20 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM STATE AGENCIES

Los Angeles to Anaheim - RECORD #013317 DETAIL

Status:	Action Pending
Record Date:	12/10/2025
Interest As:	Local Agency
Full Name:	Ka-Man Lo

Stakeholder Comments/Issues:

3954

Hi, We have received the public notice below. Could you please transfer all the files to us in order for me to save in our project folder and route to our specialists rather than download everything individually from the website? Thanks Carmen Lo Associate Environmental Planner Division of Environmental Analysis Caltrans | District 12 | 949-774-0756 Carmen.Lo@dot.ca.gov Chat with me in Teams! From: California High-Speed Rail Sent: Friday, December 5, 2025 10:35 AM To: Lo, Ka-Man@DOT Subject: NOTICE: CA HSR Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Draft EIR/EIS Available for Public Review (Español Incluido / 한국어 포함) To view this email as a web page, go here. Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section SELECT YOUR LANGUAGE TO JUMP ENGLISH / ESPAÑOL / 한국인 Dear Project Stakeholder: The California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) has released the Los ZjQcmQRYFpfptBannerStart This Message Is From an External Sender This message came from outside your organization. Please be careful when viewing message Report Suspicious ZjQcmQRYFpfptBannerEnd To view this email as a web page, go here. Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section SELECT YOUR LANGUAGE TO JUMP ENGLISH / ESPAÑOL / 한국인 Dear Project Stakeholder: The California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) has released the Los Angeles to Anaheim (LA-A) Project Section Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS) for public review and comment. The LA-A Project Section is the southernmost link of the first phase of the statewide high-speed rail system. The approximately 30-mile project section connects Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) to the Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center (ARTIC), using the Los Angeles to Anaheim rail corridor that currently serves both freight and passenger service. The LA-A Rail Corridor travels through the cities of Los Angeles, Vernon, Commerce, Bell, Montebello, Pico Rivera, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, portions of unincorporated Los Angeles County, La Mirada, Buena Park, Fullerton and Anaheim. The Draft EIR/EIS evaluates a No Project Alternative and two Build Alternatives: Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, with a Light Maintenance Facility (LMF) at 26th Street and Shared Passenger Track Alternative B, with an LMF at 15th Street. The Authority's Preferred Alternative is Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. Although not included in the Preferred Alternative, the Draft EIR/EIS also evaluates an option for one intermediate HSR station, which would consist of adding an HSR station platform and station facilities at either the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station or the Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Station under both build alternatives. The public comment period begins on December 5, 2025, and ends on February 3, 2026. Comments may be submitted during the comment period through the following methods: By mail to: Attn: Los Angeles to Anaheim Draft EIR/EIS Comment, California High-Speed Rail Authority, 355 S Grand Avenue, Suite 2050, Los Angeles, CA 90071 Through the Authority's website: www.hsr.ca.gov By email: Los.Angeles_Anaheim@hsr.ca.gov with the subject line: Los Angeles to Anaheim Draft EIR/EIS Comment Oral comment on the direct line for the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section at: 877-669-0494 Oral and written comments at Public Hearings. Your feedback is important. As part of the public review process, the Authority is hosting a series of meetings to provide information and receive public comment on the Draft EIR/EIS. Please join us for an Open House and/or Public Hearing. All Open House meetings will feature the same information, providing details about the project alternatives and the Draft EIR/EIS. The Open House will also provide an opportunity to ask questions about the document and the public comment process. Please note that comments and questions received during the Open House portion of the meetings will not be included in the official public record. The Public Hearing portion of the meetings will include a formal public comment period during which members of the public may provide oral and written comments on the Draft EIR/EIS for inclusion in the official record. MEETING INFORMATION Open House – Virtual Date: Thursday, December 11, 2025 Time: 6 to 8 p.m. Location: Virtual via Zoom Register here: bit.ly/LA-AOpenHouse1 Open House/Public Hearing #1 – Santa Fe Springs Date: Wednesday, January 7, 2026 Time: 5 to 8 p.m. Public Comment*: 6:30 to 8 p.m. Location: Santa Fe Springs Town Center Hall – Social Hall 11740 Telegraph Road Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670 Open House/Public Hearing #2 – Anaheim Date: Monday, January 12, 2026

Time: 5 to 8 p.m. Public Comment*: 6:30 to 8 p.m. Location: Anaheim Brookhurst Community Center – East & West Rooms 2271 Crescent Ave Anaheim, CA 92801 Open House/Public Hearing #3 – Commerce Date: Thursday, January 22, 2026 Time: 5 to 8 p.m. Public Comment*: 6:30 to 8 p.m. Location: DoubleTree by Hilton - Grand Ballroom 5757 Telegraph Road, Commerce, CA 90040 Public Hearing #4 – Virtual Date: Monday, January 26, 2026 Time: 4 to 7 p.m. Location: Virtual via Zoom Register here: bit.ly/LA-APublicHearing *Oral and written comments received for public record. *All meetings will be conducted in English with Spanish and Korean interpretation and American Sign Language/closed captioning. Meeting venues are ADA compliant for those with disabilities. All requests for reasonable accommodation and/or other language services must be made three working days (72 hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date by calling 877-669-0494. For TTY/TTD assistance, please call the California Relay Service at 711. Todas las solicitudes de adaptaciones razonables y/o servicios lingüísticos deben realizarse tres días hábiles (72 horas) antes de la fecha programada para la reunión llamando al 877-669-0494. 합리적인 편의 및/또는 언어 서비스에 대한 모든 요청은 예정된 회의 날짜로부터 영업일 기준 3일(72시간) 전에 (877) 669-0494로 전화하여 이루어져야 합니다. 所有合理住宿和/或语言服务的请求必须在预定会议日期前三个工作日（72 小时）致电 877-669-0494 提出. 合理的配慮/言語サービスに関するすべてのリクエストは、会議予定日の 3 営業日 (72 時間) 前までに (877) 669-0494 に電話で行う必要があります. Tất cả các yêu cầu cho các tiện nghi hợp lý và/hoặc dịch vụ ngôn ngữ phải được thực hiện trước ba ngày làm việc (72 giờ) trước ngày họp đã được sắp xếp bằng cách gọi số 877-669-0494. Comments must be received electronically by 11:59 p.m. PST or postmarked February 3, 2026. After the comment period closes, the Authority will prepare and distribute the Final EIR/EIS, which will include responses to comments received during the comment period. Website: Please visit the Authority website (www.hsr.ca.gov) or (www.meethsrsocal.org) for details on the Draft EIR/EIS, virtual open house recording, where to access the environmental document, and how to participate in the public comment process. Office Hours: Authority staff are available to answer questions during virtual hours. Please visit www.hsr.ca.gov to sign up for an appointment Thank you for your interest in the high-speed rail project. We look forward to continuing to work with you throughout this process. Sincerely, LaDonna DiCamillo Southern California Regional Director California High-Speed Rail Authority Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section 877-669-0494 Los.Angeles_Anaheim@hsr.ca.gov EIR/EIS Preliminar de la Sección del Proyecto de Los Ángeles a Anaheim Disponible para Revisión Pública Estimado interesado del proyecto: La Autoridad del Tren de Alta Velocidad de California (Autoridad) ha publicado el Informe Preliminar de Impacto Ambiental/Declaración de Impacto Ambiental (EIR/EIS, en inglés) de la sección del proyecto de Los Ángeles a Anaheim (LA-A) para revisión y comentarios públicos. La sección del proyecto LA-A es el enlace más al sur de la primera fase del sistema ferroviario estatal de alta velocidad. La sección conectará Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS, en inglés) con Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center (ARTIC, en inglés), conectando así el sur de California con el sistema ferroviario estatal de alta velocidad. El corredor ferroviario LA-A atraviesa las ciudades de Los Ángeles, Vernon, Commerce, Bell, Montebello, Pico Rivera, Norwalk, Santa Fe Springs, partes no incorporadas del Condado de Los Ángeles, La Mirada, Buena Park, Fullerton y Anaheim. El EIR/EIS Preliminar evalúa una Alternativa Sin Proyecto y dos Alternativas de Construcción: la Alternativa A de Vías Compartidas para Trenes de Pasajeros, con un Centro de Mantenimiento Ligero (LMF, en inglés) en 26th Street, y la Alternativa B de Vías Compartidas para Trenes de Pasajeros, con un LMF en 15th Street. La Alternativa Preferida de la Autoridad es la Alternativa A de Vías Compartidas para Trenes de Pasajeros. Aunque no se incluye en la Alternativa Preferida, el EIR/EIS Preliminar también evalúa una opción para una estación intermedia del HSR, que consistiría en agregar una plataforma y las instalaciones de una estación del HSR, ya sea en la estación Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs de Metrolink o en la estación Fullerton de Metrolink/Amtrak, bajo ambas alternativas de construcción. El período de comentarios públicos comienza el 5 de diciembre de 2025 y finaliza el 3 de febrero de 2026. Los comentarios pueden enviarse durante el período de comentarios a través de los siguientes métodos: Por correo postal a la atención de: Los Angeles to Anaheim Draft EIR/EIS Comment California High-Speed Rail Authority 355 S Grand Avenue, Suite 2050 Los Ángeles, CA 90071 A través del sitio en Internet de la Autoridad (www.hsr.ca.gov) Por correo electrónico a Los.Angeles_Anaheim@hsr.ca.gov indicando en el asunto “Los Angeles to Anaheim Draft EIR/EIS Comment” Si desea expresar su comentario de manera oral, puede utilizar la línea directa habilitada para la sección del proyecto de Los Ángeles y Anaheim llamando al 877-669-0494 Comentarios orales y escritos durante las Audiencias Públicas Sus comentarios son importantes. Como parte del proceso de revisión pública, la Autoridad está organizando una serie de reuniones para brindar información y recibir comentarios del público sobre el EIR/EIS Preliminar. Además, le invita a participar en una Jornada de Puertas Abiertas y Audiencias Públicas. Todos las Jornadas de Puertas Abiertas presentarán la misma información, con detallas sobre las alternativas del proyecto y EIR/EIS Preliminar. La Jornada de Puertas Abiertas también ofrecerá la oportunidad de hacer preguntas sobre el documento y el proceso de comentarios públicos. Tenga en cuenta

que los comentarios y preguntas recibidos durante la parte de Jornada de Puertas Abiertas de las reuniones no se incluirán en el registro público oficial. La parte de Audiencia Pública de las reuniones incluirá un período formal de comentarios públicos durante el cual los miembros del público podrán presentar comentarios orales y escritos sobre el EIR/EIS Preliminar para su inclusión en el registro oficial. INFORMACIÓN DE REUNIONES Jornada de Puerta Abierta – Virtual Fecha: jueves, 11 de diciembre de 2025 Hora: 6 - 8 p.m. Ubicación: Virtual via Zoom Regístrese aquí: bit.ly/LA-AOpenHouse1 Jornada de Puertas Abiertas/Audiencia Pública #1 – Santa Fe Springs Fecha: miércoles, 7 de enero de 2026 Hora: 5 - 8 p.m. Comentarios públicos*: 6:30 - 8 p.m. Ubicación: Santa Fe Springs Town Center Hall – Social Hall 11740 Telegraph Road Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670 Jornada de Puertas Abiertas/Audiencia Pública #2 – Anaheim Fecha: lunes, 12 de enero de 2026 Hora: 5 - 8 p.m. Comentarios públicos*: 6:30 - 8 p.m. Ubicación: Anaheim Brookhurst Community Center – East & West Rooms 2271 Crescent Ave Anaheim, CA 92801 Jornada de Puertas Abiertas/Audiencia Pública #3 – Commerce Fecha: jueves, 22 de enero de 2026 Hora: 5 - 8 p.m. Comentarios públicos*: 6:30 - 8 p.m. Ubicación: DoubleTree by Hilton - Grand Ballroom 5757 Telegraph Road Commerce, CA 90040 Audiencia Pública #4 – Virtual Fecha: lunes, 26 de enero de 2026 Hora: 4 - 7 p.m. Ubicación: Virtual via Zoom Regístrese aquí: bit.ly/LA-APublicHearing *Comentarios orales y escritos recibidos para el registro público *Todas las reuniones se realizarán en inglés con interpretación en español y en coreano además de Lengas de Señas Americana y subtítulos. Los lugares de reuniones cumplen con la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades (ADA, en inglés) para personas con discapacidad. Todas las solicitudes de adaptaciones razonables y/o servicios lingüísticos deben realizarse tres días hábiles (72 horas) antes de la fecha programada para la reunión llamando al 877-669-0494. Para asistencia con TTY/TTD, llame al Servicio de Retransmisión de California al 711. Los comentarios deben recibirse electrónicamente antes de las 11:59 p.m., hora del Pacífico, o deben tener fecha de matasellos del 3 de febrero de 2026. Una vez finalizado el período de comentarios, la Autoridad preparará y distribuirá el EIR/EIS Preliminar que incluirá las respuestas a los comentarios recibidos durante el período de comentarios. Sitio Web: visite el sitio web de la Autoridad (www.hsr.ca.gov) o (www.meethsrsocal.org) para detalles sobre el EIR/EIS Preliminar, grabación de la Jornada de Puertas Abiertas virtual, dónde acceder al documento ambiental y cómo participar en el proceso de comentarios públicos. Gracias por su interés en el proyecto del tren de alta velocidad. Esperamos seguir colaborando con usted durante todo este proceso. Atentamente, LaDonna DiCamillo Directora Regional del Sur de California La Autoridad del Tren de Alta Velocidad de California Sección del Proyecto de Los Angeles a Anaheim 877-669-0494 Los.Angeles_Anaheim@hsr.ca.gov 로스앤젤레스에서 애너하임 사업 구간 EIR/EIS 초안 공개 검토 사업 이해관계자들에게: 캘리포니아 고속철도국(당국)은 로스앤젤레스에서 애너하임(LA-A) 사업 구간 환경영향보고서/환경영향평가서 초안(EIR/EIS)을 공개하여 일반인의 검토와 의견을 받고자 합니다. LA-A 사업 구간은 주 전역 고속철도 시스템의 첫 번째 단계 중 최남단 구간입니다. 약 30마일의 사업 구간은 현재 화물과 여객 서비스를 모두 제공하는 로스앤젤레스에서 애너하임 철도 회랑을 사용하여 로스앤젤레스 유니온 스테이션(LAUS)과 애너하임 지역 교통 복합 센터(ARTIC)를 연결합니다. LA-A 철도 회랑은 로스앤젤레스, 버논, 커머스, 벨, 몬테벨로, 피코 리베라, 노워크, 산타페 스프링스, 라 미라다, 부에나 파크, 풀러턴, 애너하임 및 통합되지 않은 로스앤젤레스 카운티의 일부를 가로지릅니다. EIR/EIS 초안에서는 건설 대안 없음과 두 가지 건설 대안을 평가합니다: 26번가에 경정비 시설(LMF)이 있는 공유 승객 선로 대안 A와 15번가에 LMF가 있는 공유 승객 선로 대안 B가 있습니다. 당국이 선호하는 대안은 공유 승객 선로 대안 A입니다. 선호 대안에는 포함되지 않았으나, 초안 환경영향평가서(EIR/EIS)는 두 건설 대안 모두에서 노워크/산타페스프링스 메트로링크 역 또는 풀러턴 메트로링크/암트랙 역 중 한 곳에 고속철도(HSR) 승강장과 역 시설을 추가하는 중간 HSR 역 1개소 설치 옵션을 평가합니다. 의견 수렴 기간은 2025년 12월 5일에 시작하여2026년 2월 3일에 끝납니다. 의견 제출 기간 동안 다음 방법을 통해 의견을 제출할 수 있습니다: 우편으로 Attn: Los Angeles to Anaheim Draft EIR/EIS Comment California High-Speed Rail Authority 355 S Grand Avenue, Suite 2050 Los Angeles, CA 90071 당국 웹사이트(www.hsr.ca.gov)를 통해 Los.Angeles_Anaheim@hsr.ca.gov 로 보낼 때 제목 라인에 “Los Angeles to Anaheim Draft EIR/EIS Comment”라고 쓰세요 로스앤젤레스에서 애너하임 사업 섹션의 직통 전화 877-669-0494로 구두 의견을 보내주세요 공청회에서 구두 또는 서면 의견 제출 여러분의 피드백이 중요합니다. 당국은 공개 검토 절차의 일환으로 일련의 회의를 개최하여 EIR/EIS 초안에 대한 정보를 제공하고 대중의 의견을 수렴하고 있습니다. 오픈 하우스 및/또는 공청회에 함께 참여하시기 바랍니다. 모든 오픈 하우스 회의에서는 사업 대안과 EIR 초안/EIS 초안에 대한 세부 정보를 제공하는 동일한 정보를 제공할 것입니다. 오픈 하우스에서는 문서와 공개 의견 수렴 절차에 대해 질문할 수 있는 기회도 제공될 것입니다. 오픈 하우스 기간 동안 접수된 의견과 질문은 공식 공개 기록에 포함되지 않는다는 점에 유의하시기 바랍니다. 회의의 공청회 부분에는 공식 의견 수렴 기간이 포함되며, 이 기간 동안 일반 시민들은 초안 환경영향평가서(EIR/EIS)에 대한 구두 및 서면 의견을 제출하여 공식 기록에 포함될 수 있습니다. 회의 정보 오픈 하우스 - 비대면 날짜: 2025년 12월 11일 목요일 시간: 오후 6:00 - 오후 8:00 위치: 줌(Zoom)을 통한 비대면 여기에서 등록: bit.ly/LA-AOpenHouse1 오픈 하우스/공청회 #1 - 산테페 스프링스 날짜: 2026년 1월 7일 수요일 시간: 오후 5:00 - 오후 8:00 공개 의견*: 오후 6:30 - 오후 8:00 위치: Santa Fe Springs Town Center Hall Social Hall 11740 Telegraph Road Santa Fe Springs, CA

