SO-12: Impacts on Children’s Health and Safety from Operations

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

Appendix 3.12-F evaluates the potential for project operation to result in impacts on children’s health and safety. As discussed in the appendix, Shared Passenger Track Alternative A is not

[7] It is not possible to estimate the long-term job effects that would result from operations and maintenance of new station sites because there are no historical data to input into the Regional Input-Output Modeling System II model.

anticipated to result in a substantial risk to children's health and safety with the incorporation of IAMFs and implementation of mitigation measures. The project would not affect products or substances (i.e., water, soil, and food) that a child is likely to ingest, use, be exposed to, or encounter. Overall, after incorporation of IAMFs and implementation of mitigation, no residual impacts on children's health and safety are expected from project operation. Operation-related impacts that could affect children's health and safety (e.g., traffic effects on bus routes and children bicycling and walking to school, air emissions, noise/vibrations, and use of hazardous materials in proximity to schools) are described further below.

As discussed in Section 3.2, roadway modifications may change some access and routing of school buses because of new grade separations and modifications to existing grade separations, but these modifications would benefit transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, as well as provide a benefit to safety in the corridor. In addition, safer bicycle and pedestrian access will be provided to Telegraph Road. The proposed pedestrian walkway over the rail corridor would provide pedestrian access to each side of Sycamore Street and South Street. Effects on children's health and safety as a result of school district bus transportation changes, as well as effects on the safety of children bicycling or walking to school during project operations, would be negligible.

As described in Section 3.3, the project would result in a net regional decrease in emissions of criteria pollutants and mobile-source air toxins. No potentially odorous emissions would be associated with train operation because the trains would be powered from the regional electrical grid. Odorous emissions associated with project operation at ARTIC and the LMF would be similar to or less severe than odors from other commercial and industrial activities that would occur in these areas under the No Project Alternative. Operations health risk assessments were conducted to evaluate the cancer risk and chronic noncancer risk from diesel particulate matter emissions generated by the yard equipment activities at Hobart and Commerce Yards to determine the change in health risks caused by the reconfiguration of the yards. Project operation at Hobart Yard would add about 101,094 feet of additional storage and staging tracks, spread across 14 new tracks. The BNSF Railway mainline tracks would also be shifted along some locations in the project corridor. Future activity pertaining to the new tracks and BNSF Railway mainline track shift is unknown and therefore cannot be analyzed in the health risk assessment. Without clear activity data to analyze, it is possible that project operation at Hobart Yard could pose a risk to children's safety from exposure to diesel particulate matter.

To help mitigate this impact, the Authority would implement **AQ-MM#4**, which requires an operational health risk assessment to be conducted prior to the commencement of project operations. **AQ-MM#4** also requires the analysis and incorporation of additional feasible mitigation to reduce risks to the greatest extent practicable prior to project operations. Without knowing if there is a potential health risk impact from diesel particulate matter emissions at Hobart and Commerce Yards, or the level of this impact, the Authority is unable to implement other feasible mitigation measures. In the absence of certainty, exposure to diesel particulate matter emissions could result in a risk to children's health and safety in the vicinity of Commerce and Hobart Yards. However, the future operational health risk assessment may determine that impacts are below the South Coast Air Quality Management District project-level thresholds and no additional on-site or off-site mitigation measure would be required. In this case, there would not be a risk to children's health and safety from operational air quality.

As discussed in Section 3.4, operation of HSR trains would result in noise levels exceeding the severe impact criteria at 59 residences and moderate impact criteria at 443 residences in the project section. Installing a sound barrier in accordance with **N&V-MM#3, Implement California High-Speed Rail Project Noise Mitigation Guidelines**, would provide effective noise mitigation for 33 of the 59 residences. Because a noise barrier would not meet the mitigation guidelines for the remaining 26 residences with severe noise impacts, these residences would have residual severe noise impacts. For these locations, **N&V-MM#3** includes additional measures to be implemented, including noise abatement at receiver locations (for example, sound insulation of buildings) and easement acquisition. Although moderate noise impacts would still occur after mitigation, the existing community is already adjacent to a rail corridor and the moderate increase would not represent such a substantial change to community character as to cause disruption or

division of the community. With these measures, noise impacts on children's health and safety will be reduced as much as practicable.

As discussed in Section 3.10, project operation would require the use of hazardous materials, which could affect children's health and safety. The maintenance of trains would use materials and chemicals during operations. However, the quantities of these hazardous materials used and wastes generated by operations would be small compared to waste generated by other transportation services, such as conventional passenger automobiles or air travel. However, the potential exists for improper handling of hazardous materials and wastes to result in routine and accidental releases during operations, thereby affecting children's health and safety. **HMW-IAMF#10** requires the preparation of a hazardous materials plan that would minimize the potential of impacts from hazardous materials and wastes during operations. In addition, **HMW-IAMF#7** and **HMW-IAMF#9** require that the project adhere to regulations that would further avoid and prevent accidental release of hazardous materials or wastes during transport, use, or disposal, minimizing the risks to children's health and safety.

As discussed in Section 3.11, the Authority will develop a safety and security management plan (**SS-IAMF#2**) that includes system safety program plans, rail safety standards, worker safety standards, crime prevention design guidelines, safety and health plans, fire/life safety programs, security plans, and emergency procedures that will be followed to maintain the safety and security of the public, including children. In addition, improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the project section, particularly around station areas and at grade separations, would improve bicycle and pedestrian access and safety. This would result in a long-term safety benefit for children in the RSA.