90670 오픈 하우스/공청회 #2 - 애너하임 날짜: 2026년 1월 12일 월요일 시간: 오후 5:00 - 오후 8:00 공개 의견*: 오후 6:30 - 오후 8:00 위치: Anaheim Brookhurst Community Center - East & West Rooms 2271 Crescent Avenue Anaheim, CA 92801 오픈 하우스/공청회 #3 - 커머스 날짜: 2026년 1월 22일 목요일 시간: 오후 5:00 - 오후 8:00 공개 의견*: 오후 6:30 - 오후 8:00 위치: DoubleTree by Hilton Hotel Grand Ballroom 5757 Telegraph Road Commerce, CA 90040 공청회 #4 - 비대면 날짜: 2026년 1월 26일 월요일 시간: 오후 4:00 - 오후 7:00 위치: 줌(Zoom)을 통한 비대면 여기에서 등록: bit.ly/LA-APublicHearing *공개 기록을 위해 구두 및 서면 의견을 접수합니다. *모든 회의는 영어로 진행되며 스페인어 및 한국어 통역과 미국 수화/자막이 제공됩니다. 회의 장소는 장애인을 위한 ADA 규정을 준수합니다. 합리적인 편의 제공 및/또는 기타 언어 통역 모든 요청은 회의 예정일 3 영업일(72시간) 전에 877-669-0494로 전화로 요청하셔야 합니다. TTY/TTD 지원을 받으려면 캘리포니아 중계 서비스 711번으로 전화하세요. Todas las solicitudes de adaptaciones razonables y/o servicios lingüísticos deben realizarse tres días hábiles (72 horas) antes de la fecha programada para la reunión llamando al 877-669-0494. 합리적인 편의 및/또는 언어 서비스에 대한 모든 요청은 예정된 회의 날짜로부터 영업일 기준 3일(72 시간) 전에 877-669-0494로 전화하여 이루어져야 합니다. 所有合理住宿和/或语言服务的请求必须在预定会议日期前三个工作日（72 小时）致电 877-669-0494 提出. 合理的配慮/言語サービスに関するすべてのリクエストは、会議予定日の 3 営業日 (72 時間) 前までに 877-669-0494 に電話で行う必要があります. Tất cả các yêu cầu cho các tiện nghi hợp lý và/hoặc dịch vụ ngôn ngữ phải được thực hiện trước ba ngày làm việc (72 giờ) trước ngày họp đã được sắp xếp bằng cách gọi số 877-669-0494. 의견은 2026년 2월 3일 오후 11:59 (태평양 표준시) 까지 접수되거나 우체국 소인이 찍혀야 합니다. 의견 수렴 기간이 종료된 후, 당국은 의견 수렴 기간 동안 접수된 의견에 대한 답변이 포함된 최종 EIR/EIS를 작성하여 배포할 예정입니다. 웹사이트: 자세한 내용은 당국 웹사이트 (www.hsr.ca.gov) 또는 www.meethsrsocal.org를 방문해 주십시오. 해당 사이트에서는 초안 EIR/EIS, 온라인 오픈하우스 녹화본, 환경 문서 열람 위치, 그리고 공공 의견 제출 절차에 대한 정보를 확인하실 수 있습니다. 업무 시간: 당국 직원이 비대면 시간 동안 질문에 답변해 드립니다. www.hsr.ca.gov를 방문하여 예약을 신청하세요. 고속철도 사업에 관심을 가져주셔서 감사합니다. 이 과정에서 여러분과 계속 협력할 수 있기를 기대합니다. 감사합니다 LaDonna DiCamillo 남부 캘리포니아 지역 디렉터 캘리포니아 고속철도국 로스앤젤레스에서 애너하임 사업 구간 877-669-0494 Los.Angeles_Anaheim@hsr.ca.gov SEE MORE AT WWW.HSR.CA.GOV California High-Speed Rail Authority Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Los.Angeles_Anaheim@hsr.ca.gov 877-669-0494 This email was sent by: California High-Speed Rail Authority 770 L Street Suite 620, Sacramento, CA, 95814 US Privacy Policy Manage Subscription/Unsubscribe

20.1 Response to Submission 013317 (Ka-Man Lo, California Department of Transportation, Dec 10, 2025)

20.1.1 3954

The California High-Speed Rail Authority contacted the commenter on December 12, 2025, and provided the requested materials. A meeting was held on January 5, 2026, to discuss the project and continued coordination with the California Department of Transportation, District 12. This comment does not address the sufficiency of the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement, nor does it suggest edits to the document. Accordingly, no change has been made to the document in response to this comment.

Los Angeles to Anaheim - RECORD #013329 DETAIL

Status:	Action Pending
Record Date:	12/11/2025
Interest As:	State Agency
Full Name:	Maryam Molavi

Stakeholder Comments/Issues:

0429 Hello. My name is Maryam Molave and I'm calling you from Caltrans. I've tried the website that you had mentioned, but I failed to see the environmental documents for the Los Angeles to Anaheim section of the draft EIR. Can you please help me out with that? My number is, sorry, you can email me at Maryam.molave@dot.ca.gov. Thank you very much.

20.2 Response to Submission 013329 (Maryam Molavi, California Department of Transportation, Dec 11, 2025)

20.2.1 0429

The California High-Speed Rail Authority contacted the commenter on December 11, 2025, and provided the requested materials. This comment does not address the sufficiency of the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement, nor does it suggest edits to the document; accordingly, no change has been made to the document in response to this comment.

Los Angeles to Anaheim - RECORD #013722 DETAIL

Status:	Unread
Record Date:	01/23/2026
Interest As:	State Agency
Full Name:	Joleena De La Fe

Stakeholder Comments/Issues:

0424

Hi, my name is Joleena De La Fe with California Department of Fish and Wildlife. I was inquiring about the electronic versions of the technical reports. If you can give me a call back at this number, that'd be great. . Thank you.

20.3 Response to Submission 013722 (Joleena De La Fe, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Jan 23, 2026)

20.3.1 0424

The California High-Speed Rail Authority contacted the commenter on January 23, 2026, and provided the requested materials. This comment does not address the sufficiency of the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement, nor does it suggest edits to the document; accordingly, no change has been made to the document in response to this comment.

Los Angeles to Anaheim - RECORD #013783 DETAIL

Status:	Action Pending
Record Date:	01/30/2026
Interest As:	State Agency
Full Name:	Leana Tolentino

Stakeholder Comments/Issues:

Please see attached comment letter from Caltrans Division of Aeronautics.From: Tolentino, Leana@DOT Sent: Friday, January 30, 2026 10:22 AM To: Galvez, Stefan@HSR Cc: Stalin, Nirupama@DOT ; Friedman, Matthew L@DOT ; OPR State Clearinghouse Subject: SCH 2007031067- Division of Aeronautics Comment Letter CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Hello Stefan, Attached is the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics comment letter for the Draft Joint Document of the California High-Speed Rail Project -Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section, SCH Number 2007031067. We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment and look forward to continued coordination with the California High-Speed Rail Authority! Thank you, Leana Tolentino Associate Aviation Planner Office of Aviation Planning Caltrans – Division of Aeronautics (916) 812-8895 ✉ Leana.tolentino@dot.ca.gov

California Department of Transportation

DIVISION OF AERONAUTICS - M.S. #40
1120 N STREET
P. O. BOX 942874
SACRAMENTO, CA 94274-0001
PHONE (916) 654-4959
FAX (916) 653-9531
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov

January 30, 2026

Stefan Galvez-Abadia
Director of Environmental Services
California High-Speed Rail Authority
770 L St
Sacramento, CA 95814

Electronically Sent <Stefan.Galvez@hsr.ca.gov>

Re: SCH #2007031067 - California High-Speed Rail Project - Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section

Dear Stefan Galvez-Abadia:

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Division of Aeronautics (Division) has reviewed the Joint Document (JD) for the California High-Speed Rail Project - Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section (Project). One of the goals of the Division is to assist cities, counties, and Airport Land Use Commissions (ALUC) or their equivalent, to understand and comply with the State Aeronautics Act pursuant to the California Public Utilities Code (PUC), Section 21001 et seq. Caltrans encourages collaboration with our partners in the planning process and thanks you for including the Division of Aeronautics in the review of the JD.

Compliance with Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP)

0593 The proposed Project site is in the Runway Protection Zone of the Fullerton Municipal Airport and therefore must adhere to the safety criteria and restrictions defined in the Airport Environs Land Use Plan (AELUP) adopted by the ALUC pursuant to the PUC, Section 21674. The High Speed Rail Authority should consider the Runway Protection Zone Compatibility polices stipulated in the AELUP.

Compatibility Concerns (Hazards to Flight)

0594 Compatibility concerns regarding airport obstructions and hazards to flight (such as wildlife attractants, lighting, or glare i.e., solar, etc.) should also be considered for further review upon site specific updates or projects. Proposed structures that exceed FAA Regulations Part 77 height criteria are subject to an Obstruction Evaluation/Airspace Analysis for determination.

Closing Statements

0595 An ALUCP is crucial in minimizing noise nuisance and safety hazards around airports while promoting the orderly development in the vicinity of airports, as declared by the California Legislature. A responsibility of the ALUC is to assess potential risk to aircraft and persons in airspace and people occupying areas within the vicinity of the airport.

These comments reflect the areas of review by Caltrans Division of Aeronautics with respect to airport-related noise, safety, and land use planning issues. Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. If you have any questions, please contact me by email at leana.tolentino@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Leana Tolentino

Leana Tolentino
Associate Transportation Planner
Division of Aeronautics

c: State Clearing House <state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov>
Matthew Friedman, Chief Office of Aviation Planning, <matthew.friedman@dot.ca.gov>
Nirupama Stalin, Senior Transportation Planner <Nirupama.stalin@dot.ca.gov>

20.4 Response to Submission 013783 (Leana Tolentino, California Department of Transportation Division of Aeronautics, Jan 30, 2026)

20.4.1 0593

The Airport Environs Land Use Plan (AELUP) was considered in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). As described in Section 3.11.3, Consistency with Plans and Laws, the project would not conflict with operations within the runway protection zone (RPZ) or height restrictions established by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), but it would have inconsistencies with the AELUP and The Fullerton Plan, because it would place new passenger rail within the Fullerton Municipal RPZ. This is analyzed in more detail in Appendix 3.11-C, Airport Obstructions, of the Draft EIR/EIS. The California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) will continue to coordinate with FAA as the project progresses, consistent with SS-IAMF#5, Aviation Safety. The Authority is currently coordinating with FAA regional staff regarding the entire Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section and intends to submit FAA Form 7460-1 applications to FAA, which triggers the formal intradepartmental review and approval of the project in relation to the RPZ, airspace standards, and other FAA criteria. The findings from FAA coordination will be incorporated into future design packages as needed.

20.4.2 0594

As described in Section 3.11, Safety and Security, Impact SS-10, the portion of the alignment adjacent to Fullerton Municipal Airport would be below grade and within an open trench to avoid potential conflict with the height restrictions established by 14 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 77 regulations. Construction equipment such as cranes and drill rigs may be used in the vicinity of the airport. SS-IAMF#5 requires the Authority or the Authority-designated contractor to submit construction plans, information, or both to FAA, pursuant to 14 CFR Part 77, which may include the location of planned high-speed rail construction and construction staging areas within and adjacent to the boundary of the Fullerton Municipal Airport, the types and height of proposed equipment, and planned time/duration of construction to ensure construction within and adjacent to the boundary of Fullerton Municipal Airport does not intrude into imaginary surfaces.

While the project would not introduce any permanent structures that exceed 200 feet within 1.2 miles of the airport, the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section was determined to be incompatible with the AELUP, because it introduces new passenger rail within the RPZ. As such, FAA review and approval are required, as described in greater detail in the response to comment #0593 above. In addition, coordination with FAA and adherence to SS-IAMF#2, Safety and Security Management Plan, and SS-IAMF#5 will ensure compliance with aviation safety regulations and minimize risks during construction and operation.

20.4.3 0595

The Authority acknowledges the importance of the airport land use compatibility plan. The Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Draft EIR/EIS did not identify any significant impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act or the National Environmental Policy Act related to airport land use compatibility, noise, or safety as a result of project construction or operations in the vicinity of Fullerton Municipal Airport. The Authority will ensure that all relevant aviation safety requirements and compliance with state and federal regulations are met.

Los Angeles to Anaheim - RECORD #013819 DETAIL

Status:	Unread
Record Date:	02/03/2026
Interest As:	State Agency
Full Name:	Joleena De La Fe

Stakeholder Comments/Issues:

Please find attached LAA Comment Letter from CDFW.

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

State of California – Natural Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, CA 92123
wildlife.ca.gov

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
MEGHAN HERTEL, Director

February 2, 2026

Stefan Galvez-Albadia
California High-Speed Rail Authority
770 L Street, Suite 620
Sacramento, CA 95814
Stefan.Galvez@hsr.ca.gov

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Study for the California High-Speed Rail Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section, SCH No. 2007031067, Los Angeles and Orange Counties, CA

Dear Stefan Galvez-Albadia:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Study (EIR/EIS) from California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) for the California High-Speed Rail Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section (Project) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines[1].

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and recommendations regarding Project activities that may affect California fish and wildlife. Likewise, CDFW appreciates the opportunity to comment on those aspects of the Project that CDFW, by law, may be required to carry out or approve through the exercise of its own regulatory authority under the Fish and Game Code.

CDFW ROLE

0558

CDFW is California's Trustee Agency for fish and wildlife resources and holds those resources in trust by statute for all the people of the state (Fish & G. Code, §§ 711.7, subd. (a) & 1802; Pub. Resources Code, § 21070; CEQA Guidelines § 15386, subd. (a)). CDFW, in its trustee capacity, has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of fish, wildlife, native plants, and habitat necessary for biologically sustainable populations of those species (Fish & G. Code, § 1802). Similarly, for purposes of CEQA, CDFW is charged by law to provide, as available, biological expertise during public agency environmental review efforts, focusing specifically on projects and related activities that have the potential to adversely affect fish and wildlife resources.

[1] CEQA is codified in the California Public Resources Code in section 21000 et seq. The "CEQA Guidelines" are found in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, commencing with section 15000.

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0559

CDFW may also act as a Responsible Agency under CEQA. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21069; CEQA Guidelines, § 15381). CDFW expects that it may need to exercise regulatory authority as provided by the Fish and Game Code. As proposed, for example, the Project may be subject to CDFW's lake and streambed alteration regulatory authority (Fish & G. Code, § 1600 et seq.). Likewise, to the extent implementation of the Project as proposed may result in "take" as defined by State law[2] of any species protected under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA; Fish & G. Code, § 2050 et seq.) or the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA; Fish & G. Code, §1900 et seq.), the Project proponent may seek related take authorization as provided by the Fish and Game Code.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Proponent: California High-Speed Rail Authority

0560

Objective: The High-Speed Rail (HSR) system would provide a reliable high-speed electrified train system linking the San Francisco Bay Area and Central Valley to Southern California. The 30-mile-long segment from Los Angeles to Anaheim would connect the Burbank to Los Angeles Project Section. This segment is included in Phase 1, which would connect San Francisco to Los Angeles and Anaheim via the Pacheco Pass and the Central Valley, and the Los Angeles to San Diego corridor when Phase 2 begins. The Project would construct, maintain, and operate an electrified, high-speed train system connecting the Los Angeles Union Station and the Anaheim Regional Transit Intermodal Center. The HSR system would provide travel between highly urbanized centers and connectivity to major areas, which would alleviate travel demand on highways and airports as California's population increases.

The Project includes construction, improvement, upgrade, operation, and maintenance of new and existing facilities and infrastructure necessary to support the HSR system. This includes new and upgraded track, overhead contact systems, maintenance and traction power facilities, grade separations, drainage improvements, communications towers, security fencing, and modifications to passenger train stations. The only difference between the two presented Build Alternatives is the placement of a Light Maintenance Facility, which is a facility where trains are inspected, cleaned, serviced, and stored.

Location: The Project spans the City of Los Angeles at Los Angeles Union Station to Anaheim at the Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center, using already exiting railways by expanding them for HSR use. The Project extends through a mostly urban and developed environment, having contact with natural areas where the existing track follows river banks. Both Build Alternatives will utilize the same railway path from beginning to end. Major water crossings include the Los Angeles River, Rio Hondo (and

[2] "Take" is defined in Section 86 of the Fish and Game Code as "hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill."

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0560

basins), San Gabriel River, North Fork Coyote Creek, La Mirada Creek, Coyote Creek, Brea Creek, Fullerton Creek, and Carbon Creek.

Timeframe: Project activities are proposed to occur January 2031 to September 2037.

0561

Biological Setting: Within the Supplemental Resource Study Area (RSA; Project footprint with a three-mile buffer), over 95 percent of the land has been developed. Other RSAs defined within the EIR/EIS include the Botanical RSA (Project footprint with a 100-foot buffer), the Aquatic RSA (Project footprint with a 250-foot buffer), and the Wildlife RSA (Project footprint with 1,000-foot buffer). Vegetation communities that were identified within the Wildlife RSA include eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus* spp.) – tree of heaven (*Ailanthus altissima*) – black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia*) woodland seminatural alliance; wild oats (*Avena* spp.) and annual brome (*Bromus* spp.) grasslands seminatural alliance; hardstem (*Schoenoplectus acutus*) and California bulrush marsh herbaceous alliance (State Rank (S) 3; S4); mulefat (*Baccharis salicifolia*) thickets shrubland alliance (S4); cattail (*Typha* spp.) marshes herbaceous alliance (S5); Goodding's willow – red willow riparian woodland and forest (S3); duckweed (*Lemna* spp., *Spirodela* spp., *Wolffia* spp., *Wolffiella* spp.) blooms and relatives' provisional herbaceous alliance (S4); and salt grass flats herbaceous alliance (S4). Permanent, temporary, and shading impacts to each vegetation community are proposed be less than one acre.

Field surveys for special status plants, special status wildlife, special status natural communities, aquatic resources, and habitats of concern were completed between May 2007 and April 2017. Site reconnaissance surveys were conducted to assess habitat for wildlife and plants from the public right-of-way and where access was granted. Suitable habitat for special-status plants and wildlife was mapped and field verified during reconnaissance field surveys. Bat roost surveys were conducted in accessible areas in 2010. No other wildlife surveys (including protocol surveys) were conducted.

Sensitive species that are of potential concern for the Project include, but are not limited to western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypugaea*; CESA listed-candidate endangered), western mastiff bat (*Eumops perotis californicus*; California Species of Special Concern (SSC)), pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*; SSC), Mexican long-tongued bat (*Choeronycteris mexicana*; SSC), Townsend's big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii*; SSC), pocketed free-tailed bat (*Nyctinomops femorosaccus*; SCC), western red bat (*Lasiurus blossevillii*; SSC), western yellow bat (*Lasiurus xanthinus*; SSC), big free-tailed bat (*Nyctinomops macrotis*; SSC), and white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*; CDFW Fully Protected).