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

With the LMF location at 15th Street, impacts on children's health and safety would be the same as those described for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, because the children's health and safety RSA includes all the same schools and facilities where children may gather. After implementation of mitigation, no residual impacts on children's health and safety are expected from operation in the project section. There would be no adverse impacts on children's health and safety.

High-Speed Rail Station Options

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs

With inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option, impacts on children's health and safety would be the same as those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area because the children's health and safety RSA includes all the same schools and facilities where children may gather. After incorporation of IAMFs and implementation of mitigation, no residual impacts on children's health and safety are expected from operation in the project section. There would be no adverse impacts on children's health and safety.

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Fullerton

With the Fullerton HSR Station Option, impacts on children's health and safety would be the same as those described for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area because the children's health and safety RSA includes all the same schools and facilities where children may gather. After incorporation of IAMFs and implementation of mitigation, no residual impacts on children's health and safety are expected from operation in the project section. There would be no adverse impacts on children's health and safety.

CEQA Conclusion

There is no specific requirement in California for analysis of children's health impacts, separate from that of other individuals. Similarly, CEQA does not require analysis of health impacts on children. Therefore, this section does not provide CEQA significance conclusions related to specific impacts on children.

Impact SO-13: Unplanned Growth

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

As discussed in Section 3.18, the project would result in small, incremental increases in population growth along the project corridor or in localized areas in the vicinity. Long-term population growth would result from the increased accessibility and mobility that the project would bring to areas within the RSA. As discussed in Section 3.13, the permanent footprint, including Metrolink station relocation sites, requires conversion of 3.59 acres of adjacent residential land uses to transportation uses. As discussed in Section 3.18, even with the conversion of residential land use, communities in the region have adequate space to accommodate HSR-induced growth in their current spheres of influence. The land use patterns prescribed in the Southern California Association of Governments' *2024–2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy* have the capacity to accommodate 2 million more residents and 1.6 million more households in the Southern California Association of Governments region by 2050 (SCAG 2024). Furthermore, the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy assumes the presence of HSR. This planned capacity is sufficient to support the increase of 715,000 and 100,000 residents in Los Angeles County and Orange County, respectively, between 2021 and 2040, when considering anticipated growth without the project.

As discussed in Section 3.18, project operation would result in a 0.07 percent (direct and indirect) employment growth effect compared to the forecasted growth under the No Project Alternative. Unplanned population growth may also occur. There is also a possibility that the project could induce population growth in exurban counties by offering a faster and more efficient means for commuters to travel from exurban communities to jobs in urban centers in Los Angeles and Orange Counties. In the consideration of jobs induced by the project, it should first be noted that the percentage increase in population induced by Shared Passenger Track Alternative A would likely be lower than projected, because the jobs are likely to be filled by local workers. Second, if population increases were to occur, they would occur slowly because they would be driven by growth in indirect employment, which is spread out over time. Third, although the project could attract some new residents to the region, it would not lead to a wholesale shift in residential locations from outside major metropolitan areas to Los Angeles and Anaheim because relocation and housing choices are more complex, driven by many factors beyond long-distance transportation accessibility. As discussed in Section 3.18, the area is already heavily urbanized and largely built out; therefore, high growth rates are not anticipated. Developments in these urbanized areas are generally limited to infill and redevelopment projects, because housing affordability in urban centers throughout California is low and workers often choose to commute longer distances or buy housing in suburban and exurban communities. The number, magnitude, and distribution of households that may make this decision as a result of this project are difficult to estimate because of the many economic factors and individual preferences involved.

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

With the location of the LMF at 15th Street, unplanned growth would be similar to that of Shared Passenger Track Alternative A except for additional job growth related to the LMF that would occur in the city of Los Angeles instead of Vernon. There would be no additional impacts on employment or accessibility that would lead to unplanned growth.

High-Speed Rail Station Options

<u>High-Speed Rail Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs</u>

With inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option, impacts related to unplanned growth would be similar to those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives.

Including the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option may induce additional long-term population growth from the increased accessibility and mobility that the HSR station would bring to metropolitan areas within the RSA. However, as mentioned above, the population growth induced by the project would likely be lower than projected, because the labor force needed for the jobs created by the project is expected to be filled by local supply. It is unlikely that including the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option would attract a substantial number of new

residents to the region, because it would not lead to a wholesale shift in residential locations from outside major metropolitan areas to Los Angeles and Anaheim.

As discussed for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, some individuals and their households may choose to relocate to suburban and exurban communities to purchase more affordable housing because of convenient access to potentially affordable HSR commute services. As discussed in Section 3.18, the area is already heavily urbanized and largely built out; therefore, high growth rates are not anticipated. Developments in these urbanized areas are generally limited to infill and redevelopment projects. Therefore, interregional shifts in residential locations would likely make up only a small portion of the growth in the region.

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Fullerton

With the Fullerton HSR Station Option, impacts related to unplanned growth would be similar to those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. As described above for the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option, inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option may induce additional long-term population growth from the increased accessibility and mobility that the HSR station would bring to metropolitan areas within the RSA, but is unlikely that there would be a substantial number of new residents.

CEQA Conclusion

The project would serve the existing and future need for transportation while providing economic incentives for revitalization and transit-oriented development around transit areas. However, the extent to which these changes would be realized would be primarily determined by land use decisions made at the local jurisdiction level. Therefore, these changes would not induce substantial unplanned growth in the region, either directly or indirectly, and impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, CEQA does not require mitigation.

3.12.7 Mitigation Measures

The Authority has identified the following mitigation measures for impacts under NEPA and significant impacts under CEQA that cannot be avoided or minimized adequately by IAMFs.

The following mitigation measures, developed for other environmental resource areas, would also serve to reduce impacts related to socioeconomics and communities:

- **AQ-MM#1**, **AQ-MM#2**, **AQ-MM#3**, and **AQ-MM#4**, further described in Section 3.3.7, would reduce community impacts related to air quality.
- **N&V-MM#1**, **N&V-MM#2**, and **N&V-MM#3**, further described in Section 3.4.7, would reduce community impacts related to noise and vibration from construction and operations.
- **HMW-MM#1**, further described in Section 3.10.7, would reduce community impacts related to the use of extremely hazardous materials near schools during construction.

The Authority would also apply the following mitigation measures to further reduce the impacts of the project on socioeconomics and communities as identified in Section 3.12.6.

3.12.7.1 SO-MM#1: Implement Measures to Reduce Impacts Associated with the Division of Residential Neighborhoods

Prior to construction (in residential areas), the Authority will minimize project impacts associated with the division of residential areas by conducting special outreach to affected homeowners and residents to fully understand their special relocation needs. The Authority will make efforts to locate suitable replacement properties that are comparable to those currently occupied by these residents.

In cases where residents wish to remain in the immediate vicinity, the Authority will take measures to purchase vacant land or buildings in the area and consult with local authorities over matters such as zoning, permits, and moving of homes and replacement of services and utilities, as appropriate. Before land acquisition, the Authority will conduct community workshops to obtain input from those homeowners whose property would not be acquired, but whose community would be substantially altered by construction of HSR facilities, including the loss of many

neighbors, to identify measures that could be taken to mitigate impacts on those who remain (including placement of sound walls and landscaping, and potential uses for nonagricultural remnant parcels that could benefit the community in the long term). The Authority will document implementation of this measure through annual reporting.

3.12.7.2 SO-MM#2: Implement Measures to Reduce Impacts Associated with the Division of Communities

Prior to construction (in mixed-use communities), the Authority will minimize project impacts associated with the division of existing communities through a program of outreach to homeowners, residents, land owners, business owners, community organizations, and local officials in affected neighborhoods. The objective will be to maintain community cohesion. The Authority will evaluate the community's modified access, including the effectiveness of providing overcrossings or undercrossings of the HSR track to allow continued use of community facilities and connectivity. This includes the design of overcrossings or undercrossings to allow multimodal passage.

The Authority will also conduct community workshops about the future use of the area beneath the rail guideway, where these would exist. These meetings will provide the community an opportunity to identify design and use options that could strengthen community cohesion and be compatible with the existing community character.

To maximize attendance and generate awareness of the workshops, the Authority will work with either community organizations or community leaders in the neighborhoods. A location and time will be selected to increase attendance and be based on the community's needs.

The Authority will present information at the workshops giving the community options for the future use of the area beneath or above the rail guideway, and provide an opportunity for individuals to provide feedback and also propose solutions. For example, if safety considerations prohibit such uses as bike paths or community gardens, alternatives, such as sculpture gardens or managed landscaping, could be considered. The Authority will consider comments and feedback in planning for the sites.

On gathering feedback from the community, the Authority will coalesce the input and define solutions. The Authority will report the decisions, through a public workshop and in a written report made available to the public.

The Authority will be responsible for implementing the measures to reduce impacts through project design and through the long-term management of the measures. This will involve documenting the desired design concepts, incorporating them into the final design, and facilitating ongoing maintenance. The Authority will identify potential uses that may be developed in the project right-of-way. These uses will be compatible with the character of the adjacent community and sensitive to project needs (as outlined in Section 3.11). The costs associated with the development of these corridor improvements and how these costs would be paid will be determined during consultations with the affected jurisdictions or community organizations. Furthermore, the parties (e.g., the Authority, local government, park or recreation district, or nonprofit organization) responsible for ongoing maintenance of these community areas will be determined. The Authority will document compliance with this measure through annual reporting.

3.12.7.3 Impact of Mitigation

There would be no secondary socioeconomic or community impacts from mitigation of **SO-MM#1** or **SO-MM#2**. Implementation of the mitigation measure could include cooperative agreements that could lead to the construction of new facilities, such as multimodal overcrossings or undercrossings as discussed in **SO-MM#2**. However, it is not expected that these facilities would be in environmentally sensitive areas or require residential or nonresidential displacements.

3.12.7.4 Early Action Projects

The following mitigation measures would be required for early action projects, as provided in Table 3.12-40.

Table 3.12-40 Mitigation Measures Applicable to Construction and Operation of the High-Speed Rail Project Alternative Early Action Projects

Early Action Project	Impacts	Mitigation Measures
Norwalk Boulevard/ Los Nietos Grade Separation State College Boulevard Grade Separation Cerritos Avenue Grade Separation	SO-1: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Construction ▪ Permanent visual changes ▪ Temporary road closures ▪ Construction air quality impacts ▪ Construction noise impacts SO-10: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Operation ▪ Visual impacts	None
Pioneer Boulevard Grade Separation	SO-1: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Construction ▪ Permanent visual changes ▪ Temporary road closures ▪ Construction air quality impacts ▪ Construction noise impacts SO-2: Residential Impacts ▪ Residential relocations SO-10: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Operation ▪ Visual impacts	SO-MM#1, SO-MM#2
Commerce Metrolink Station Relocation	SO-1: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Construction ▪ Permanent visual changes ▪ Construction air quality impacts ▪ Construction noise impacts ▪ Increased delays at intersections SO-10: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Operation ▪ Visual impacts	None
Buena Park Metrolink Station Relocation	SO-1: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Construction ▪ Permanent visual changes ▪ Construction air quality impacts ▪ Construction noise impacts SO-10: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Operation ▪ Visual impacts	None