The EIR/EIS includes a variety of mitigation measures. They consist of avoidance and minimization actions specific to aquatic resources, nesting birds and raptors, special status plants and vegetation communities, western burrowing owl, wildlife movement corridors, white-tailed kite, bats, and protected trees. Additionally, the EIR/EIS includes numerous general construction mitigation measures.

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0562

Project History: The California HSR System plans to provide intercity, high-speed service on more than 800 miles of track throughout California, connecting the major population centers. The Authority plans to implement the California HSR System in two phases. Phase 1 is currently underway and would connect San Franciso to Anaheim via the Pacheco Pass and the Central Valley. Phase 2 would extend the HSR system from the Central Valley to the state's capital in Sacramento and from Los Angeles to San Diego.

In February 2021, CDFW provided the Authority with comments on an administrative draft EIR/EIS. CDFW's primary concerns were the Project's impact on unarmored threespine stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoni*; Endangered Species Act (ESA) endangered; CESA endangered; CDFW Fully Protected), wildlife connectivity, and CESA-listed species including (but not limited to) western Joshua tree (*Yucca brevifolia*; CESA Candidate), and mountain lion (*Puma concolor*) Southern California/Central Coast Evolutionarily Significant Units.

In December 2022, CDFW provided the Authority with comments on the Palmdale to Burbank Section Draft EIR/EIS. Comments consisted of potential impacts to unarmored threespine stickleback, mountain lion and wildlife connectivity, aquatic resources, western Joshua tree, Crotch's bumble bee (*Bombus crotchii*; CESA candidate endangered), monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus plexippus pop. 1*; ESA proposed threatened), special status amphibian species, western pond turtle (*Actinemys pallida*; SSC), western burrowing owl, bats, and special status plants and sensitive natural communities.

Lastly, CDFW has been included in a quarterly HSR Agency Meeting.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CDFW offers the comments and recommendations below to assist the Authority in adequately identifying and/or mitigating the Project's significant, or potentially significant, direct and indirect impacts on fish and wildlife (biological) resources. Additional comments or other suggestions are also included to improve the document.

0563

COMMENT # 1: Impacts to Western Burrowing Owl

Issue: The Project may have impacts to western burrowing owl.

Specific impact: Project construction and activities may result in injury or mortality of western burrowing owl, disrupt natural western burrowing owl breeding behavior, and reduce reproductive capacity. Also, the Project may impact breeding, wintering, and foraging habitat for the species. Habitat loss could result in local extirpation of the species and contribute to local, regional, and State-wide declines of western burrowing owl.

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0563

Why impact would occur: Impacts in the form of habitat loss and degradation will occur as a result of grading and construction activities. These ground-disturbing activities may also cause direct mortality of western burrowing owl. To mitigate for impacts on western burrowing owl, the Project proposes mitigation measures BIO-MM#20, 21, and 44. However, the Project's impact has yet to be mitigated below a level of significance. BIO-MM#21 would require 600-foot no-work buffers around occupied burrowing owl burrows both during the nesting season and outside breeding season and if buffers are not feasible, western burrowing owl would be relocated citing CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW 2012). However, 600 feet could be an insufficient buffer from occupied burrows and adjacent foraging grounds given the types of disturbance associated with the Project. The Project is proposing a buffer that may be more suitable for low level disturbances; however, the Project could generate noise and ground vibrations more consistent with medium to high level disturbance. Furthermore, CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation does not support relocating breeding western burrowing owls as mitigation, which is why relocating/translocating is not a measure in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. BIO-MM#44 requires compensatory mitigation for loss of active western burrowing owl burrows and habitat. However, BIO-MM#44 is not specific and does not provide any performance standards suitable for successfully mitigating impacts on western burrowing owl habitat. The mitigation measure proposed in the EIR/EIS may not satisfy the CEQA standards for mitigation and may be considered deferred mitigation (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.4).

Evidence impact may be significant: Western burrowing owl is a species designated as candidate for listing as threatened or endangered pursuant to CESA (Fish & G. Code, § 2050 et seq.). Take of any endangered, threatened, or candidate species that results from the Project is prohibited, except as authorized by State law (Fish & G. Code, §§ 86, 2062, 2067, 2068, 2080, 2085; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 786.9). Additionally, take of individual western burrowing owl and their nests is defined by Fish and Game Code section 86 and prohibited by sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513.

Take is defined in Fish and Game Code section 86 as "hunt, pursue, catch, capture or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture or kill." Inadequate avoidance and mitigation measures will result in the Project continuing to have a substantial adverse direct and cumulative effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFW.

0564

Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measure(s)

CDFW requests the following recommendations and mitigation measures are incorporated into the final CEQA document:

Mitigation Measure #1: Incidental Take Permit – If an occupied burrow or western burrowing owl is found within the Project site, the Project proponent shall coordinate with CDFW and attain appropriate take authorization from CDFW (pursuant to Fish and

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0564

Game code, § 2080 et seq.). The Project proponent shall comply with the mitigation measures detailed in the take authorization issued by CDFW. The Project proponent shall provide a copy of a fully executed take authorization prior to implementing Project activities with potential to impact western burrowing owl.

0565

Mitigation Measure #2: Conduct Protocol Surveys for Burrowing Owls – The Authority should revise BIO-MM#20 to incorporate the underlined language and omit language in strikethrough:

Prior to ground-disturbing activity, the Project Biologist will conduct protocol-level surveys for Burrowing Owl within suitable habitat in the work area and extending 500 feet from the boundary of the work area, where access is available. Surveys will be conducted in accordance with guidelines in CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW 2012) or CDFW's most recent guidance. Survey protocol for breeding seasonal survey states to conduct 4 survey visits: 1) at least one site visit between February 15 and April 15 and 2) a minimum of three survey visits at least three weeks apart between April 15 and July 15, with at least one visit after June 15. If no Burrowing Owls are observed and construction occurs within 14~~30~~ days of the last survey, no further action is required for Burrowing Owls. However, if no Burrowing Owls are observed and construction is delayed more than 14~~30~~ days after the last surveys, prior to ground-disturbing activities, within 14~~30~~ days prior to construction, the Project Biologist will conduct preconstruction clearance surveys for Burrowing Owl within suitable habitat in the work area and extending 500 feet from the boundary of the work area, where access is available. If no Burrowing Owls are observed, ground disturbance may occur.

0566

Mitigation Measure #3: Implement Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Burrowing Owl – The Authority should revise BIO-MM#21 to incorporate the underlined language and omit language in strikethrough:

If o~~O~~ccupied Burrowing Owl burrows are found within the work area, ~~that would be directly affected by ground-disturbing activities~~ (if documented under BIO-MM#20), ~~will be relocated in accordance with CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG 2012), which will include the preparation of~~ a Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan, which will be approved by CDFW, will be prepared. The Authority shall obtain an Incidental Take Permit from CDFW for impacts to Burrowing Owl. ~~To the extent feasible,~~ T~~t~~he Project Biologist will establish no-work buffers of 1650 feet around occupied Burrowing Owl burrows in the work area. Work shall not resume in this area unless the Project Biologist determines the burrow is inactive and concurrence from CDFW has been granted. Reductions in the nest buffer distance may be appropriate depending on ambient levels of human activity, screening vegetation, or possibly other factors. ~~From April 1 through October 15, the no-work buffer will be at least 600 feet, and from October 16 through March 31, the no-work buffer will be at least 165 feet. If the no-work buffer is not feasible and occupied burrows will be relocated during the nesting season, relocation will occur either before the birds have begun egg-laying and incubation or~~

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0566

~~after the Project Biologist has determined that the juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival.~~

0567

Recommendation #1: Provide Compensatory Mitigation for Loss of Active Burrowing Owl Burrows and Habitat - CDFW recommends the Authority revise mitigation measure BIO-MM#44 to provide a specific mitigation measure addressing compensatory mitigation for western burrowing owl habitat. Mitigation should be specific, provide performance standards, and action(s) to achieve those performance standards. The Authority should provide criteria for selecting mitigation lands appropriate for western burrowing owl; mitigation land performance criteria; a plan to monitor success of mitigation; and contingency measures if mitigation does not meet performance criteria. The mitigation land should also provide equivalent or greater habitat value than that of the Project area. The Project proponent should protect replacement habitat in perpetuity under a conservation easement dedicated to a local land conservancy or other appropriate entity that has been approved to hold and manage mitigation lands pursuant to Government Code § 65967(c). Recordation of the conservation easement should occur prior to commencement of Project activities. An appropriate endowment should also be provided for the long-term monitoring and management of mitigation lands.

COMMENT # 2: Impacts on Bats

0568

Issue: The Project may have a significant impact on special status bat species.

Specific impact: Potential direct impacts include Project construction on structures or trees that may provide roosting habitat and therefore has the potential for the direct loss of bats. Indirect impacts to bats and roosts could result from increased noise disturbances, human activity, dust, vegetation clearing, ground disturbing activities (e.g., staging, access, excavation, grading), and vibrations caused by heavy equipment.

Why impact would occur: Multiple species of bats, such as pocketed free-tailed bat and western yellow bat, may be adversely impacted by Project activities. According to Table 3.7-12 of the EIR/EIS, there will be permanent direct impacts to these special status bat species regardless of the Build Alternative chosen. To mitigate for impacts on bats, the Project proposes mitigation measures BIO-MM#25, 26, and 27. BIO-MM#26 and 27 would require avoidance or relocation of active hibernacula or maternity roosts "guided by accepted exclusion and deterrent techniques." The EIR/EIS does not state what those "accepted exclusion and deterrent techniques" would be or from where they were derived. Additionally, it is unclear how the mitigation measure would avoid or relocate active hibernacula or maternity roosts. BIO-MM#27 states that bats in active maternity roosts would not be evicted and instead active maternity roosts would be relocated. Relocating or evicting bats in maternity roosts could result in reduced fecundity or injury and mortality of reproductive female bats and pups. Maternity colonies that are affected by temporarily reduced fecundity or mortality may require

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0568

multiple years to recover following a disturbance event (H.T. Harvey & Associates 2019).

Finally, no compensatory mitigation is proposed in the EIR/EIS. The Project could result in loss of roosting habitat. Without replacement of habitat, the Project would contribute to the ongoing loss of suitable habitat on a local and regional scale. Relocating or evicting active hibernacula or maternity roosts is not mitigating for loss of habitat that would occur.

Evidence impact would be significant: Bats are considered non-game mammals and are protected by state law from take and/or harassment (Fish and Game Code § 4150, CCR § 251.1). Several bat species are also considered Species of Special Concern (SSC), which meet the CEQA definition of rare, threatened, or endangered species (CEQA Guidelines §15065). CDFW considers adverse impacts to a SSC, for the purposes of CEQA, to be significant without mitigation. Mitigation is not just exclusion from maternity roosts, wintering sites, night roosts, mating roosts and foraging sites, but providing similarly functioning habitat to what is impacted.

Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measure(s)

0569

CDFW requests the following recommendations and mitigation measures are incorporated into the final CEQA document:

Mitigation Measure #4: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Special-Status Bat Species – The Authority should revise BIO-MM#25 to incorporate the underlined language and omit language in strikethrough:

Two spring surveys (April through June) and two winter surveys (November through January) shall be performed by the Project Biologist. Each survey shall consist of one dusk emergence survey (start one hour before sunset and last for three hours), followed by one pre-dawn re-entry survey (start one hour before sunrise and last for two hours), and one daytime visual inspection of all potential roosting habitat on the Project site. Surveys shall be conducted within one 24-hour period. Visual inspections shall focus on the identification of bat sign (i.e., individuals, guano, urine staining, corpses, feeding remains, scratch marks and bats squeaking and chattering). Bat detectors, bat call analysis, and visual observation shall be used during all dusk emergence and pre-dawn re-entry surveys.

No earlier than 30 days prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities in a work area, the Project Biologist will conduct protocol ~~a visual and acoustic~~ surveys ~~(over the course of one day and one evening at a minimum)~~ for roosting bats in the work area and extending 500 feet from the boundary of the work area, where access is available. ~~When necessary,~~ ~~s~~Such surveys will be conducted in suitable habitat for special-status bats, including those areas in which bridges, abandoned structures, or trees with large cavities or dense foliage are present within up to a half-mile of the boundary of the work area, dependent on potential project indirect effects on bat hibernacula or maternity

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0569

colonies. The Project Biologist will determine if surveys extending past 500 feet are necessary.

0570

Mitigation Measure #5: Implement Bat Avoidance and Relocation Measures– The Authority should revise BIO-MM#26 to incorporate the underlined language and omit language in strikethrough:

Prior to ground-disturbing activity or bridge work, the Project Biologist will survey for active hibernacula or maternity roosts. If active hibernacula or maternity roosts are identified in the work area or within 500 feet extending from the work area during preconstruction surveys, they will be avoided ~~to the extent feasible~~. For maternity roosts, Project construction will only between October 1 and February 28, outside of the maternity roosting season when young bats are present but are yet ready to fly out of the roost (March 1 to September 30). Maternity roosts shall not be evicted, excluded, removed, or disturbed.

A minimum 500-foot no-work buffer shall be provided around hibernacula. The buffer shall not be reduced. Project-related construction and activities shall not occur within 500 feet of or directly under or adjacent to hibernacula. Buffers shall be left in place until the end of Project construction and activities or until a qualified bat biologist determines that the hibernacula are no longer active. Project-related construction and activities shall not occur between 30 minutes before sunset and 30 minutes after sunrise. Hibernacula roosts shall not be evicted, excluded, removed, or disturbed.

If avoidance of a hibernaculum is not feasible, the Project Biologist will prepare a relocation plan to remove the hibernaculum and provide for construction of an alternative bat roost outside of the work area.

The Project Biologist will implement the relocation plan and new roost sites shall be in place before the commencement of ground-disturbing activities that would occur within 500 feet of the hibernaculum where the qualified biologist deems removal to be more beneficial than avoidance. If avoidance is possible without disturbing the bats, then avoidance will be implemented. New roost sites shall be in place prior to the initiation of Project-related activities to allow enough time for bats to relocate. ~~Removal of roosts will be guided by accepted exclusion and deterrent techniques.~~

The relocation plan may include the following elements:

- Required pre-construction surveys and monitoring
- Timing considerations for temporal avoidance (e.g., outside of the maternity season if the project may potentially impact a maternity roost or non-flying juvenile bats)
- Humane relocation and exclusion methods to remove and/or exclude bats from roosting sites within structures or vegetation slated for removal
- Protective fencing or signage to avoid impacts to potential roosting habitat that shall remain on site

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0570

- Best Management Practices for minimizing the effects of noise, human activity, dust, lighting, and ground vibrations on bats
- On and/or off-site mitigation measures to compensate for lost roosting habitat, including installation of alternative roosting habitat
- Monitoring to evaluate the effectiveness of bat-related mitigation

0571

Mitigation Measure #6: Bat Compensatory Mitigation – If the Project shall impact confirmed habitat of bats and avoidance is not achievable, the Project proponent shall provide compensatory mitigation for temporary and permanent loss of any habitat supporting SSC. There should be no net loss of habitat supporting SSC (CEQA Guidelines, § 15370(e)). Mitigation shall provide appropriate habitat (depending on the species), refugia, and habitat structures that support that species. Additionally, mitigation shall include habitat of comparable size, function, and quality should be created or preserved and maintained in the new bat habitat, or for bats in trees, at a nearby suitable undisturbed area. Additionally, the mitigation and monitoring plan shall include a discussion on the territory size; roosting and foraging locations; food availability; and how all life cycle functions will be mitigated. The mitigation and monitoring plan shall describe proposed mitigation habitat and include performance standards for the use of replacement roosts/hibernacula by the displaced species, as well as provisions to prevent harassment, predation, and disease of relocated bats. Bat mitigation methods may include, but is not limited to, Texas Bat Abode-style structures, Oregon wedges, and other alternate bat roosting habitat installation depending on the impact area. The Authority shall consult and coordinate with CDFW regarding bat habitat creation and implementation if necessary.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

0572

Lake and Streambed Alteration Notification CDFW has regulatory authority over activities in streams that will divert or obstruct the natural flow, or change the bed, channel, or bank (which may include associated riparian resources) of any river, stream, or lake or use material from a river, stream, or lake. For any such activities, the Project proponent (or "entity") must provide written notification to CDFW pursuant to section 1600 et seq. of the Fish and Game Code. Based on this notification and other information, CDFW determines whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (LSAA) with the applicant is required prior to conducting the proposed activities. CDFW's issuance of a LSAA for a project that is subject to CEQA will require CEQA compliance actions by CDFW as a Responsible Agency. A Notification package for a LSAA may be obtained by accessing CDFW's Lake and Streambed Alteration Program website[3].

0573

Fully Protected Species. The EIR/EIS notes that white-tailed kite was observed and there is potential for this Fully Protected species to forage within the Project site. Fully Protected Species may not be taken or possessed at any time according to the Fish and

[3] http://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/LSA

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0573 Game Code § 3511. CDFW cannot authorize take for white-tailed kite and the Authority must completely avoid impacts to these species during Project's construction and operational activities.

0574 **Use of Rodenticides**. Vegetation may need to be managed via chemical methods. Herbicides, pesticides, and rodenticides may impact wildlife. Second generation anticoagulant rodenticides are known to have harmful effects on the ecosystem and wildlife. Assembly Bill 1788[4] prohibits the use of any second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides because second generation anticoagulant rodenticides have a higher toxicity and are more dangerous to nontarget wildlife (California Legislative Information 2020). CDFW recommends the Final EIR/EIS include a discussion as to the Project's use of herbicides, pesticides, and second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides to maintain the restored areas within the Project site in perpetuity. CDFW recommends the Authority include measures that would prohibit the use of any second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides throughout the Project.