Early Action Project	Impacts	Mitigation Measures
Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Modifications (Fullerton Interlocker)	SO-1: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Construction ▪ Permanent visual changes ▪ Temporary road closures ▪ Increased delays at intersections and roadways ▪ Construction air quality impacts ▪ Construction noise impacts SO-10: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Operation ▪ Visual impacts	None
Hobart Yard (BNSF Railway Los Angeles Intermodal Facility)	SO-1: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Construction ▪ Permanent visual changes ▪ Temporary road closures ▪ Increased delays at intersections and roadways ▪ Construction air quality impacts ▪ Construction noise impacts SO-9: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Operation ▪ Increased delays at intersections and roadways ▪ Visual impacts	SO-MM#2
Commerce Yard (BNSF Railway Storage and Intermodal Facility) including Commerce Flyover	SO-1: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Construction ▪ Permanent visual changes ▪ Temporary road closures ▪ Construction air quality impacts SO-9: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Operation ▪ Visual impacts	SO-MM#2

3.12.8 NEPA Impacts Summary

This section summarizes the impacts of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives and compares them to the impacts of the No Project Alternative.

3.12.8.1 No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative represents the transportation system and major planned land use changes anticipated by 2040. Under the No Project Alternative, there would be no HSR station or impacts associated with an HSR station in the RSA. Foreseeable future development projects include small and large residential and mixed-use developments, a commercial retail center, industrial projects, and transportation projects. The No Project Alternative could result in other transportation improvement projects (e.g., road widening or construction of new roadways) that may be implemented in the future to meet growing regional transportation needs. These projects include bridge replacement, highway expansion, grade separation, and utility improvement projects that could result in impacts similar to those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives with regard to temporary construction impacts (e.g., noise, vehicle delay, traffic detours) and property or easement acquisition. Although these actions would introduce impacts similar to those

of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, improvements would occur at different locations and the degree of impacts would vary. Property acquisitions for new developments that displace residences and businesses could have impacts on local government revenue similar to those of the project if displacements cause losses in school district funding, property tax, or sales and use tax revenue. In addition, commercial developments for new business, residential, or mixed-use development could provide new housing and job opportunities and additional tax revenues to communities in the project section. These development and infrastructure projects could temporarily or permanently during construction, or permanently during operations, disrupt or divide established communities as a result of increased traffic congestion, increased noise and vibration, air quality deterioration, degradation of visual quality, and increased health and safety risks. Cities and counties in the region would evaluate the specific impacts of future projects in the course of applicable environmental review. In general, the job creation, other beneficial economic activity, and improvements to community connectivity in new grade-separated areas that would occur under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would likely not occur under the No Project Alternative.

3.12.8.2 Shared Passenger Track Alternatives

Construction of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives could result in temporary and permanent impacts on socioeconomics and communities, including:

- **Impact SO-1:** Temporary disruption or division of communities through secondary effects related to displacements, dust and ambient air quality, noise and vibration, visual quality, traffic, and community cohesion. These impacts would be minimized with incorporation of **AQ-IAMF#1**, **AQ-IAMF#2**, **AQ-IAMF#3**, **AQ-IAMF#4**, **AQ-IAMF#5**, **LU-IAMF#3**, **NV-IAMF#1**, **SOCIO-IAMF#1**, **SS-IAMF#1**, **TR-IAMF#2**, **TR-IAMF#4**, **TR-IAMF#5**, **TR-IAMF#6**, **TR-IAMF#8**, **TR-IAMF#11**, **TR-IAMF#12**, **AVQ-IAMF#1**, and **AVQ-IAMF#2** into project design. In addition, implementation of **SO-MM#1** and **SO-MM#2** would reduce impacts on division and disruption of communities during construction. The Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would benefit community connectivity by grade separating five existing at-grade crossings with the existing railroad tracks, improving access across the existing rail corridor.
- **Impact SO-2:** Displacement of three residential units and an estimated 12 residents in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP. There is a surplus of suitable replacement sites in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP. IAMFs included in the project require individualized relocation assistance for displaced residents (**SOCIO-IAMF#2** and **SOCIO-IAMF#3**).
- **Impact SO-3:** Shared Passenger Track Alternative A would result in the displacement of an estimated 256 businesses and an estimated 2,948 employees. Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would displace an additional 18 businesses (for a total of 274 displaced businesses) and an additional 833 employees (for a total of 3,781 displaced employees). The Fullerton HSR Station Option would displace an additional 9 businesses and 81 employees; the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option would not displace any additional businesses or employees. Provision of individualized relocation assistance outlined in **SOCIO-IAMF#3** would reduce impacts on displaced businesses. There is a surplus of suitable replacement sites in the cities with residential and business displacements, except for Commerce.
- **Impact SO-4:** Given the low number of residential displacements and the availability of replacement sites, residential displacements are not expected to lead to physical deterioration from considerable residential migration. Suitable relocation sites have been identified to accommodate the relocation of commercial and industrial businesses in all cities except for Vernon and Commerce. For business displacements in Vernon and Commerce, suitable relocation sites for businesses have been identified in surrounding cities with similar zoning and land use for businesses. Incorporation of **SOCIO-IAMF#3** will provide relocated business owners with individualized relocation assistance with the objective of minimizing the permanent closure of businesses. Providing individualized relocation assistance and identifying suitable replacement units would ensure that commercial activity remains in the

areas where displacements occur and enable businesses to remain open with minimal disruption. Therefore, business displacements would not result in physical deterioration from the reduction of long-term viability of a business district. In addition, although relocations from project construction could result in temporary decreases in tax revenues, there would also be a temporary increase in sales tax revenues from construction spending. Therefore, there would not be substantial reductions in revenue sources for local governments that could lead to physical deterioration.

- **Impact SO-5:** Short-term employment during construction and creation of an estimated 31,950 additional direct, indirect, and induced annual job-years in Los Angeles and Orange Counties. With inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option, construction would create an estimated 840 additional direct, indirect, and induced annual job-years. With inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option, construction would create an estimated 1,740 additional direct, indirect, and induced annual job-years.
- **Impact SO-6:** School district revenue losses of $34,256 in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP from two student displacements. Revenue losses represent 0.02 percent of total revenue in the affected school district. Because these losses represent a small percentage of the overall revenue of affected jurisdictions, revenue losses would likely not be perceptible to residents in the affected jurisdictions.
- **Impact SO-7:** Property tax revenue losses of approximately 0.48 percent of property tax revenue among affected jurisdictions in FY 2021/2022 for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would result in property tax revenue losses of approximately 0.65 percent, or an additional 0.17 percent loss of property tax revenue when compared to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. Both alternatives may result in a change to property values. Long-term property value changes, positive or negative, are difficult to predict because of other factors that affect property values, including diverse consumer preferences and fluctuations in the economy. Property adjacent to the project may be perceived as less valuable to current or future users after construction. However, development of the project section and the growth in employment supported by its operations could result in positive effects on property values, because workers may place a premium on living close to the HSR system to reduce their commuting time.
- **Impact SO-8:** Sales and tax use losses from displacements would affect both county and city tax revenues. Estimated county sales and use tax losses total $2,320,003 for Los Angeles and Orange Counties for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. Estimated city sales and use tax revenue losses total $2,010,932 for the cities where business displacements would occur for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. For Shared Passenger Track Alternative B, the additional business relocations required for the 15th Street LMF would result in an additional loss of sales and use tax of $108,947 in the city of Los Angeles. This represents 0.02 percent of Los Angeles's total sales tax revenue for FY 2021/2022. With inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option, the nine additional business relocations would result in an additional loss of sales and use tax in the amount of $66,865 in Fullerton. Permanent losses are expected to be substantially less than this estimate because most businesses displaced along the corridor could relocate within the same tax jurisdiction. Sales tax losses would be at least partially offset by a temporary sales tax revenues increase of roughly $1.5 million for the two-county region. In addition, **SOCIO-IAMF#3** will minimize the permanent closure of businesses and the economic disruption to owners within the limits established by law and regulation.
- **Impact SO-9:** Potential risks to children's health and safety related to transportation, air quality, noise, hazardous materials and waste, and safety. Impacts would be reduced through incorporation of project features designed to address effects and implementation of mitigation, including **TR-IAMF#2**, **HMW-IAMF#5**, **HMW-IAMF#6**, **HMW-IAMF#7**, **HMW-IAMF#8**, **SS-IAMF#2**, **AQ-IAMF#1**, **AQ-IAMF#3**, **AQ-IAMF#4**, **AQ-IAMF#5**, **NV-IAMF#1**, **HMW-MM#1**, **N&V-MM#1**, **N&V-MM#2**, **AQ-MM#1**, **AQ-MM#2**, and **AQ-MM#3**.

Operation of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives could result in temporary and permanent impacts on socioeconomics and communities, including:

- **Impact SO-10:** Disruption or division of communities from project operations (including traffic, air quality, noise and vibration, and aesthetic changes). Overall, project operation is anticipated to result in a net improvement to regional air quality for communities in the RSA. However, uncertainty about the level of future track operations at Hobart Yard could pose health risks from diesel particulate matter emissions. **AQ-MM#4** requires a pre-operational health risk assessment to confirm compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds. Because Hobart Yard is in a primarily industrial area with few nearby residents, this impact is unlikely to disrupt or divide local communities, despite the potential localized air quality impact.
- **Impact SO-11:** Ongoing operation and maintenance of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would add roughly 680 jobs to Los Angeles and Orange Counties by 2040. Over 4,900 additional jobs could be added by 2050 as a result of long-term economic effects associated with increased accessibility in areas surrounding HSR stations.
- **Impact SO-12:** Potential risks to children's health and safety related to operational noise, hazardous materials and waste, air quality, and safety. Impacts would be reduced through incorporation of project features designed to address effects (**HMW-IAMF#7**, **HMW-IAMF#9**, **HMW-IAMF#10**, and **SS-IAMF#2**) and implementation of **AQ-MM#4** and **N&V-MM#3**.
- **Impact SO-13:** Small, incremental increases in population growth along the project corridor or in localized areas in the vicinity. Long-term population growth would result from the increased accessibility and mobility that the project would bring to areas within the RSA. The project would serve the existing and future need for transportation while providing economic incentives for revitalization and transit-oriented development around transit areas. However, the extent to which these changes would be realized would be primarily determined by land use decisions made at the local jurisdiction level. Therefore, these changes would not induce substantial unplanned growth in the region, either directly or indirectly.

Table 3.12-41 provides a comparison of the potential impacts of the project alternatives followed by a summary of the impacts.