0575 **Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Plan**. CDFW recommends the Project's environmental document include mitigation measures recommended in this letter. CDFW has provided comments via a mitigation monitoring and reporting plan to assist in the development of feasible, specific, detailed (i.e., responsible party, timing, specific actions, location), and fully enforceable mitigation measures (CEQA Guidelines, § 15097; Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.6). The Authority is welcome to coordinate with CDFW to further review and refine the Project's mitigation measures. Per Public Resources Code section 21081.6(a)(1), CDFW has provided a summary of our suggested mitigation measures and recommendations in the form of an attached Draft Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (Attachment A).

ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

0576 CEQA requires that information developed in environmental impact reports and negative declarations be incorporated into a database which may be used to make subsequent or supplemental environmental determinations. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21003, subd. (e).) Accordingly, please report any special status species and natural communities detected during Project surveys to the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). The CNDDB website[5] provides direction regarding the types of information that should be reported and allows on-line submittal of field survey forms.

In addition, information on special status native plant populations and sensitive natural communities, should be submitted to CDFW's Vegetation Classification and Mapping Program using the Combined Rapid Assessment and Relevé Form[6].

---

[4] https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB1788
[5] https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB
[6] https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/VegCAMP/Natural-Communities/Submit

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0576

The Authority should ensure data collected for the preparation of the EIR/EIS is properly submitted.

FILING FEES

0577

The Project, as proposed, would have an impact on fish and/or wildlife, and assessment of environmental document filing fees is necessary. Fees are payable upon filing of the Notice of Determination by the Lead Agency and serve to help defray the cost of environmental review by CDFW. Payment of the environmental document filing fee is required in order for the underlying project approval to be operative, vested, and final. (Cal. Code Regs, tit. 14, § 753.5; Fish & G. Code, § 711.4; Pub. Resources Code, § 21089.)

CONCLUSION

CDFW appreciates the opportunity to comment on the EIR/EIS to assist the Authority in identifying and mitigating Project impacts on biological resources. CDFW requests an opportunity to review and comment on any response that the Authority has to our comments and to receive notification of any forthcoming hearing date(s) for the Project (CEQA Guidelines, § 15073(e)).

Questions regarding this letter or further coordination should be directed to Joleena De La Fe[7], Environmental Scientist.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
5991E19EF8094C3...

Victoria Tang
Environmental Program Manager
South Coast Region

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Draft Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program

ec: California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Erinn Wilson-Olgin, South Coast Regional Manager
Victoria Tang, Environmental Program Manager
Frederic (Fritz) Rieman, Senior Environmental Scientist (Supervisor)
Steve Gibson, Senior Environmental Scientist (Supervisor)
Jennifer Turner, Senior Environmental Scientist (Supervisor)
Joleena De La Fe, Environmental Scientist
Cooper Wall, Environmental Scientist

[7] Phone: (858) 354-3527; Email: Joleena.delafe@wildlife.ca.gov

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation
State.Clearinghouse@lci.ca.gov

REFERENCES

[CDFW] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2012. Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. Available from: https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=83843&inline

California Legislative Information. 2020. AB-1788 Pesticides: use of second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides. Available from: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB1788

H.T. Harvey & Associates 2019. Caltrans Bat Mitigation: A Guide to Developing Feasible and Effective Solutions. Available from: https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/env/caltrans-bat-mitigation-guide-a11y.pdf

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

Figure 1: Figure S-2 Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section



Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0578

ATTACHMENT A: DRAFT MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

CDFW provides the following language to be incorporated into the MMRP for the Project.

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
Mitigation Measure #1: Incidental Take Permit – If an occupied burrow or western burrowing owl is found within the Project site, the Project proponent shall coordinate with CDFW and attain appropriate take authorization from CDFW (pursuant to Fish and Game code, § 2080 et seq.). The Project proponent shall comply with the mitigation measures detailed in the take authorization issued by CDFW. The Project proponent shall provide a copy of a fully executed take authorization prior to implementing Project activities with potential to impact western burrowing owl.	Prior to Project Initiation/During Project Construction	Project Proponent
Mitigation Measure #2: Conduct Protocol Surveys for Burrowing Owls – The Authority should revise BIO-MM#20 to incorporate the underlined language and omit language in strikethrough: Prior to ground-disturbing activity, the Project Biologist will conduct protocol-level surveys for Burrowing Owl within suitable habitat in the work area and extending 500 feet from the boundary of the work area, where access is available. Surveys will be conducted in accordance with guidelines in CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW 2012) or CDFW's most recent guidance. Survey protocol for breeding seasonal survey states to conduct 4 survey visits: 1) at least one site visit between February 15 and April 15 and 2) a minimum of three survey visits at least three weeks apart between April 15 and July 15, with at least one visit after June 15. If no Burrowing Owls are observed and construction occurs within 14~~30~~ days of the last survey, no further action is required for Burrowing Owls. However, if no Burrowing Owls are observed and construction is delayed more than 14~~30~~ days after the last surveys, prior to ground-disturbing activities, within 14~~30~~ days prior to	Prior to Project Initiation	Lead Agency

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0578

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
construction, the Project Biologist will conduct preconstruction clearance surveys for Burrowing Owl within suitable habitat in the work area and extending 500 feet from the boundary of the work area, where access is available. If no Burrowing Owls are observed, ground disturbance may occur.		
Mitigation Measure #3: Implement Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Burrowing Owl – The Authority should revise BIO-MM#21 to incorporate the underlined language and omit language in strikethrough: If o~~O~~ccupied Burrowing Owl burrows are found within the work area, ~~that would be directly affected by ground-disturbing activities~~ (if documented under BIO-MM#20), ~~will be relocated in accordance with CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG 2012), which will include the preparation of~~ a Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan, which will be approved by CDFW, will be prepared. The Authority shall obtain an Incidental Take Permit from CDFW for impacts to Burrowing Owl. ~~To the extent feasible,~~ T~~t~~he Project Biologist will establish no-work buffers of 1650 feet around occupied Burrowing Owl burrows in the work area. Work shall not resume in this area unless the Project Biologist determines the burrow is inactive and concurrence from CDFW has been granted. Reductions in the nest buffer distance may be appropriate depending on ambient levels of human activity, screening vegetation, or possibly other factors. ~~From April 1 through October 15, the no-work buffer will be at least 600 feet, and from October 16 through March 31, the no-work buffer will be at least 165 feet. If the no-work buffer is not feasible and occupied burrows will be relocated during the nesting season, relocation will occur either before the birds have begun egg-laying and incubation or after the Project Biologist~~	Prior to Project Initiation	Lead Agency

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0578

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
~~has determined that the juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival.~~		
Recommendation #1: Provide Compensatory Mitigation for Loss of Active Burrowing Owl Burrows and Habitat - CDFW recommends the Authority revise mitigation measure BIO-MM#44 to provide a specific mitigation measure addressing compensatory mitigation for western burrowing owl habitat. Mitigation should be specific, provide performance standards, and action(s) to achieve those performance standards. The Authority should provide criteria for selecting mitigation lands appropriate for western burrowing owl; mitigation land performance criteria; a plan to monitor success of mitigation; and contingency measures if mitigation does not meet performance criteria. The mitigation land should also provide equivalent or greater habitat value than that of the Project area. The Project proponent should protect replacement habitat in perpetuity under a conservation easement dedicated to a local land conservancy or other appropriate entity that has been approved to hold and manage mitigation lands pursuant to Government Code § 65967(c). Recordation of the conservation easement should occur prior to commencement of Project activities. An appropriate endowment should also be provided for the long-term monitoring and management of mitigation lands.	Prior to Project Initiation	Lead Agency
Mitigation Measure #4: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Special-Status Bat Species – The Authority should revise BIO-MM#25 to incorporate the <u>underlined</u> language and omit language in strikethrough: <u>Two spring surveys (April through June) and two winter surveys (November through January) shall be performed by the Project Biologist. Each survey shall consist of one dusk emergence survey (start one hour before sunset and last for three hours), followed by one pre-dawn re-entry survey (start one hour before sunrise and last for</u>	Prior to Project Initiation	Lead Agency

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0578

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
two hours), and one daytime visual inspection of all potential roosting habitat on the Project site. Surveys shall be conducted within one 24-hour period. Visual inspections shall focus on the identification of bat sign (i.e., individuals, guano, urine staining, corpses, feeding remains, scratch marks and bats squeaking and chattering). Bat detectors, bat call analysis, and visual observation shall be used during all dusk emergence and pre-dawn re-entry surveys. No earlier than 30 days prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities in a work area, the Project Biologist will conduct protocol ~~a visual and acoustic~~ surveys ~~(over the course of one day and one evening at a minimum)~~ for roosting bats in the work area and extending 500 feet from the boundary of the work area, where access is available. ~~When necessary,~~ sSuch surveys will be conducted in suitable habitat for special-status bats, including those areas in which bridges, abandoned structures, or trees with large cavities or dense foliage are present within up to a half-mile of the boundary of the work area, dependent on potential project indirect effects on bat hibernacula or maternity colonies. The Project Biologist will determine if surveys extending past 500 feet are necessary.		
Mitigation Measure #5: Implement Bat Avoidance and Relocation Measures– The Authority should revise BIO-MM#26 to incorporate the underlined language and omit language in strikethrough: Prior to ground-disturbing activity or bridge work, the Project Biologist will survey for active hibernacula or maternity roosts. If active hibernacula or maternity roosts are identified in the work area or within 500 feet extending from the work area during preconstruction surveys, they will be avoided ~~to the extent feasible~~. For maternity roosts, Project construction will only between October 1 and February 28, outside of the maternity roosting season when young bats are present but are yet ready to fly	Prior to Project Initiation	Lead Agency

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0578

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
out of the roost (March 1 to September 30). Maternity roosts shall not be evicted, excluded, removed, or disturbed. A minimum 500-foot no-work buffer shall be provided around hibernacula. The buffer shall not be reduced. Project-related construction and activities shall not occur within 500 feet of or directly under or adjacent to hibernacula. Buffers shall be left in place until the end of Project construction and activities or until a qualified bat biologist determines that the hibernacula are no longer active. Project-related construction and activities shall not occur between 30 minutes before sunset and 30 minutes after sunrise. Hibernacula roosts shall not be evicted, excluded, removed, or disturbed. If avoidance of a hibernaculum is not feasible, the Project Biologist will prepare a relocation plan to remove the hibernaculum and provide for construction of an alternative bat roost outside of the work area. The Project Biologist will implement the relocation plan and new roost sites shall be in place before the commencement of ground-disturbing activities that would occur within 500 feet of the hibernaculum where the qualified biologist deems removal to be more beneficial than avoidance. If avoidance is possible without disturbing the bats, then avoidance will be implemented. New roost sites shall be in place prior to the initiation of Project-related activities to allow enough time for bats to relocate. ~~Removal of roosts will be guided by accepted exclusion and deterrent techniques.~~ The relocation plan may include the following elements: • Required pre-construction surveys and monitoring		

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0578

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
• Timing considerations for temporal avoidance (e.g., outside of the maternity season if the project may potentially impact a maternity roost or non-flying juvenile bats) • Humane relocation and exclusion methods to remove and/or exclude bats from roosting sites within structures or vegetation slated for removal • Protective fencing or signage to avoid impacts to potential roosting habitat that shall remain on site • Best Management Practices for minimizing the effects of noise, human activity, dust, lighting, and ground vibrations on bats • On and/or off-site mitigation measures to compensate for lost roosting habitat, including installation of alternative roosting habitat • Monitoring to evaluate the effectiveness of bat-related mitigation		
Mitigation Measure #6: Bat Compensatory Mitigation – If the Project shall impact confirmed habitat of bats and avoidance is not achievable, the Project proponent shall provide compensatory mitigation for temporary and permanent loss of any habitat supporting SSC. There should be no net loss of habitat supporting SSC (CEQA Guidelines, § 15370(e)). Mitigation shall provide appropriate habitat (depending on the species), refugia, and habitat structures that support that species. Additionally, mitigation shall include habitat of comparable size, function, and quality should be created or preserved and maintained in the new bat habitat, or for bats in trees, at a nearby suitable undisturbed area. Additionally, the mitigation and monitoring plan shall include a discussion on the territory size; roosting and foraging locations; food availability; and how all life cycle functions will be mitigated. The mitigation and monitoring plan shall describe proposed mitigation habitat and include performance standards for the use of replacement roosts/hibernacula by the displaced species, as well as provisions to prevent harassment, predation, and	Prior to Project Initiation	Project Proponent

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0578

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
disease of relocated bats. Bat mitigation methods may include, but is not limited to, Texas Bat Abode-style structures, Oregon wedges, and other alternate bat roosting habitat installation depending on the impact area. The Authority shall consult and coordinate with CDFW regarding bat habitat creation and implementation if necessary.		
Lake and Streambed Alteration Notification CDFW has regulatory authority over activities in streams that will divert or obstruct the natural flow, or change the bed, channel, or bank (which may include associated riparian resources) of any river, stream, or lake or use material from a river, stream, or lake. For any such activities, the Project proponent (or "entity") must provide written notification to CDFW pursuant to section 1600 et seq. of the Fish and Game Code. Based on this notification and other information, CDFW determines whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (LSAA) with the applicant is required prior to conducting the proposed activities. CDFW's issuance of a LSAA for a project that is subject to CEQA will require CEQA compliance actions by CDFW as a Responsible Agency. A Notification package for a LSAA may be obtained by accessing CDFW's Lake and Streambed Alteration Program website[8].	Prior to Project Initiation	Project Proponent
Fully Protected Species. The EIR/EIS notes that white-tailed kite was observed and there is potential for this Fully Protected species to forage within the Project site. Fully Protected Species may not be taken or possessed at any time according to the Fish and Game Code § 3511. CDFW cannot authorize take for white-tailed kite and	Prior to Project Initiation/During Project Construction	Lead Agency

[8] http://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/LSA

Docusign Envelope ID: 43DD6853-B98B-445B-BC6A-DCD3528788E0

0564

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
the Authority must completely avoid impacts to these species during Project's construction and operational activities.		
Use of Rodenticides. Vegetation may need to be managed via chemical methods. Herbicides, pesticides, and rodenticides may impact wildlife. Second generation anticoagulant rodenticides are known to have harmful effects on the ecosystem and wildlife. Assembly Bill 1788[9] prohibits the use of any second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides because second generation anticoagulant rodenticides have a higher toxicity and are more dangerous to nontarget wildlife (California Legislative Information 2020). CDFW recommends the Final EIR/EIS include a discussion as to the Project's use of herbicides, pesticides, and second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides to maintain the restored areas within the Project site in perpetuity. CDFW recommends the Authority include measures that would prohibit the use of any second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides throughout the Project.	Prior to Project Initiation/During Project Construction	Lead Agency

[9] https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB1788

20.5 Response to Submission 013819 (Joleena De La Fe, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Feb 3, 2026)

20.5.1 0558

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) appreciates the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (CDFW) role as outlined in its comment letter dated February 2, 2026.

20.5.2 0559

As described in Chapter 9, Public and Agency Involvement, the Authority acknowledges CDFW's authority as a responsible agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In addition, as described in Section 3.7, Biological and Aquatic Resources, the Authority will coordinate with CDFW should a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement be required prior to project construction, pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Section 1600 et seq. Lastly, the Authority acknowledges its responsibility if the project would result in a "take" of listed species.

20.5.3 0560

This comment summarizes the high-speed rail (HSR) project objectives and elements of the project. No response is required.

20.5.4 0561

This is an accurate description of the biological resources within the Supplemental Resource Study Area (RSA), the vegetation communities within the Wildlife RSA, the studies completed, potential species of concern within the Wildlife RSA, and a description of avoidance and minimization measures and mitigation measures. No changes to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) have been made in response to this comment.

20.5.5 0562

Regarding unarmored threespine stickleback (federal Endangered Species Act [FESA] endangered, California ESA [CESA] endangered, CDFW fully protected), the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section (project section) is not within the range of this species and this species is not expected to occur. There are four populations of this species. The nearest population is approximately 22 miles to the north of the project section, north of San Fernando in the Santa Clarita area. Therefore, this species was not included in the Draft EIR/EIS.

Regarding Western Joshua Tree (CESA candidate), the project section is separated from the range of this species by the San Gabriel Mountain range; this species is therefore not in the range of the project section, has no potential to occur, and was not included in the Draft EIR/EIS.

The following topics are addressed in Section 3.7 of the Draft EIR/EIS as specified below. These topics are also addressed in the *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Biological and Aquatic Resources Technical Report* (BARTR). Wildlife connectivity is addressed in Section 3.7.6.3, Project Impacts, in Impact BIO-6 and Impact BIO-11. Mountain lion (CESA Candidate) is addressed in Section 3.7.6.3 in Impact BIO-4 and Impact BIO-10. Western Burrowing Owl (CESA Candidate) is addressed in Section 3.7.6.3 in Impact BIO-3 and Impact BIO-9. Special-status plants are addressed in Section 3.7.6.3 in Impact BIO-2 and Impact BIO-8. Special-status bats are addressed in Section 3.7.6.3 in Impact BIO-4 and Impact BIO-10. Sensitive natural communities are addressed in Section 3.7.6.3 in Impact BIO-1 and Impact BIO-8.

Crotch's bumble bee (CESA candidate endangered), Monarch butterfly (FESA proposed threatened), and western pond turtle (FESA proposed threatened, California species of special concern) are not expected to occur and are addressed in the BARTR in Appendix A, Special-Status Species Potentially Occurring in the Resource Study Area.

Regarding CDFW's participation in quarterly HSR meetings, the Authority also meets weekly with CDFW Region 4 managers to review ongoing and future work. The Authority asks that Region 5 consider joining these calls and coordinating with Region 4 on future efforts related to the HSR project.

20.5.6 0563

Potential impacts on Burrowing Owl and applicable mitigation measures are discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section 3.7, pp. 3.7-85 through 3.7-94.

The Authority acknowledges CDFW's concerns regarding potential impacts on Burrowing Owl during project construction activities and its assertion that BIO-MM#20, Conduct Protocol Surveys for Burrowing Owls; BIO-MM#21, Implement Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Burrowing Owl; and BIO-MM#44, Provide Compensatory Mitigation for Loss of Active Burrowing Owl Burrows and Habitat, would not reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels under CEQA. CDFW proposes specific revisions to BIO-MM#20, BIO-MM#21, and BIO-MM#44 in subsequent comments #0564, 0565, 0566, and 0567 below. The Authority also acknowledges CDFW's concern that inadequate avoidance or mitigation may result in a substantial adverse direct and cumulative effects, either directly or through habitat modification. Please refer to responses to comments #0564, 0565, 0566, and 0567 below for details on how these mitigation measures have been revised.

The Authority recently acquired incidental take authorization for Burrowing Owl for the Fresno to Bakersfield Project Section of the California HSR System, and understands its responsibilities under the CESA. Burrowing Owl is currently a candidate species under CESA, and may be subsequently listed as threatened or endangered. The Authority has revised BIO-MM#21 and BIO-MM#44 to more directly address Burrowing Owl's CESA status. Refer to Section 16.5.7, Section 3.7: Biological and Aquatic Resources, in Chapter 16, Corrections and Additions to the Draft Report, for these revisions.

The *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (CDFG 2012) does not recommend burrow exclusion and closure; however, this document does describe this process in Appendix E. Burrowing Owl burrow exclusion and closure are necessary when a proposed project would otherwise result in the direct mortality of Burrowing Owls and is a method to provide additional burrowing opportunities in the vicinity should eviction be absolutely necessary. Eviction would only occur outside of the nesting season and would be completed by a qualified biologist, after the preparation of a Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan (per Appendix E of the *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation*). This is the only feasible method to avoid direct mortality of Burrowing Owls should they occur in the project work area and are unavoidable. For this reason, nest eviction and relocation provide a method to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels where impacts are unavoidable and otherwise constitute direct mortality. Should Burrowing Owl be a candidate or listed species, an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) would be sought for such an action through BIO-MM#44. However, relocation of Burrowing Owls will trigger coordination by the Authority with CDFW regardless of listing status of the species. This impact would be less than significant under CEQA because direct impacts on Burrowing Owls would be avoided and alternative burrowing opportunities provided. If the species is listed or remains a candidate, an ITP would be sought from CDFW.

Buffers where no work will occur will be determined by the Project Biologist based on project conditions, Burrowing Owl behavior, burrow conditions, and expert knowledge of the species, and also based on guidance from the *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (CDFG 2012). Buffer distances and buffer reductions will therefore be based on biological needs of the species and will be at the discretion and expertise of the Project Biologist as outlined in BIO-MM#21. This is sufficient to protect Burrowing Owls from impacts from the Project, because the buffers will be based on site conditions and biology. Because buffers would be appropriate to the conditions and the species, this impact would be less than significant under CEQA. Revisions per comment #0565 below are consistent with CDFW requirements and are considered to be adequate per the analysis. Revisions per comments #0566 and #0567 below, including revisions to mitigation measures BIO-MM#21 and BIO-MM#44, provide requirements should Burrowing Owl remain a candidate species or become listed, and require an ITP. These measures also include requirements for appropriate buffers based on project conditions. In the event Burrowing Owl is not a listed or candidate species requiring an ITP, the Authority confirms relocation will only occur outside of the nesting season (per BIO-MM#21). Any impacts on active Burrowing Owl burrows during the nesting season would require an ITP should Burrowing Owl be a candidate or listed species (BIO-MM#44).

With implementation of these measures, the project would not have a substantial adverse impact on Burrowing Owl or Burrowing Owl habitat.

Please refer to Chapter 16, Section 16.5.7, BIO-MM#20; BIO-MM#21; BIO-MM#44; BIO-MM#54, Prepare and Implement an Annual Vegetation Control Plan; and BIO-MM#56, Conduct Monitoring of Construction Activities, of the Final EIR/EIS for these changes.

20.5.7 0564

The Authority intends to avoid take of Burrowing Owl. However, if Burrowing Owl is listed as threatened or endangered or remains a candidate species, is present in the project work site, and full avoidance cannot be achieved, the Authority will submit an ITP application to CDFW. Please refer to BIO-MM#21 and BIO-MM#44 and the discussion below for these changes.

20.5.8 0565

The Authority appreciates CDFW's recommendations. The Authority will follow the take avoidance (preconstruction) survey guidelines designed to detect the presence of Burrowing Owls on a project site at a fixed period in time and inform necessary take-avoidance actions, as outlined in CDFW's *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (CDFG 2012) until this guidance is updated by CDFW. The 2012 staff report remains CDFW's most recent guidance available at this time. BIO-MM#20 has been revised to modify the preconstruction survey window from 30 days to 14 days, and to add a final survey 24 hours prior to commencing ground-disturbing activities. Please refer to Final EIR/EIS Chapter 16, Section 16.5.7, BIO-MM#20 for these revisions.

20.5.9 0566

The Authority acknowledges that, as originally proposed, BIO-MM#21 cannot be implemented absent incidental take authorization, because Burrowing Owl is currently a candidate species under CESA. BIO-MM#44 has been revised to state that the Authority will obtain an ITP if Burrowing Owl remains a candidate species or becomes listed and occurs within the work area. If Burrowing Owl is not a candidate or listed, BIO-MM#21 states that the Authority will implement CDFW's *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation*, which outlines steps to avoid, evict, or relocate Burrowing Owl. These revisions make both mitigation measures enforceable.

BIO-MM#21 has not been revised to include a 1,650-foot buffer, because buffer sizes will be determined by the Project Biologist based on project conditions, Burrowing Owl behavior, burrow conditions, and expert knowledge of the species, with guidance from the *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (CDFG 2012). The biological needs of the species will determine buffer distances and buffer reductions, and this will be at the discretion of the Project Biologist. Because buffers would be appropriate to the conditions and the species, this impact would be less than significant under CEQA.

Please refer to Final EIR/EIS Chapter 16, Section 16.5.7, BIO-MM#21 of the Final EIR/EIS for changes to this measure.

20.5.10 0567

If Burrowing Owls are detected during surveys as outlined in BIO-MM#20, and Burrowing Owl is a candidate or listed species, the Authority may submit an ITP application to CDFW. Details of the compensatory mitigation requirements are expected to be outlined in the ITP issued by CDFW. The title of BIO-MM#44, Provide Compensatory Mitigation for Loss of Active Burrowing Owl Burrows and Habitat, has been revised to BIO-MM#44, Obtain an Incidental Take Permit under the California Endangered Species Act for Burrowing Owl.

In the event the Authority does not acquire an ITP but will cause loss of Burrowing Owl habitat, the Authority will develop a Compensatory Mitigation Plan for Burrowing Owl requiring the concurrence of CDFW and satisfying the criteria laid out in this comment. Please refer to the revised BIO-MM#44 in Section 16.5.7 of Chapter 16 for these changes.

20.5.11 0568

The Authority acknowledges CDFW's concern regarding potential impacts on special-status (species of special concern) bat species as a result of the project. CDFW notes that species of special concern meet the definition of rare, threatened, or endangered species under CEQA and that CDFW considers adverse impacts on species of special concern to be significant without mitigation.

CDFW is concerned that BIO-MM#26, Implement Bat Avoidance and Relocation Measures; and BIO-MM#27, Implement Bat Exclusion and Deterrence Measures, require avoidance or relocation of active hibernacula or maternity roosts, and that the Draft EIR/EIS did not state what the "accepted exclusion and deterrent techniques" used for relocation would be or their origin. Although the Authority believes the measures identified in the Draft EIR/EIS would adequately mitigate impacts on special-status bat species, in response to this comment, the Authority has provided revisions and specifications with respect to each mitigation measure for special-status bats in Section 16.5.7. The Authority has also clarified the guidance the Authority will follow in implementation: *Caltrans Bat Mitigation: A Guide to Developing Feasible and Effective Solutions* (Johnston et. al 2021).

The Authority notes CDFW's concern that no compensatory mitigation is proposed for the potential loss of roosting habitat, and suggests providing similarly functioning habitat as a form of mitigation. The Authority further responds to this aspect of the comment in its response to comment #0571 below.

20.5.12 0569

The Authority has revised BIO-MM#25, Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Special-Status Bat Species, to include preconstruction surveys per *Caltrans Bat Mitigation: A Guide to Developing Feasible and Effective Solutions* (Johnston et. al 2021). Preconstruction surveys will be completed no earlier than 30 days prior to construction and will include appropriate buffer distances as determined by the Project Biologist and as specified in BIO-MM#25. The Project Biologist may determine that additional surveys, prior to preconstruction surveys, may be required to develop effective mitigation strategies. Surveys to plan for effective mitigation may begin up to 2 years prior to construction to identify bat species present and their locations. The requirement for these surveys and timing is at the discretion of the Project Biologist and is based on resources present for bats and proposed construction activities. The Authority believes this strategy enhances BIO-MM#25.

Please refer to Final EIR/EIS Section 16.5.7 of Chapter 16 for these changes.

20.5.13 0570

The Authority notes that its preference is to practice full avoidance, but there may be a scenario where avoidance cannot be achieved. Therefore, the Authority cannot accept the initial underlined language striking that avoidance will occur "to the extent feasible." The Authority has specified that avoidance and other measures in BIO-MM#26 and BIO-MM#27 will follow *Caltrans Bat Mitigation: A Guide to Developing Feasible and Effective Solutions* (Johnston et. al 2021), and provided greater specificity in BIO-MM#26 with respect to potential avoidance, passive exclusion, and elements of relocation plan measures.

The Authority appreciates CDFW's additional details in BIO-MM#26, but cannot universally limit project activities to between October and February for each maternity roost or apply a 500-foot buffer around each hibernaculum of the project work area in all circumstances. The Authority concludes that BIO-MM#26 and BIO-MM#27 as revised are sufficient to fully mitigate, avoid, or both all significant impacts. The Authority's revisions to BIO-MM#26 clarify relocation will occur outside maternity season, if at all, and that relocation will occur only where it is anticipated to provide equivalent or superior protection for bats. Where this is not true, additional avoidance measures (including those listed in revised BIO-MM#26 and including buffer zones) may be considered to further mitigate any impact.

The Authority has accepted CDFW's suggested requirement that new roost sites be in place prior to implementation of the relocation plan, and to allow sufficient time to allow relocation from roosts.

Please refer to Final EIR/EIS Chapter 16, Section 16.5.7, BIO-MM#26 for these changes.

20.5.14 0571

The Authority appreciates CDFW comments, but respectfully concludes that the project will not result in a net loss of habitat supporting bats, as discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section 3.7.6.3. It is anticipated that the project's modifications to existing structures like bridges will result in in-kind replacement of habitat, meaning there will be no net loss as a result of such activities. Additionally, unlike western

yellow bat that prefers to roost in palm fronds, pocketed free-tailed bats will use human-made structures for roosting, so the project structure itself may ultimately provide roosting sites. No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.5.15 0572

The Authority acknowledges its responsibility under California Fish and Game Code Section 1600 et seq. Please refer to responses to comments #0558 and 0559 above.

20.5.16 0573

The Authority acknowledges its responsibility pertaining to the requirement for complete avoidance of fully protected species. As described in Section 3.7.6.3 of the Draft EIR/EIS, Impact BIO-3, the Authority will completely avoid impacts on fully protected species during construction activities. Refer to BIO-MM#68, Avoid and Minimize Impacts on White-Tailed Kite, in Section 3.7.7, Mitigation Measures, of the Draft EIR/EIS.

20.5.17 0574

Please refer to the existing mitigation measure in Draft EIR/EIS Section 3.7.7, BIO-MM#54, that requires the preparation of a Vegetation Control Plan (VCP). The use of rodenticides and the requirements of BIO-MM#54 are discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section 3.7.6.3 in Impact BIO-8, Impact BIO-9, Impact BIO-10, Impact BIO-11, and Impact BIO-12. BIO-MM#54 expressly provides that the use of rodenticides is prohibited. The VCP is required to be prepared every year and includes “Other chemical pest control methods (e.g., insects, snail, rodent).” For clarity, this measure will be modified. Please refer to Chapter 16, Section 16.5.7 of the Final EIR/EIS for these changes.

20.5.18 0575

The Authority acknowledges and appreciates CDFW’s feedback and comments. The Authority is committed to implementing a mitigation program that meets the needs of CEQA, NEPA, and other state and federal regulations through a robust EIR/EIS environmental document and obtaining all necessary permits. The Authority has reviewed and considered those proposals, as described in detail in the responses above.

20.5.19 0576

The Authority acknowledges the comment and recommendation pertaining to its responsibility to report all special-status species to the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). Any special-status species and natural communities detected during surveys will be reported to the CNDDB. BIO-MM#56 has been revised in Final EIR/EIS Section 16.5.7 regarding inclusion of the requirement to report special-status species and sensitive natural communities to the CNDDB.

20.5.20 0577

If the project is approved, the Authority will pay any required filing fee upon filing of the Notice of Determination.

20.5.21 0578

Per responses to comments #0564, 0565, 0566, 0567, 0568, 0569, 0570, 0574, and 0576 above, edits to BIO-MM#20, BIO-MM#21, BIO-MM#25, BIO-MM#26, BIO-MM#27, BIO-MM#44, BIO-MM#54, and BIO-MM#56 have been made. Please refer to Chapter 16, Section 16.5.7 of the Final EIR/EIS for these changes.

Los Angeles to Anaheim - RECORD #013837 DETAIL

Status:	Unread
Record Date:	02/03/2026
Interest As:	State Agency
Full Name:	Richard Le

Stakeholder Comments/Issues:

Please find attached LAA Comment Letter from CPUC. From: Le, Richard Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 1:23 PM To: Galvez, Stefan@HSR ; OPR State Clearinghouse Cc: Truong, Anh ; Bond, Matthew ; Leible, Maria ; Martinez, Dionisio Subject: SCH 2007031067 (JD) - CAHSR - Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section - CPUC Reply Greetings, The California Public Utilities Commission's Rail Crossings and Engineering Branch (RCEB) has reviewed the JD filed under SCH 2007031067, titled "California High-Speed Rail Project - Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section" by the California High Speed Rail Authority. Attached is our response letter to this filing. Please feel free to reach out should you have any questions. Best, Richard _____ Richard Le, P.E. Rail Crossings and Engineering Branch Rail Safety Division California Public Utilities Commission Cell:

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
320 WEST 4TH STREET, SUITE 500
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

January 26, 2026 ENVR 20251200006

Stefan Galvez-Abadia
Director of Environmental Services
California High-Speed Rail Authority
770 L Street, Suite 620
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: California High-Speed Rail Project - Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section SCH 2007031067 – *Joint Document JD*

Dear Stefan Galvez-Abadia,

The California Public Utilities Commission (Commission/CPUC) has jurisdiction over rail crossings (crossings) in California. CPUC ensures that crossings are safely designed, constructed, and maintained. The Commission's Rail Crossings Engineering Branch (RCEB) is in receipt of the Joint Document (JD) for the proposed California High-Speed Rail Project - Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section. The California High-Speed Rail Authority (CAHSR) is the lead agency.

CAHSR's JD examines the 30-mile Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section of the CAHSR project between the Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) and the Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center (ARTIC). The section proposes two alternative designs, both of which will run along shared railroad corridors from LAUS to ARTIC with the following corridor modifications:

- Overhead catenary installation from north of the US 101 Freeway to First Street
- Two electrified tracks to be shared between CAHSR and passenger rail from First Street to the I-10 Freeway
- Two existing tracks will be electrified between the I-10 Freeway and Downey Road
- Two new tracks will be added between Downey Road and Fullerton Junction
- Two existing tracks will be electrified between Fullerton Junction and the ARTIC

The project also intends to fully grade separate the following 5 existing at-grade crossings:

Roadway Name	CPUC Number	DOT Number
Pioneer Blvd	002-152.29	027647B
Norwalk Blvd	002-153.10	027649P
Los Nietos Road	002-153.40	027650J
Cerritos Avenue	101OR-169.69	026651M
State College Blvd	101OR-170.21	026652U

1758

The following highway-rail crossings will remain at grade or partially grade separate the crossing (CAHSR tracks grade separated with existing freight track remaining at grade):

1758

Roadway Name	CPUC Number	DOT Number	Notes
Lakeland Ave	002-155.10	027653E	• HSR to be on aerial structure while freight rail to remain at-grade • 2 crossing incidents in the last 20 years
Orangethorpe Ave	101OR-166.18	026640A	• High volume roadway • 2 crossing incidents in the last 20 years • Within a quiet zone
La Palma Ave	101OR-167.04	026642N	• 5 crossing incidents in the last 20 years • Within a quiet zone
Sycamore St	101OR-167.44	026643V	• Potential sightline limitations due to industry and residential • 3 crossing incidents in the last 20 years • Within a quiet zone
Broadway	101OR-167.91	026645J	• Potential sightline limitations due to industry and residential • Within a quiet zone
Santa Ana St	101OR-168.06	026646R	• Potential sightline limitations due to industry and residential • 1 crossing incident in the last 20 years • Within a quiet zone
South St	101OR-168.38	026647X	• Potential sightline limitations due to industry and residential • 2 crossing incidents in the last 20 years • Within a quiet zone
Vermont Ave	101OR-168.64	026648E	• Potential sightline limitations due to industry • Within a quiet zone
Ball Rd	101OR-169.12	026649L	• Potential sightline limitations due to industry and residential • High volume roadway • 3 crossing incidents in the last 20 years • Within a quiet zone

1759

Assuming full funding, CAHSR intends to run a total of 2 all-stop trains per hour in each direction on the segment between LAUS and ARTIC. Many of the aforementioned crossing incidents involved pedestrians, and both Ball Road and Orangethorpe Avenue are also roadways with higher vehicular

1759 traffic volumes. Given the increase in train traffic along the corridor as well as much of the remaining at-grade crossings having reduced sightlines of the tracks due to their locations in dense residential and industry areas, CPUC recommends the entire corridor be grade separated with no at-grade highway-rail crossings. Grade separated crossings provide a greater level of safety, for both the roadway users as well as railroad employees, than at-grade highway-rail crossings. Ideally, all tracks at every at-grade crossing would be grade separated under this recommendation, but at a minimum CAHSR should consider grade separating any track it uses. The inclusion of many of the aforementioned crossings in quiet zones, where trains are not required to sound their horn, further compounds the concern of sightline limitations as pedestrians may elect to go around railroad warning devices unaware of an approaching train or trains from both directions.