Table 3.12-41 Comparison of Project Alternatives Impacts on Socioeconomics and Communities

Impacts	Shared Passenger Track Alternative A	Shared Passenger Track Alternative B	With Inclusion of HSR Station Option		NEPA Conclusion Before Mitigation	Mitigation	NEPA Conclusion Post Mitigation			
			Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs	Fullerton			Shared Passenger Track Alternative A	Shared Passenger Track Alternative B	With Inclusion of HSR Station Option	
									Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs	Fullerton
Impact SO-1: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Construction	Shared Passenger Track Alternative A would cause temporary disruption of communities through secondary effects related to traffic, noise and vibration, dust and ambient air quality, recreational resources, utility interruptions, and aesthetic changes during construction activities. These impacts would be temporary and would not result in the physical division of an existing community. Property acquisitions for project construction would result in permanent removal of 3 residential units and 256 businesses, but these would not physically divide communities or isolate one community from another. Grade separations would permanently improve connectivity across the rail corridor and improve bicycle and pedestrian access and safety.	Similar to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. Acquisitions associated with the LMF at 15th Street would displace an additional 18 businesses when compared to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A (a total of 274 businesses). However, based on the locations of the displaced businesses in an industrial area adjacent to an existing rail corridor, these property acquisitions would not physically divide communities or isolate one community from another.	Similar impacts to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Construction of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR station platform, facilities, and parking would result in slightly higher emissions compared to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives.	Similar impacts to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Construction of the Fullerton HSR station platform, facilities, and parking would displace nine additional businesses and would also result in slightly higher emissions compared to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives.	Adverse effect (all alternatives and HSR station options)	SO-MM#1 SO-MM#2	No adverse effect	No adverse effect	No adverse effect	No adverse effect
Impact SO-2: Residential Displacements and Relocations	The project would displace three single-family residential units in the West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP. There is an anticipated surplus of replacement sites for the displaced residents and there would be relocation assistance provided. The project would not require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because there are sufficient residential replacement properties.	Same as Shared Passenger Track Alternative A.	Same impacts as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area.	Same impacts as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area.	No adverse effect (all alternatives and HSR station options)	No mitigation needed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Impact SO-3: Business Displacements and Relocations	Construction of the project would result in displacement of 256 businesses with an estimated 2,948 employees. The greatest number of business and employee displacements would occur in the Commerce and Vernon areas, where 115 businesses with an estimated 1,101 employees and 37 businesses with an estimated 911 employees would be displaced in each city, respectively. There is a surplus of suitable replacement sites in the cities with residential and business displacements, except for Commerce and Vernon.	Similar to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. Construction of the project would result in displacement of 274 businesses with an estimated 3,781 employees. The greatest number of business and employee displacements would still occur in Commerce and Vernon. There is a surplus of suitable replacement sites in the cities with residential and business displacements, except for Commerce and Vernon.	Same impacts as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area.	Similar impacts to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Construction of the Fullerton HSR station platform, facilities, and parking would displace nine additional businesses.	No adverse effect (all alternatives and HSR station options)	No mitigation needed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Impacts	Shared Passenger Track Alternative A	Shared Passenger Track Alternative B	With Inclusion of HSR Station Option		NEPA Conclusion Before Mitigation	Mitigation	NEPA Conclusion Post Mitigation			
			Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs	Fullerton			Shared Passenger Track Alternative A	Shared Passenger Track Alternative B	With Inclusion of HSR Station Option	
									Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs	Fullerton
Impact SO-4: Physical Deterioration	Temporary construction impacts from increases in dust, noise, traffic congestion, and access disruptions are not anticipated to result in the physical deterioration of communities in the area. Physical deterioration would not occur, because suitable relocation sites have been identified to accommodate the relocation of residential, commercial, and industrial businesses in most cities and displacements would not result in considerable residential migration out of a community or introduce changes to the business environment.	Similar to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. Eighteen additional business relocations in Los Angeles are anticipated for construction of the 15th St LMF. As described above, suitable relocation sites have been identified to accommodate the relocation of commercial and industrial businesses in Los Angeles and displacements would not result in considerable residential migration out of a community or introduce changes to the business environment.	Same impacts as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area.	Similar impacts to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Construction of the Fullerton HSR station platform, facilities, and parking would displace nine additional businesses. Although several businesses would be relocated in this area, they represent a small proportion of the much larger industrial area spanning Fullerton and would not substantially disrupt the larger existing district.	No adverse effect (all alternatives and HSR station options)	No mitigation needed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Impact SO-5: Job Creation During Construction	Project construction would lead to a temporary increase in employment for construction and jobs that support construction activities and workers. Construction would create 31,950 total annual job-years, with 15,300 direct and 16,650 indirect/induced annual job-years. Given the number of unemployed workers in the RSA, there would be an ample supply of local residents to fill many of the new jobs, which would reduce the number of jobs needing to be filled by new residents and the resulting population, housing, and public service effects.	Same as Shared Passenger Track Alternative A.	Similar impacts to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Construction of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option would create an additional estimated 840 total annual job-years, with 400 direct and 440 indirect/induced annual job-years in construction.	Similar impacts to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Construction of the Fullerton HSR Station Option would create an additional estimated 1,740 total annual job-years, with 820 direct and 920 indirect/induced annual job-years in construction.	No adverse effect (all alternatives and HSR station options)	No mitigation needed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Impact SO-6: Changes in School District Funding	The project could displace 0.018 percent of the student population (approximately two students) from the school districts in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP. The project could result in school district revenue losses of $34,256 in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP. Revenue losses represent 0.02 percent of total revenue within the affected school district.	Same as Shared Passenger Track Alternative A.	Same impacts as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area.	Same impacts as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area.	No adverse effect (all alternatives and HSR station options)	No mitigation needed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Impacts	Shared Passenger Track Alternative A	Shared Passenger Track Alternative B	With Inclusion of HSR Station Option		NEPA Conclusion Before Mitigation	Mitigation	NEPA Conclusion Post Mitigation			
			Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs	Fullerton			Shared Passenger Track Alternative A	Shared Passenger Track Alternative B	With Inclusion of HSR Station Option	
									Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs	Fullerton