1760 Additionally, CAHSR notes that along the LAUS to ARTIC corridor, HSR will cross other railroad tracks at-grade at 5 new crossing locations, 1 in Los Angeles, 1 in Vernon, 2 in Santa Fe Springs, and 1 in Anaheim. Similar to the concerns raised with highway-rail crossings, CPUC recommends grade-separating all of these crossings to increase safety to railroad workers and train traffic.

1761 In addition to the CAHSR station at ARTIC the project will also modify numerous railroad yards and equipment as well as the existing Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs, Fullerton, Commerce, and Buena Park Metrolink stations:

Station Name	Modifications
Norwalk	• Shift the station 350 feet east and elevate the platforms with surface access to the platforms via stairs, escalators, and elevators • Construct two new shared tracks for Metrolink and CAHSR to the platform along with a new grade-separated crossing over Imperial Hwy east of the existing BNSF crossing
Fullerton	• Fourth mainline freight track added on south side of the corridor • Construct two new shared tracks for Metrolink and CAHSR south of the existing corridor and realign Walnut Ave to account for new railroad right-of-way • Replace both existing south platforms with center platform over Harbor Blvd. • Removal of existing pedestrian bridge crossing (002-165.05-AD, 027891X) and install a pedestrian underpass linking the north platform to center platform and Walnut Ave.
Commerce	• Relocate to the northeast corner of Maple Ave. and Telegraph Rd. • Construct a center platform on the southern side of the corridor with pedestrian access via a new tunnel between the parking lot south of the station, and Sycamore St.
Buena Park	• Relocate to an area between Coyote Creek and Beach Blvd. on the southwest corner of Beach Blvd. and Stage Rd. • Construct a center platform on the northern side of the corridor with pedestrian access via a new tunnel between the parking lot north of the station.

1761 CAHSR shall also ensure that any corridor, crossing, or station modifications comply with CPUC General Orders (GO), including GO 26-D clearance requirements. Crossing improvement projects, including signal timing modifications, require authorization from the CPUC under CPUC General Order

1761

88-B (GO 88-B) while new crossings require CAHSR to submit formal applications to the Commission for authorization. CAHSR should coordinate with CPUC staff to determine which crossing modifications, including at station, rail-rail, and highway-rail crossings will require authorization through a GO 88-B request or a formal application. For example, the new pedestrian tunnels at the new Commerce and Buena Park stations will require formal applications as they are new crossings. Additionally, at the Norwalk station, the new grade-separated passenger tracks, given their distance east from the existing crossing at Imperial Highway (002-156.10-B, 027654L) will be considered a new crossing over Imperial Highway and require a formal application.

1763

Any proposed crossing improvement project, including signal timing modifications, must also conform to the goals of the CPUC's Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan. This includes improving safety and access to transportation, improving local air quality and public health, and expanding outreach and public participation opportunities in disadvantaged communities. For more information, please visit https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/esjactionplan.

RCEB is available to discuss any potential safety impacts or concerns at this location and address any questions from the CAHSR.

If you have any questions, please contact Richard Le at , or richard.le@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Anh Truong, PE
Senior Utilities Engineer (Supervisor)
Rail Crossings Engineering Branch
Rail Safety Division

cc: State Clearinghouse, state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov
Dionisio Martinez, BNSF, dionisio.martinez@bnsf.com
Maria Leible, Southern California Regional Rail Authority/Metrolink, leiblem@scrra.net

20.6 Response to Submission 013837 (Richard Le, California Public Utilities Commission, Feb 3, 2026)

20.6.1 1758

Refer to Standard Response LAA-Response-Section 3.11 S&S-01: At-Grade Crossing Safety, in Chapter 18, Standard Responses. Information provided by the commenter in the table is consistent with the data disclosed in Volume 2, Appendix 3.11-A, Safety and Security Data, Table 3.11-A-6, and provided in Section 3.11, Safety and Security. Please note that although the commenter provided at-grade crossing incidents over the past 20 years, the Draft EIR/EIS limited analysis to at-grade crossing incidents since 2018.

20.6.2 1759

Refer to Standard Response LAA-Response-Chapter 2 Alt-05: Grade Separations, in Chapter 18.

Refer to Standard Response LAA-Response-Section 3.11 S&S-01: At-Grade Crossing Safety, in Chapter 18.

20.6.3 1760

Refer to Standard Response LAA-Response-Section 3.11 S&S-01: At-Grade Crossing Safety, in Chapter 18.

The commenter incorrectly asserts that there would be five new high-speed rail (HSR)-railroad at-grade crossings in the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section (project section). However, there are only four of these crossings in this project section. They can be found in Volume 3.1: General, Track Alignment, and Right-of-Way Part 1, of the Preliminary Engineering for Project Definition at the following locations: Vernon, SBY 223+80.00 (two new diamond crossings) Santa Fe Springs, SBN 614+46.45 (pg. 103 of 399) Santa Fe Springs, SBN 666+10.30 (pg. 107 of 399) Anaheim, SOC 1556+61.70 These four locations are existing at-grade rail crossings with infrequent rail traffic. There is no new proposed HSR-railroad track crossing in Los Angeles. The Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would introduce a new fourth main track crossing adjacent to the existing tracks at three of these four locations, and two new tracks for BNSF Railway West Hobart lead track and HSR 26th Street light maintenance facility lead track, with two new diamond crossings in Vernon. The Authority acknowledges that, while grade separating each of these existing at-grade crossings is desirable, that design change would result in adverse impacts on surrounding communities because it would require a heavy level of construction activity and a large construction footprint that extends beyond the existing railroad corridor, as well as substantially increase project costs.

20.6.4 1761

The Authority acknowledges the table provided by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), which summarizes proposed modifications to four Metrolink stations: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs, Fullerton, Commerce, and Buena Park. Applicable design standards, including CPUC General Order 26-D, are outlined in Appendix 2-B, Applicable Design Standards. The Authority will comply with all relevant laws, regulations, and industry standard practices for design and construction of the project, and will coordinate with CPUC during the next stages of design on any required grade-crossing applications (CPUC 2004). No revisions have been made to the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement in response to this comment.

20.6.5 1763

The Authority acknowledges CPUC's mission to regulate essential utility services to protect consumers and safeguard the environment while ensuring safe and reliable access to all Californians (CPUC 2022). Diagnostic meetings will be scheduled with CPUC for all proposed modifications of crossings to ensure the proposed design meets all railroad, CPUC, agency, and stakeholder needs.

Los Angeles to Anaheim - RECORD #013839 DETAIL

Status:	Unread
Record Date:	02/03/2026
Interest As:	State Agency
Full Name:	Jeffery Esquivel

Stakeholder Comments/Issues:

See attached PDF comment letterFrom: Esquivel, Jeffery@CalRecycle Sent: Tuesday, February 3, 2026 9:58 AM To: Galvez, Stefan@HSR Cc: Young, Stephanie@CalRecycle ; Escotto, Benjamin@CalRecycle ; dcheng@ochca.com; lfrias@ph.lacounty.gov; FAgyin@cityofvernon.org; state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov; 'jose.gutierrez@lacity.org' Subject: CEQA Comment Letter, California High-Speed Rail Project - Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section (SCH#2007031067) Hello – The Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) is submitting a comment letter for the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement, titled California High-Speed Rail Project - Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section (SCH#2007031067). Please see attached document. Thank you. Jeffery Esquivel Training & Assistance Section Permitting & Assistance Branch Waste Permitting, Compliance, & Mitigation Division Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) 1001 I Street, MS#10A Sacramento, CA 95814 916.341.6337

California Environmental Protection Agency

Gavin Newsom
California Governor

Yana Garcia
Secretary for Environmental Protection

Zoe Heller
CalRecycle Director

Department of
Resources Recycling and Recovery

February 3, 2026

California High-Speed Rail Authority
Attn: Los Angeles to Anaheim Draft EIR/EIS Comment
355 S Grand Avenue, Suite 2050
Los Angeles, CA 90071

Subject: **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Comment Letter for the Draft Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement, titled California High-Speed Rail Project - Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section (State Clearinghouse Number 2007031067)**

The Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) would like to provide comments on the proposed Subject project and for your agency's consideration of these comments as part of the CEQA process.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

0923

The California High-Speed Rail Authority, acting as Lead Agency, has prepared and circulated a Draft Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement, in order to comply with CEQA and to provide information to, and solicit consultation with, Responsible Agencies in the approval of the proposed project.

The proposed project titled, California High-Speed Rail Project - Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section, will create approximately 30-miles of high-speed rail service within the Counties of Los Angeles and Orange. The project has indicated that several closed and active landfills are adjacent to the project footprint within the County of Los Angeles may be impacted.

COMMENTS

0924

If closed or active landfills are affected by the project the following regulatory requirements may need to be addressed for each affected site:

Section 21190 - CIWMB-Postclosure Land Use

(a) Proposed postclosure land uses shall be designed and maintained to:

(1) protect public health and safety and prevent damage to structures, roads, utilities and gas monitoring and control systems;

(2) prevent public contact with waste, landfill gas and leachate; and

0924

(3) prevent landfill gas explosions.

(b) The site design shall consider one or more proposed uses of the site toward which the operator will direct its efforts, or shall show development as open space, graded to harmonize with the setting and landscaped with native shrubbery or low maintenance ground cover.

(c) All proposed postclosure land uses, other than non-irrigated open space, on sites implementing closure or on closed sites shall be submitted to the EA, RWQCB, local air district and local land use agency. The EA shall review and approve proposed postclosure land uses if the project involves structures within 1,000 feet of the disposal area, structures on top of waste, modification of the low permeability layer, or irrigation over waste.

(d) Construction on the site shall maintain the integrity of the final cover, drainage and erosion control systems, and gas monitoring and control systems. The owner or operator shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the EA that the activities will not pose a threat to public health and safety and the environment. Any proposed modification or replacement of the low permeability layer of the final cover shall begin upon approval by the EA, and the RWQCB.

(e) Construction of structural improvements on top of landfilled areas during the postclosure period shall meet the following conditions:

(1) automatic methane gas sensors, designed to trigger an audible alarm when methane concentrations are detected, shall be installed in all buildings;

(2) enclosed basement construction is prohibited;

(3) buildings shall be constructed to mitigate the effects of gas accumulation, which may include an active gas collection or passive vent systems;

(4) buildings and utilities shall be constructed to mitigate the effects of differential settlement. All utility connections shall be designed with flexible connections and utility collars;

(5) utilities shall not be installed in or below any low permeability layer of final cover;

(6) pilings shall not be installed in or through any bottom liner unless approved by the RWQCB;

(7) if pilings are installed in or through the low permeability layer of final cover, then the low permeability layer must be replaced or repaired; and

(8) periodic methane gas monitoring shall be conducted inside all buildings and underground utilities in accordance with § 20933 of Article 6, of Subchapter 4 of this Chapter.

(f) The EA may require that an additional soil layer or building pad be placed on the final cover prior to construction to protect the integrity and function of the various layers of final cover.

0924

(g) All on-site construction within 1,000 feet of the boundary of any disposal area shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the following, or in accordance with an equivalent design which will prevent gas migration into the building, unless an exemption has been issued:

(1) a geomembrane or equivalent system with low permeability to landfill gas shall be installed between the concrete floor slab of the building and subgrade;

(2) a permeable layer of open graded material of clean aggregate with a minimum thickness of 12 inches shall be installed between the geomembrane and the subgrade or slab;

(3) a geotextile filter shall be utilized to prevent the introduction of fines into the permeable layer;

(4) perforated venting pipes shall be installed within the permeable layer, and shall be designed to operate without clogging;

(5) the venting pipe shall be constructed with the ability to be connected to an induced draft exhaust system;

(6) automatic methane gas sensors shall be installed within the permeable gas layer, and inside the building to trigger an audible alarm when methane gas concentrations are detected; and

(7) periodic methane gas monitoring shall be conducted inside all buildings and underground utilities in accordance with Article 6, of Subchapter 4 of this chapter (§ 20920 et seq.).

Gas Monitoring and Control Requirements

Sections 20921 through 20939 set forth the performance standards and the minimum substantive requirements for landfill gas monitoring and control systems for active solid waste disposal sites and for the proper closure, postclosure maintenance and ultimate reuse of solid waste disposal sites.

Closure and Postclosure Maintenance Standards

Sections 21090 through 21200 set forth the performance standards and minimum substantive requirements for proper closure, postclosure maintenance and ultimate reuse of disposal sites. Site specific conditions may be required to be described in the affected site's Closure Plan to ensure public health and safety and the environment are protected.

Solid Waste Regulatory Oversight

Solid Waste local enforcement agencies (LEA) are designated by the governing body of a county or city and, upon certification by CalRecycle, are empowered to implement delegated CalRecycle programs and locally designated activities. LEAs have the primary responsibility for ensuring the correct operation and closure of solid waste facilities in the state. They also have responsibilities for guaranteeing the proper storage and transportation of solid wastes.

0924 As mentioned, LEAs must review and approve all postclosure land uses. It is encouraged that the project proponent and the Lead Agency reach out to the LEA to determine whether the project has the potential to impact active or closed solid waste disposal sites and to discuss applicable postclosure land use requirements for those sites affected. Contact information for each LEA can be found at CalRecycle's LEA Directory Database.

CONCLUSION

0925 CalRecycle staff thanks the Lead Agency for the opportunity to review and com ment on the environmental document and hopes that this comment letter will be useful to the Lead Agency preparing the Final EIR and in carrying out their responsibilities in the CEQA process.

CalRecycle staff requests copies of any subsequent environmental documents, copies of public notices and any Notices of Determination for this proposed project. If the environmental document is adopted during a public hearing, CalRecycle staff requests 10 days advance notice of this hearing. If the document is adopted without a public hearing, CalRecycle staff requests 10 days advance notification of the date of the adoption and proposed project approval by the decision-making body.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Stephanie Young at 916.323.1100 or by e-mail at Stephanie.Young@CalRecycle.ca.gov for any discussions about a closed, illegal, or abandoned disposal sites, and please contact Ben Escotto at 916.341.6138 or by e-mail at Benjamin.Escotto@calrecycle.ca.gov for any discussions about active disposal sites.

Sincerely,

Jeffery Esquivel

Jeffery Esquivel
Senior Environmental Scientist (Specialist), CalRecycle
Waste Permitting, Compliance, & Mitigation Division
Permitting & Assistance Branch
Jeffery.Esquivel@calrecycle.ca.gov

cc:

City of Vernon, Health Department
Attention: Freddie Agyin, Director
FAgyin@cityofvernon.org

City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles Dept. of Building & Safety
Attention: Jose Gutierrez, Supervisor
jose.gutierrez@lacity.org

County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Health
Attention: Liza Frias, Director
lfrias@ph.lacounty.gov

County of Orange, Environmental Health Division
Attention: Darwin Cheng, Director
dcheng@ochca.com

CalRecycle
Ben Escotto, Supervisor
Permitting & Assistance Branch – South Unit
Benjamin.Escotto@calrecycle.ca.gov

CalRecycle
Stephanie Young, Supervisor
Closed, Illegal & Abandoned Sites Section
Stephanie.Young@CalRecycle.ca.gov

State Clearinghouse
state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov

20.7 Response to Submission 013839 (Jeffery Esquivel, California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery, Feb 3, 2026)

20.7.1 0923

Two closed landfills, one in Vernon and one in Norwalk, have been identified in Section 3.10, Hazardous Materials and Wastes, of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) within the landfill resource study area (defined in Section 3.10.4.1, Definition of Resource Study Area). Although these two closed landfills are within the landfill resource study area and are identified as potential environmental concern sites, they are outside of the project footprint and, based on their location and current closed status, they have been determined to present low potential for project-related disturbance and risk of contamination.

As described in Impact HMW-7, incorporation of HMW-IAMF#2, Landfill, would require the construction contractor to verify that methane protection measures are in place prior to any ground-disturbing activities for work within 1,000 feet of a landfill.

Section 3.9, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources, of the Draft EIR/EIS identifies several additional former municipal landfills (closed) and landfills composed of unknown wastes that are adjacent to the project footprint in Vernon, Pico Rivera, and Santa Fe Springs not identified as sites of potential environmental concern in the analysis presented in Section 3.10. These sites would be monitored by the construction contractor (GEO-IAMF#3, Gas Monitoring). As such, Impact GSSPR-10 concludes that there would not be a significant impact during construction.

If final design activities identify a need for project construction or operation to occur within 1,000 feet of a landfill facility, the California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) would comply with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations related to landfills.

20.7.2 0924

Refer to response to comment #0923 above. No closed or active landfills would be affected by the project.

The Authority requires coordination with regulatory agencies (including Local Enforcement Agencies) if unknown contamination (including unpermitted landfills or disposal sites) were discovered during project construction (refer to Impact HMW-4). HMW-IAMF#4, Known, Suspected, and Unanticipated Environmental Contamination, requires a Construction Management Plan addressing provisions for the disturbance and handling of known, suspected, and unanticipated contamination and coordination with regulatory agencies. HMW-IAMF#2 requires methane protection measures for all work within 1,000 feet of a landfill, including gas detection systems and personnel training.

20.7.3 0925

The Authority has notified agencies of the availability of the Final EIR, including responses to comments on the Draft EIR/EIS, in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) noticing requirements (at least 10 days prior to the date that the Authority Board will consider certifying the Final EIR under CEQA). The Authority Board will also consider issuing a combined Final EIS/Record of Decision under the National Environmental Policy Act.

The California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery will remain on the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section distribution list to receive notification of the availability of any subsequent environmental documents.

Los Angeles to Anaheim - RECORD #013844 DETAIL

Status:	Unread
Record Date:	02/03/2026
Interest As:	State Agency
Full Name:	Maryam Molavi

Stakeholder Comments/Issues:

Greetings, Please see the attached comment letter and confirm receipt. Thank you, Maryam Molavi Associate Transportation Planner Planning Division LDR Branch 1750 E. 4th Street Santa Ana, Ca 92705

California Department of Transportation

DISTRICT 12
1750 East 4th Street, Suite 100 | SANTA ANA, CA 92705
(657) 328-6000 | FAX (657) 328-6499
https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-12

February 3, 2026

CA High-Speed Rail Authority
355 South Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90071

File: LDR/CEQA
SCH: 2007031067
LDR LOG #2025-00446

Greetings,

0619 Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the review of the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the California High-Speed Rail (HSR) System, Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section.

The mission of Caltrans is Improving lives and communities through transportation. Caltrans is a commenting agency on this project and has the following comments:

1. Caltrans recognizes there is a strong link between transportation and land use. Development can have a significant impact on traffic and congestion on State transportation facilities. In particular, the pattern of land use can affect both local vehicle miles traveled and the number of trips. Caltrans supports collaboration with state and local agencies to work towards a safe, functional, interconnected, multi-modal transportation network integrated through applicable "smart growth" type land use planning and policies.

2. Caltrans encourages California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) to continue coordination with the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) for opportunities to enhance multimodal transit strategies at stations along the HSR system.

3. Caltrans is committed to prioritizing projects that are equitable and provide meaningful benefits to historically underserved communities, to ultimately improve transportation accessibility and quality of life for people in the communities we serve. We look forward to working with CHSRA on areas of joint jurisdiction to enhance the transportation network and connections between various modes of travel, to improve the experience of those who use the transportation system.

0620

4. Fullerton Station serves various local and regional bus routes. If Fullerton is selected as a stop, ensure construction impacts are minimized, and coordinate with Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) to maintain these services during construction.

5. Buena Park Station serves OCTA bus route 29/29a, 123, and 129. The latter, 129, is missing from the EIR. CHSRA should coordinate with OCTA on maintaining existing services along these routes during construction of the station relocation and aim to mitigate and/or minimize impacts on riders.

0621

6. Caltrans encourages CHSRA to coordinate with the City of Anaheim and other partners as developments such as OC Vibe intensify. Particularly, as events such as the LA 28 Olympics bring an influx of visitors into Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center (ARTIC) and Orange County.

0622

7. Caltrans supports the design of Complete Streets that include high-quality pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities that are safe and comfortable for users of all ages and abilities. Improvements may include providing secure bicycle parking, pedestrian-oriented LED lighting, wayfinding signage, and comfortable connections to nearby active transportation and/or transit facilities. Complete Streets improvements also promote regional connectivity, improve air quality, reduce congestion, promote improved first-/last-mile connections, and increase safety for all modes of transportation.

0623

8. Caltrans recommends the project to consider the use of methods such as, but not limited to, pedestrian and bicyclist warning signage, flashing beacons, crosswalks, signage and striping, to indicate to motorists that they should expect to see and yield to pedestrians and bicyclists near the proposed stations. Visual indication from signage can be reinforced by road design features such as lane widths, landscaping, street furniture, and other design elements.

0624

9. Given the proximity to existing bicycle facilities near the proposed stations at Buena Park, Fullerton, and ARTIC, the project should ensure there are easy, safe, and direct multimodal connections to the proposed stations. Also, please ensure that the bike parking included in the project is both secure (allows frame of bicycle to be locked to rack) and functional (adequate spacing between bicycle spaces). For additional guidance on providing functional bike parking, see the attached "Essentials of Bike Parking" guidance created by the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals (link to online PDF: https://www.apbp.org/Publications).

0625 10. On page 4-4 of Appendix 2-C please include the existing Class II bike lane on Beach Boulevard.

0626 11. During construction, please ensure that appropriate detours and safety measures are in place that prioritize the mobility, access, and safety of bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users. If adjacent sidewalks or bike lanes need to be closed during construction, please ensure that closures and detours are clearly signed.

0627 12. Any work performed within Caltrans right-of-way (R/W) will require discretionary review and approval by Caltrans and an encroachment permit will be required for any work within the Caltrans R/W prior to construction.

Please continue to coordinate with Caltrans for any future developments that could potentially impact the State transportation facilities. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Maryam Molavi at Maryam.Molavi@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Scott Shelley (Feb 3, 2026 08:48:47 PST)

Scott Shelley
Branch Chief – Local Development Review/Climate Change/Transit Grants
District 12

20.8 Response to Submission 013844 (Maryam Molavi, California Department of Transportation, District 12, Feb 3, 2026)

20.8.1 0619

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) acknowledges the California Department of Transportation's (Caltrans) support for collaboration between state and local agencies, encouragement for the Authority to coordinate with the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), and commitment to prioritizing projects that are equitable and provide meaningful benefits to historically underserved communities. The Authority will continue to work with Caltrans and other agencies and stakeholders as the project design advances.

20.8.2 0620

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) evaluates potential impacts that could occur as a result of the project components at the Fullerton Metrolink/ Amtrak Station, including the modifications that would occur as part of construction of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, as well as the new high-speed rail (HSR) components that would be built with inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option. Where potential impacts are identified, the Draft EIR/EIS describes the impact avoidance and minimization features (IAMF) that the Authority will incorporate to avoid or reduce impacts. In cases where the IAMFs would not sufficiently avoid or reduce impacts, the Draft EIR/EIS sets forth mitigation measures to further address the impacts. For example, as discussed under Impact TR-8 in Section 3.2, Transportation, of the Draft EIR/EIS, the Authority will incorporate TR-IAMF#13, Stakeholder Coordination with Transportation Agencies, to prevent construction from adversely affecting passenger rail service within the corridor and transit service at passenger rail stations. Through incorporation of TR-IAMF#13, the Authority will work closely with all agencies that provide freight and passenger rail services or bus services, or maintain operating rights within the corridor, to ensure that the design, construction, and operation of the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section (project section) do not adversely affect service. The Authority will coordinate with OCTA as part of incorporation of TR-IAMF#13. The contractor will also identify specific measures in the Construction Management Plan (CMP), as required by TR-IAMF#11, Maintenance of Transit Access, to maintain passenger rail access and provide safe and adequate access for passenger rail users during construction. In addition, the CMP will include methods to minimize construction traffic.

With respect to transit lines that could be affected by the Buena Park Metrolink Station relocation, the list of transit lines that could be affected under Impact TR-5 in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR/EIS has been revised in the Final EIR/EIS to reflect that OCTA bus route 129 could be affected by installation of the new bridge at State Route 39 (Beach Boulevard). Refer to Section 16.5.2, Section 3.2: Transportation, in Chapter 16, Corrections and Additions to the Draft Report, of the Final EIR/EIS for this revision. The Authority will coordinate with OCTA and other transit agencies to ensure the relocation of Metrolink stations does not affect existing transit lines from continuing to serve the stations following relocation.

20.8.3 0621

The Authority will coordinate with the City of Anaheim and other agencies and stakeholders to manage implementation of the project section and other projects in Anaheim in proximity to Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center including, but not limited to, the OCVIBE Project, as the projects advance.

20.8.4 0622

The Authority acknowledges Caltrans' support for Complete Streets designs. As discussed under Impact TR-13 in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the Authority will incorporate TR-IAMF#12, Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety, which requires the project section design plans to include specifications for vehicle lanes, passenger loading zones, sidewalks, crosswalks, bike lanes, trails, bus stops, parking, and intersection controls. These will address how pedestrian and bicycle accessibility will be provided and maintained. All reconstructed roadways would replace bicycle and

pedestrian facilities on completion of construction. New and replaced facilities would be designed with specifications for passenger loading zones, sidewalks, crosswalks, bike lanes, trails, bus stops, parking, and intersection controls. Incorporation of this IAMF will accommodate the increased number of pedestrians and bicyclists accessing the HSR station during operation.

20.8.5 0623

Refer to response to comment #0622 above.

20.8.6 0624

The Authority will provide bike parking that is both secure and functional and will incorporate IAMFs to prevent impacts on bicycle facilities, as well as pedestrian facilities and transit, during project operation. Refer to response to comment #0622 above for more information on TR-IAMF#12, which will address potential impacts on bicycle facilities during project operation. The station plans in the Draft EIR/EIS are conceptual; at this phase of design, they are meant to depict the overall station programming and access. The station concepts would be refined in later phases of design, in coordination with the cities and stakeholders. The design of all stations will adhere to applicable engineering design standards.

20.8.7 0625

The first paragraph on page 4-4 of Appendix 2-C, Buena Park Metrolink Station Relocation Analysis, of the Draft EIR/EIS has been revised in the Final EIR/EIS to reflect that southbound Beach Boulevard adjacent to the station alternative site has an existing Class II bicycle lane. Refer to Section 16.21, Appendix 2-C: Buena Park Metrolink Station Relocation and Commerce Metrolink Station Relocation Analysis, in Chapter 16 of the Final EIR/EIS for this revision.

20.8.8 0626

The Authority will incorporate IAMFs to prevent impacts on bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities during project construction and operation. As discussed under Impact TR-5 in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the Authority will incorporate TR-IAMF#2, Construction Transportation Plan; TR-IAMF#4, Maintenance of Pedestrian Access; TR-IAMF#5, Maintenance of Bicycle Access; TR-IAMF#11; TR-IAMF#12; and TR-IAMF#13 during project construction. TR-IAMF#2 requires the Authority-designated contractor to prepare a detailed Construction Transportation Plan for the purpose of minimizing the impact of construction and construction traffic on adjoining and nearby roadways in close consultation with the local jurisdiction or property owners having authority over the site. TR-IAMF#4 requires the Authority-designated contractor to prepare specific CMPs as part of the Construction Transportation Plan to address maintenance of pedestrian access during the construction period, to the extent feasible, in accordance with design, safety, and Americans with Disabilities Act requirements. TR-IAMF#5 requires the Authority-designated contractor to prepare specific CMPs as part of the Construction Transportation Plan to address maintenance of bicycle access during the construction period, to the extent feasible, in accordance with design, safety, and Americans with Disabilities Act requirements. TR-IAMF#11 requires the project contractor to identify specific measures in the CMP to maintain passenger rail access and provide safe and adequate access for passenger rail users during construction. TR-IAMF#13 requires the Authority to coordinate with transit agencies so that bus routes serving the existing and relocated passenger rail stations will be maintained and rerouted during construction. Refer to response to comment #0622 above for more information on TR-IAMF#12, which will also address potential impacts on bicycle facilities during project operation. As discussed under Impact TR-13 in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the Authority's incorporation of TR-IAMF#13 would additionally address potential impacts on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities during project operation.

20.8.9 0627

The Authority acknowledges that any work performed within Caltrans' right-of-way will require discretionary review and approval by Caltrans and an encroachment permit. The Authority will coordinate with Caltrans for any work within Caltrans' right-of-way.

Los Angeles to Anaheim - RECORD #013867 DETAIL

Status:	Action Pending
Record Date:	02/03/2026
Interest As:	State Agency
Full Name:	Thoa Le

Comments/Issues:

Dear HSR Los Angles to Anaheim Project Team, I hope this email finds you well. Please see the attached Caltrans' comment letter on the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). If you have any questions or would like to discuss any of our comments, please do not hesitate to reach out to us. Best regards, Thoa ------- Thoa Le Senior Environmental Scientist Caltrans District 7 – Division of Environmental Planning Tel: 213-269-0238 Email: thoa.le@dot.ca.gov

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 7
100 S. MAIN STREET, SUITE 100
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
PHONE (213) 897-0362
FAX (213) 897-0360
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov

Making Conservation a California Way of Life.

February 3, 2026

Ms. LaDonna DiCamillo, Southern California Regional Director
Mr. Stefan Galvez, Director of Environmental Services
California High-Speed Rail Authority
355 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 2050,
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Email: Los.Angeles_Anaheim@hsr.ca.gov

Re: Los Angeles to Anaheim Draft EIR/EIS Comments.

Dear Ms. DiCamillo and Mr. Galvez,

The California Department of Transportation, District 7, appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) prepared by the Authority. We truly appreciate the dedication and effort that has gone into this significant project.

As a Responsible Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and potentially a Cooperating Agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Caltrans has reviewed the Draft EIR/EIS and is providing comments below.

If you have any questions, require further clarification, or would like to discuss our comments, please do not hesitate to reach out to me or my staff member, Thoa Le – Senior Environmental Scientist, at thoa.le@dot.ca.gov or (213)269-0238.

We look forward to the continued collaboration between our agencies to establish an efficient, multi-modal transportation system that would benefit all Californians.

Thank you once again for the opportunity to review and comment on this important project.

Sincerely,

Kelly Ewing-Toledo

KELLY EWING-TOLEDO
Deputy District Director
Division of Environmental Planning

1779

General:
Caltrans is requesting a discussion focusing and elaborating on impacts and applicable measures associated with proposed work within Caltrans's right-of-way (ROW) and jurisdiction, including CEQA significant impact determination. This is to ensure that we can effectively review and maintain our NEPA and CEQA compliance, and that the project meets our standards before making any decisions or approvals. The specific locations within Caltrans ROW to be covered include, but not limited to, where the project crosses Interstate 10 (the Santa Monica Freeway), Interstate 710 (the Long Beach Freeway), Interstate 5 (the Santa Ana Freeway), and Interstate 605 (the San Gabriel River Freeway).

1780

Section 2- Alternatives:
The scope of work described in Table 2-14 (Modifications to Roadway Crossings) indicates no modifications to the interstate freeways. No specific improvements within Caltrans's right-of-way (ROW) and jurisdiction, especially at overheads and underpasses, are described in this table and elsewhere in the Draft EIR/EIS. Work under and over these facilities may be subject to Caltrans' jurisdiction and need to be discussed in the document. This clarification would help enable Caltrans to review and adopt the EIR/EIS for our roles as a Responsible and possibly Cooperating Agency and ensure our CEQA and NEPA compliance before making any decisions or approvals on the project.

1781

Table 2-24 regarding permits and approvals: There is insufficient information regarding the scope of work within Caltrans's ROW to help us determine if FHWA's approval would be required for the encroachment. Given that the project involves work associated with interstate routes, FHWA's approval might be necessary, which would require Caltrans' NEPA compliance, in addition to CEQA. Please list Caltrans as a NEPA cooperating agency in the document to facilitate our adoption of the EIR/EIS and future approval of project's encroachment permits.

1782

Cultural Resources

Section 3, Table 3.17-6:
We had recommended further consultation with the Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians (Morales' group), as they likely wish to be involved in the Section 106 MOA development. However, no additional consultation was documented. We recommend additional outreach with the tribe, based on our experience with previous consultations related to the Patsaouras Plaza, LINK US, and other projects near Los Angeles Union Station.

1783

Additionally, we recommend a revision on page 3.17-75, which currently states "In addition, the pre-contact/Native American component of P-19-1575/CA-LAN-1575 includes a cemetery." This statement is incorrect. While the human remains found at the site include one that was possibly Native American, the remainder of the skeletons were associated with a historic-era medical college. Please revise this statement and make necessary corrections in Table 3.17-11 and any other relevant sections of the Draft EIR/EIS, including Appendix 4-B - Section 4(f).

1784

Section 4 - Section 4(f) and Section 6(f):
This section discusses that one resource (P-19-001575/CA-LAN-1575) has been previously determined NRHP eligible under Criterion D; therefore, it is not a property protected by Section 4(f) (23 C.F.R. Part 774.13(b)(1)). While it is true that CA-LAN-1575/H was determined eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D, it is also likely eligible under Criterion A. We recommend pursuing a determination of eligibility under Criterion A for this site and discuss whether or not it is considered a Section 4(f) resource in this document accordingly. CA-LAN-1575/H may have value for preservation in place and should be addressed in the Section 4(f) analysis.

1785 **Noise and Vibration**
Section 3.4 - Impact N&V-5 (Permanent Exposure of Sensitive Receivers to Noise from Project Operation; and Construction impacts): There are residential areas adjacent to the I-605 crossing that are not identified as noise-sensitive receptors. These residential areas need to be identified as noise-sensitive receptors and discussion should be added regarding potential permanent and construction noise impacts to these specific communities. This comment also applies to Section 5 - Community Analysis.

1786 **Biological and Aquatic Resources**
Section 3.7: Measure BIO MM-14 should include a 150-foot buffer zone for songbirds. Measure BIO MM-15 should specify a 500-foot buffer zone for raptors and require preconstruction surveys no more than 3 days prior to the start of work. Measure BIO MM-26 should also specify the preconstruction survey time window for bats and prohibit disturbance to maternity colonies.

1787 **Community Analysis**
Section 5: This section should include analyses of construction and operational impacts to the residential areas near the I-605 crossing and whether impacts associated with work within Caltrans' jurisdiction would be significant under CEQA, as these communities are adjacent to Caltrans' facilities. Applicable avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures should be included.

1788 **Public Transit**
Caltrans supports promoting transit improvements and public transit use to aid California in reaching zero deaths and serious injuries and foster socially and economically vibrant, thriving, and resilient communities, per the upcoming Caltrans Director's Transit Policy. The Authority has adopted objectives and policies in accordance with Section 15124 of the State CEQA Guidelines, which include objectives that overlap with Caltrans's mission and goals. There is a clear statewide need for this Project. The Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would achieve reduced VMT within Los Angeles and Orange counties, enhance and maximize intercity travel, and provide economic benefits to the regional communities. We understand that each Alternative (A and B) contains advantages and disadvantages, but both will result in numerous benefits for the public and enhance connections to destinations such as airports, transit networks, and highway networks.

1789 We acknowledge that the Draft EIR/EIS identifies temporary and permanent construction-related impacts on transit operations; however, the analysis would benefit from additional clarification regarding the duration and phasing of these impacts, particularly where construction activities may overlap or extend for longer periods near high-ridership station areas.

1790 We also recommend clarification of coordination efforts with affected transit agencies under TR-IAMF#13. Specifically, the Draft EIR/EIS should identify transit operators that have been or will be consulted regarding proposed detours, stop relocations, and service adjustments, and whether temporary service changes may require additional operational resources, particularly where project elements intersect with state highway facilities used by transit services or may otherwise affect transit operations or plans. TR-IAMF#13 in Appendix 2-A does not identify several major and local transit agencies serving the project corridor, including LA Metro and Long Beach Transit, which are listed in Table 3.2-14 (Existing Transit Service Along the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Alignment). For consistency and clarity, Caltrans recommends revising TR-IAMF#13 to include all transit agencies identified in Table 3.2-14 as part of the coordination commitments.

1791

In addition, we recommend expanding the discussion of access and first- and last-mile connectivity under TR-IAMF#11 and TR-IAMF#12, particularly with respect to temporarily relocated bus stops during construction. The Draft EIR/EIS should clarify how safe, accessible, and clearly signed pedestrian pathways will be maintained throughout construction, especially in areas with high transit dependency and near station construction zones. Although TR-IAMF#12 appears to address pedestrian and bicycle safety during operations, it does not clearly address safety and accessibility during other project phases, including construction, that may affect these facilities.