Impact SO-7: Property Value Changes and Property Tax Losses	The project would result in approximately $4.7 million in losses in property taxes in the project area. Construction, operations, and maintenance of the project have the potential to affect property values in the RSA. Longer-term property value changes, positive or negative, are more difficult to predict in the future because of factors that affect property values, including diverse consumer preferences and fluctuation in the economy.	Similar to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. The project would result in approximately $6.3 million in losses in property taxes in the project area. Construction, operations, and maintenance of the project have the potential to affect property values in the RSA. Longer-term property value changes, positive or negative, are more difficult to predict in the future because of factors that affect property values, including diverse consumer preferences and fluctuation in the economy.	Same impacts as those for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area.	Similar impacts to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Construction of the Fullerton HSR station platform, facilities, and parking would displace nine additional businesses. Inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option would result in additional losses of approximately $48,639 in property taxes in Fullerton.	No adverse effect (all alternatives and HSR station options)	No mitigation needed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Impact SO-8: County and City Sales Tax Effects	A temporary increase in sales tax revenues is expected for Los Angeles County and the communities in the region because of project construction. Increases in sales tax revenues are estimated at $1.5 million combined for Los Angeles and Orange Counties. Sales and tax use losses from business displacements would affect both county and city tax revenues. The project could result in a county sales tax loss of $2,320,003 for Los Angeles and Orange Counties. The project could result in a city sales tax loss of $2,010,932 total across cities with business displacements.	Similar to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. The additional business relocations required for the 15th St LMF would result in an additional loss of sales and use tax of $108,947 in the city of Los Angeles.	Similar impacts to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Construction of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option would result in additional spending on construction equipment and materials to build the station elements. There would be a slightly larger temporary increase in sales tax revenues in Los Angeles County.	Similar impacts to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Construction of the Fullerton HSR Station Option would result in additional spending on construction equipment and materials to build the station elements. There would be a slightly larger temporary increase in sales tax revenues in Orange County. The nine additional business relocations required in Fullerton would result in an additional loss of sales and use tax in the amount of $66,865 in Fullerton.	No adverse effect (all alternatives and HSR station options)	No mitigation needed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Impact SO-9: Impacts on Children's Health and Safety from Construction	Substantial risks to children's health and safety would be reduced through the incorporation of project features designed to address effects related to transportation, air quality, noise, hazardous materials and waste, and safety and implementation of mitigation measures established by other sections of this Draft EIR/EIS.	Same as Shared Passenger Track Alternative A.	Same impacts as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area.	Same impacts as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area.	No adverse effect (all alternatives and HSR station options)	No mitigation needed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Impacts	Shared Passenger Track Alternative A	Shared Passenger Track Alternative B	With Inclusion of HSR Station Option		NEPA Conclusion Before Mitigation	Mitigation	NEPA Conclusion Post Mitigation			
			Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs	Fullerton			Shared Passenger Track Alternative A	Shared Passenger Track Alternative B	With Inclusion of HSR Station Option	
									Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs	Fullerton
Impact SO-10: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities During Operations	Traffic impacts during project operation on adjoining and nearby roadways would be direct and continual but would not physically divide an established community because the project would be within an existing rail corridor. Although there would be substantial aesthetic degradation of historic bridges as a result of project operation, there would be no physical division of an established community as a result of these visual changes. Future activity near Hobart Yard could pose health risks from DPM emissions, but because Hobart Yard is in an industrial area with few nearby residents, impacts are unlikely to disrupt or divide local communities.	Same as Shared Passenger Track Alternative A.	Similar impacts to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Operation of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option would add a small amount of emissions to those described for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. Overall, operation of the system with inclusion of the HSR station option would result in a net regional decrease in emissions of criteria pollutants.	Similar impacts to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Operation of the Fullerton HSR Station Option would add a small amount of emissions to those described for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. Overall, operation of the system with inclusion of the HSR station option would result in a net regional decrease in emissions of criteria pollutants.	No adverse effect (all alternatives and HSR station options)	No mitigation needed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Impact SO-11: Job Creation During Operations	Project operations and maintenance have the potential to result in an increase in employment for the upkeep and repair of tracks, stations, and light maintenance facilities and for materials needed for operations and maintenance. In the long term, the HSR system would result in job creation from improvements in accessibility in areas surrounding stations. When considered on an annual basis, 680 jobs would be added to the region by 2040. Employment growth constitutes a minor increase to projected growth.	Same as Shared Passenger Track Alternative A.	Similar impacts to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option would result in an additional amount of job creation relative to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives.	Similar impacts to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option would result in an additional amount of job creation relative to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives.	No adverse effect (all alternatives and HSR station options)	No mitigation needed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Impact SO-12: Impacts on Children's Health and Safety from Operations	No residual impacts on children's health and safety are expected from operations in the project section with incorporation of project features and implementation of mitigation measures established in other sections of this Draft EIR/EIS. There would be no adverse impacts on children's health and safety.	Same as Shared Passenger Track Alternative A.	Same impacts as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area.	Same impacts as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area.	No adverse effect (all alternatives and HSR station options)	No mitigation needed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Impacts	Shared Passenger Track Alternative A	Shared Passenger Track Alternative B	With Inclusion of HSR Station Option		NEPA Conclusion Before Mitigation	Mitigation	NEPA Conclusion Post Mitigation			
			Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs	Fullerton			Shared Passenger Track Alternative A	Shared Passenger Track Alternative B	With Inclusion of HSR Station Option	
									Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs	Fullerton
Impact SO-13: Unplanned Growth	The project would serve the existing and future need for transportation while providing economic incentives for revitalization and transit-oriented development around transit areas. However, the extent to which these changes would be realized would be primarily determined by land use decisions made at the local jurisdiction level. Therefore, these changes would not induce substantial unplanned growth in the region, either directly or indirectly.	Similar to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. Siting the LMF at 15th Street would result in additional job growth related to the LMF in the city of Los Angeles instead of Vernon.	Similar impacts to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option may induce additional long-term population growth from the increased accessibility and mobility that the HSR station option would bring to metropolitan areas within the RSA. It is unlikely that including the HSR station option would attract a substantial number of new residents to the region, because it would not lead to a wholesale shift in residential locations from outside major metropolitan areas to Los Angeles and Anaheim.	Similar impacts as those for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option may induce additional long-term population growth from the increased accessibility and mobility that the HSR station option would bring to metropolitan areas within the RSA. It is unlikely that including the HSR station option would attract a substantial number of new residents to the region, because it would not lead to a wholesale shift in residential locations from outside major metropolitan areas to Los Angeles and Anaheim.	No adverse effect (all alternatives and HSR station options)	No mitigation needed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

CDP = Census-Designated Place; DPM = diesel particulate matter; EIR/EIS = environmental impact report/environmental impact statement; HSR = high-speed rail; LMF = light maintenance facility; N/A = not applicable; RSA = resource study area

3.12.9 CEQA Significance Conclusions

As described in Section 3.12.4.5, Determining Significance Under CEQA, the impacts of project actions under CEQA are evaluated against thresholds to determine whether a project action would result in no impact, a less-than-significant impact, or a significant impact. Table 3.12-42 contains a summary of the CEQA determination of significance for all construction and operational impacts for the project.

Table 3.12-42 CEQA Significance Conclusions for Socioeconomics and Communities

Impact	Impact Description and Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Source of Impact
Construction				
Impact SO-1: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities from Construction	Significant for both project alternatives. Construction activities could temporarily disrupt or divide established communities by creating a new physical barrier from construction of grade separations that affect community paths of travel and access within the RSA.	SO-MM#1 SO-MM#2	Less than significant	All alternatives and options
Impact SO-2: Residential Displacements and Relocations	Less than significant for both project alternatives. The project would displace three single-family residential units in West Whittier–Los Nietos CDP. Because there is an anticipated surplus of replacement sites for the displaced residents and there would be relocation assistance provided, impacts are minimal.	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable	All alternatives and options
Impact SO-3: Business Displacements and Relocations	Not applicable. In accordance with Section 15064(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, “economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant impacts on the environment.”	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Impact	Impact Description and Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Source of Impact
Impact SO-4: Physical Deterioration	Less than significant for both project alternatives. The project would not result in residential migration or introduce changes to the business environment. There would not be substantial reductions in revenue sources for local governments nor broad long-term impacts on the regional tax base.	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable	All alternatives and options
Impact SO-5: Job Creation During Construction	In accordance with Section 15064(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, "economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant impacts on the environment." Therefore, this section does not provide CEQA significance conclusions related to regional employment and CEQA does not require mitigation.	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Impact SO-6: Changes in School District Funding	Not applicable. In accordance with Section 15064(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, "economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant impacts on the environment."	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Impact SO-7: Property Value Changes and Property Tax Losses	Not applicable. In accordance with Section 15064(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, "economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant impacts on the environment."	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Impact	Impact Description and Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Source of Impact
Impact SO-8: County and City Sales Tax Effects	Not applicable. In accordance with Section 15064(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, "economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant impacts on the environment."	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Impact SO-9: Impacts on Children's Health and Safety from Construction	There is no specific requirement in California for analysis of children's health impacts, separate from that of other individuals. Therefore, this section does not provide CEQA significance conclusions related to specific impacts on children.	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Operation				
Impact SO-10: Disruption or Division of Existing Communities During Operations	Less than significant for both project alternatives. Project operation would result in noise and vibration impacts near sensitive receptors, visual changes, and traffic delays, which could disrupt but not physically divide existing communities.	Not applicable	Not applicable	All alternatives and options
Impact SO-11: Job Creation During Operations	Not applicable. In accordance with Section 15064(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, "economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant impacts on the environment."	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

Impact	Impact Description and Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Source of Impact
Impact SO-12: Impacts on Children's Health and Safety from Operations	There is no specific requirement in California for analysis of children's health impacts, separate from that of other individuals. Therefore, this section does not provide CEQA significance conclusions related to specific impacts on children.	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Impact SO-13: Unplanned Growth	Less than significant for both project alternatives. The project would serve the existing and future need for transportation while providing economic incentives for revitalization and transit-oriented development around transit areas. However, the extent to which these changes would be realized would be primarily determined by land use decisions made at the local jurisdiction level. Therefore, these changes would not induce substantial unplanned growth in the region, either directly or indirectly.	No mitigation measures are required.	Not applicable	All alternatives and options

CDP = Census-Designated Place; CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act