We encourage ongoing coordination with transit operators throughout design, construction, and operations, and recommend that the Draft EIR/EIS documents these commitments to ensure continuity of service.

20.9 Response to Submission 013867 (Thoa Le, California Department of Transportation, District 7, Feb 3, 2026)

20.9.1 1779

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) recognizes the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as a responsible agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) with authority and jurisdiction over the listed facilities. Table 2-14 in Chapter 2, Alternatives, of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) describes potential construction work that may occur at Caltrans facilities. The Authority acknowledges that any work performed within Caltrans' right-of-way will require discretionary review and approval by Caltrans and an encroachment permit. The Authority has coordinated with Caltrans throughout the development of the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section (project section), including providing draft Preliminary Engineering for Project Definition (PEPD) plan sets to Districts 7 and 12 for review in 2018 and in 2024, and providing the Administrative Draft EIR/EIS for responsible agency review in February 2025. The Authority will continue to coordinate with Caltrans throughout the high-speed rail (HSR) project design to ensure any potential effects on Caltrans facilities are addressed and modifications to the design are incorporated as appropriate.

20.9.2 1780

The description of proposed work at existing roadway crossings, including interstate freeways, is accurately captured in Table 2-14 in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS. The Authority acknowledges that any work performed within Caltrans' right-of-way will require discretionary review and approval by Caltrans and an encroachment permit. The Authority will coordinate with Caltrans for any work within Caltrans' right-of-way. Table 2-24 accurately reflects Caltrans Encroachment Permits as a required approval for the project. No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.9.3 1781

Caltrans' status as a CEQA responsible agency and the description of proposed work at existing roadway crossings, including interstate freeways, is accurately captured in Table 2-14 in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Based on the current design, the Authority does not anticipate Federal Highway Administration approvals, which would trigger National Environmental Policy Act responsibilities for Caltrans. No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.9.4 1782

The Authority notes the recommendation to consult with Anthony Morales, Gabrieleño/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians. The commenter refers to this tribe as "Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians (Morales' group)."

In Draft EIR/EIS Section 3.17, Cultural Resources, Table 3.17-5 summarizes all outreach efforts conducted with Native American tribes, including outreach to Mr. Morales. The Gabrieleño/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians contacted the Authority on December 1, 2016, for formal consultation under CEQA (Assembly Bill 52). Between 2016 and 2020, the Authority reached out six times to the tribe to provide updates about the project.

No response from Mr. Morales has been received since the initial letter in 2016 in regard to the project section. The Gabrieleño/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians is not a consulting party for the Memorandum of Agreement. No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.9.5 1783

P-19-001575/CA-LAN-1575 includes components from the precontact period consisting of over 20 Native American interments or cremations recovered in 1996, Native American tools, projectile points, debitage, groundstone, beads, and other artifacts. The historic component consists of 1860s–1930s Chinatown (structural remains and artifacts), and the remains of the subsequent residential

neighborhood, El Aliso Winery structural remains, and medical specimens from the University of Southern California Medical College.

The human remains recovered in 1996 were Native American and a different/earlier discovery from the medical college remains found in 2018–2019 during the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's Patsaouras Plaza project. Both the Native American remains and the medical specimens were found within the site boundary of P-19-0001575/CA-LAN-1575. For consistency and to avoid confusion, the term "cemetery" was revised to "human remains" in regard to the Native American finds in the resource description and Table 3.17-11 in Section 3.17. Refer to Section 16.5.17, Section 3.17: Cultural Resources, in Chapter 16, Corrections and Additions to the Draft Report, of the Final EIR/EIS for these revisions.

20.9.6 1784

The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) formally evaluated each temporal component of P-19-001575/CA-LAN-1575/H under all four National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) criteria in 2018 for the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's Link Union Station Project, which will involve ground-disturbing activities within the boundary of P-19-001575. To support this evaluation, the FRA also conducted Native American consultation with the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, and the Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation. Consulting tribes have provided comments and information that have contributed to the FRA's CA-LAN-1575/H evaluation according to NRHP criteria. The State Historic Preservation Officer concurred with the FRA's findings by letter dated to September 27, 2018. The Authority has also conducted consultation efforts for the project section, and no additional information has been received from tribes about P-19-001575 that would change the previous eligibility determination. No additional information regarding the context of the site has been identified—either through archaeological findings, historical research, or consultation with interested parties—that would warrant a reevaluation of the finding of eligibility under Criterion D. No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.9.7 1785

All noise-sensitive receptors adjacent to the Interstate (I-) 605 crossing within the resource study area (RSA) boundary, defined in Table 3.4-4 of the Draft EIR/EIS by a screening distance of 700 feet from the centerline of the rail corridor, were identified and included in the noise analysis. Based on the results of the analysis, no noise impacts from project operation were identified in the residential areas adjacent to the I-605 crossing. Although site-specific assessments of construction noise impacts were not performed for the Draft EIR/EIS, potential noise impacts were identified in Section 3.4.6.3, Project Impacts, of the Draft EIR/EIS for this community and for other communities based on the impact screening distances for construction activities included in Table 3.4-13. Adverse effects from Section 3.4, Noise and Vibration, were evaluated for disproportionately high and adverse effects (DHAE) on minority and low-income communities in Chapter 5, Community Analysis, Section 5.6.3.3, Noise and Vibration. Although the majority of communities affected by Shared Passenger Track Alternatives A and B would be in low-income and minority communities, with implementation of N&V-MM#1, Construction Noise Mitigation Measures; and N&V-MM#2, Construction Vibration Mitigation Measures, all construction-period effects would be reduced to have no adverse effects related to noise and vibration in any community. For operational noise and vibration, because adverse effects on low-income and minority communities would remain after implementation of N&V-MM#3, Implement California High-Speed Rail Project Noise Mitigation Guidelines; and N&V-MM#4, Implement Operational Vibration Mitigation Measures, there would be a DHAE related to noise and vibration during operation in the McCampbell neighborhood in Pico Rivera, northeast Buena Park, and central Anaheim. Of these locations, the McCampbell neighborhood in Pico Rivera is closest to the I-605 crossing. No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.9.8 1786

The stated 75-foot nest buffer zone for song birds in BIO-MM#14, Conduct Preconstruction Surveys and Delineate Active Nest Buffers Exclusion Areas for Breeding Birds, is consistent with the Authority's approach to nest buffer zones for passerine birds. As discussed in Section 3.7, Biological

and Aquatic Resources, of the Draft EIR/EIS, the project biologist has the discretion to extend nest buffer zones based on the following text in BIO-MM#14; and BIO-MM#15, Conduct Preconstruction Surveys and Monitoring for Raptors. BIO-MM#15's stated 500-foot buffer for raptors is consistent with the commenter's recommendation.

BIO-MM#14 states, "Larger buffers may be required if the Project Biologist determines that a larger buffer is required to prevent nest abandonment." BIO-MM#15 states, "Nest buffers may be adjusted if the Project Biologist determines that smaller buffers would be sufficient to avoid impacts on nesting raptors or if a larger buffer is required to prevent nest abandonment."

The commenter does not provide a basis for the proposed 150- and 500-foot nest buffer zones or explain why 75 feet is inadequate. The performance standard for the biologist to exercise discretion are circumstances where the biologist determines that the nest could become abandoned. Nest buffer size is therefore based on biological requirements and construction activity rather than standardized arbitrary requirements.

However, to address the commenter's concerns about survey timing, both BIO-MM#14 and BIO-MM#15 have been modified to require nesting bird surveys to be completed as close to the start of construction activities as possible. Please refer to Section 16.5.7, Section 3.7: Biological and Aquatic Resources, BIO-MM#14 and BIO-MM#15 of the Final EIR/EIS for these changes.

Through these measures, the project is consistent with the requirements of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503 and 3503.5.

Refer to Submission #013819 in this chapter, comments #0569 and 0570, for clarifications regarding BIO-MM#26, Implement Bat Avoidance and Relocation Measures; preconstruction survey time window for bats; and avoidance areas surrounding bat hibernacula and maternity areas.

20.9.9 1787

The intent of Chapter 5 is to evaluate whether any minority or low-income communities would experience a DHAE from implementation of the project alternatives. Section 5.3.4, Methods for Impact Analysis, describes the methodology of this analysis. Chapter 5's analysis builds upon the analyses in Chapter 3, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures, such as Section 3.2 (Transportation), Section 3.4 (Noise and Vibration), Section 3.10 (Hazardous Materials and Wastes), Section 3.12 (Socioeconomics and Communities), or Section 3.15 (Parks and Recreation). Each section of Chapter 3 evaluates impacts on all properties within the RSA particular to that topic. Chapter 5 examines whether any of these impacts would disproportionately affect minority or low-income communities. As depicted on Figure 5-2, the I-605 crossing is surrounded by block groups 60375023031, 60375023032, 60375026031, 60375026042, 60375027001, and 60375027004. Impacts on these block groups include impacts on unsignalized intersections during operation (Impact TR-11), temporary exposure of sensitive receivers to construction noise and vibration (Impacts N&V-1 and N&V-2), handling of hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school (Impact HMW-6), residential displacements (Impact SO-2), disruption or division of existing communities related to community access and displacements during construction (Impact SO-1), and diminished access to or use of recreational resources (Impact PR-4). These impacts are summarized and described at the block group level in Chapter 5; for further detail, please refer to corresponding sections of Chapter 3. There are no DHAE in these block groups, as described in Table 5-35. No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.9.10 1788

Refer to Standard Response LAA-Response-GENERAL-04: General Opinions, Opposition, or Support, in Chapter 18, Standard Responses.

The Authority appreciates Caltrans' support for transit improvements and its recognition of the project's role in advancing statewide mobility, safety, and sustainability goals. The project section would provide statewide benefits that would align with Caltrans' missions and goals.

20.9.11 1789

SOCIO-IAMF#1, Construction Management Plan, and TR-IAMF#2, Construction Transportation Plan, will address in detail the activities to be carried out in each construction phase. No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.9.12 1790

TR-IAMF#13, Stakeholder Coordination with Transportation Agencies, already states that coordination will occur with agencies that provide existing or planned bus services, so the Authority did not list all transit service providers along the corridor in the TR-IAMF#13 description. The commenter's requests for items to be discussed during consultation would also be addressed as part of TR-IAMF#13, as well as by TR-IAMF#2 and TR-IAMF#11, Maintenance of Transit Access. No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.9.13 1791

The commenter requests revisions to TR-IAMF#11 and TR-IAMF#12, Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety, to address transit access and pedestrian and bicycle safety during construction. These elements are already included in TR-IAMF#2; TR-IAMF#4, Maintenance of Pedestrian Access; and TR-IAMF#5, Maintenance of Bicycle Access, and are discussed in Section 3.2, Impact TR-5 of the Draft EIR/EIS. TR-IAMF#2 would require the construction contractor to prepare a Construction Management Plan that includes provisions for safe vehicular and pedestrian access, as well as scheduled transit access and safe locations for temporary bus stops. TR-IAMF#4 and TR-IAMF#5 would require the construction contractor to prepare specific Construction Management Plans that would detail the maintenance of pedestrian and bicycle access during construction, including wayfinding and signage and connectivity, to ensure safety and accessibility. Additionally, as discussed in Impact TR-8, TR-IAMF#13 would require the Authority to continue coordination with appropriate agencies to ensure existing and planned transit services are maintained throughout construction and operation of the project. No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

Los Angeles to Anaheim - RECORD #013894 DETAIL

Status:	Action Pending
Record Date:	02/04/2026
Interest As:	State Agency
Full Name:	Barbara Mcgahey

Stakeholder Comments/Issues:

Hi Scott,Enclosed are Caltrans' comments on the High Speed Rail Draft EIR. Thank you to Carmen for pulling this all together!Best regards,Barbara

EA 12-0L390

HSR Coordination - PEPD

Comment Response Form

Submittal Description: PEPD
Agency: CALTRANS
Date Comments Received:
DISPOSITION CODE: 1 - Agree; 2 - Disagree; 3 - Discuss

	Reviewer Comment Section					Designer Response Section		
	No.	Name	Submittal Reference	Page/Sheet No.	Comment	Name	Response	Code
	1	Hams Huynh - Design		CV-T3581	Follow-up on previous comment:- Prop Condition X-section @ Douglass Rd 23+35, can we shift retaining wall to maintain 10.5' sidewalk to match existing condition (or increase width to more than 6' min).			
2107	2	Hams Huynh - Design		CV-T3581	Prop Condition X-section @ Service Rd: proposed sidewalk in SB direction should be 6' minimum excluding curb.			
2108	3	Hams Huynh - Design		CV-T1269	Delineate Caltrans right-of-way line.			
2109	4	Hams Huynh - Design		CV-T1269; AR-B0601	Are there any changes to SB Beach Blvd at the crossing associated with Metrolink Station improvements? Impact areas extend into the roadbed.			
2110	5	Erin K - Bio			Where is the "LA to Anaheim Project Section Draft Biology and Aquatic Resources Tech Study"? It is mentioned and I couldn't find it in the attachments. I imagine my next comments will be found in that document.			
2111	6	Erin K - Bio			Where are the official species lists? How up to date are those?			
2112	7	Erin K - Bio			Where is the bat survey report? Are they planning on redoing the surveys? This document says there were surveys completed in 2010.			
2113	8	Erin K - Bio			Is there a high resolution/more detailed map of the various RSAs? I saw the main overview one but I would like to review a more detailed one if it exists.			
2114	9	Erin K - Bio			Where is the detailed aquatic delineation report?			
2115	10	Judy B - Cul			Project Features (Implemented during design/planning phase) as outline by the Impact, Avoidance and Minimization Features in Section 3.17.5.3 (Page 3.17-69) and Mitigation Measures in CEQA & NEPA Conclusion (Pg 3.17- 130). No further comments or concerns as the outlined Agencies features follow the Caltrans AIM Project Features during Phase 0, 1 and 3. CUL-IAMF#1-5 and CUL-MM#1-3.			
2116	11	Judy B - Cul			Requesting Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Archaeological Survey Report (ASR) (Authority and FRA 2017)			
2117	12	Judy B - Paleo			Chpt 3.9-Pg 16, Table 3.9-3 (Comment- no actions necessary)150-ft. radius around resource project area is geospatially too small for determining significant patterns within Paleontological fossil locality searches, per Caltrans District 12's standards. A minimum radius outside our ROW should be ½ mile to determine resource potential, however I defer to the larger project scope and will just leave this a comment for future endeavors.			
2118	13	Judy B - Paleo			Follow up question/comment to Agency- Who will the curation facility be? District 12 (Orange County) request the primary facility be assigned to Copper Lab (OC Parks) for all potential fossil resources found in Orange County, second would be National History Museum, Los Angeles.			
2119	14	Judy B - Paleo			Requesting: Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Paleontological Resources Technical Report (Authority 2025b).			
2120	15	Judy B - Cul/Paleo		*One state/railroad concern at SR-39 location	Volume 3.3_3 Pages 41-48 cCultural: Pg. 43: Historic resource concern at intersection of (north or Tulare St./south of Cascade Way); RR Tracks-State ROW SR-39 (Post Mile 16.5)* cPaleo: HFYC 2 (Low Potential)- no concerns with present plans.			
2121	16	Judy B - Cul/Paleo		*One state/railroad concern at SR-39 location	Volume 3.3_3 Pages 13-15 cCultural: Pg. 13: Historic resource concern along BNSF railroad tracks (owned and operated by federal rail authority) - this will not impact the State ROW SR-91 work cPaleo: PFYC 2 (Low Potential)- no concerns with present plans.			
2122	17	Judy B - Cul/Paleo		*One state/railroad concern at SR-39 location	Volume 3.3_3 Pages 63-73 cCultural: Pg. 63: Historic resource concern along BNSF railroad tracks (owned and operated by federal rail authority) - this will not impact the State ROW SR-57 work cPaleo: PFYC 2 (Low Potential)- no concerns with present plans.			
2123	18	Seth Cutler - Trans Planning		PEPD Vol 3 3A R1-R4	Typical Sections do not represent consistent bikeways on State College. Recommend the Team looks to provide comfortable bicycling facilities in both directions through the project area. (i.e. 5-6 Bike Lanes with buffers or Class IV protected bikeways.			
2124	19	Seth Cutler - Trans Planning		PEPD Vol 3.3	Where local roads cross the HSR alignment, please be sure to work with local agencies to improve and implement pedestrian and bicycling facilities especially when work will encroach onto those local roads.			
2125	20	Jessica Thornsley - ROW			Existing (and proposed) Caltrans right of way should be clearly dimensioned on ALL project plans, exhibits, etc. Will any property rights be coming to Caltrans? Will Caltrans need to grant any property rights? Specifically, in the adopted preferred alternative volume 3.1, sheet no. 332 drawing no. RW-M1581 crosses Beach Blvd SR-39, sheet no. 357 drawing no. RW-M1606 crosses SR-91, and sheet no. 376 drawing no. RW-M1623 crosses SR-57. (Required public r/w areas identified on the map should indicate which public agency has ownership. Will the required public r/w areas need to be acquired for this project? If so, those areas should be included on the granter table. In the adopted preferred alternative volume 3.1 sheet no. 36 / drawing no. RW-M16 I6 why are 'required proposed RAW area' and 'required public r/w area' both shown in white? Why is there no ownership information shown for "required proposed r/w area"? In granter table TCE expiration date should be included under remarks on all plan sheets.			
2126	21	Alex Thanh - Trans Operation			1 Please request the consultant to provide the vertical clearance at SR-91 for our review. What is the height of the train? 2.At SR-57: a. Please provide typical cross section of the new track and SR-57. b. Please provide vertical clearance of the new track and SR-57. c. What happens to the existing bridge and the Douglass Rd?			
2127	22	Joseph Lee - Design		CV-T3581	show existing Caltrans right of way line on cross sections			
2128	23	Joseph Lee - Design		CV-T3581	show exist and proposed cross slopes			
2129	24	Joseph Lee - Design		CV-T3581	sidewalk on north side of Douglas Rd not shown on existing condition for 23+35. Are we eliminating existing sidewal?			
2130	25	Joseph Lee - Design		CV-T3581	can we move retaining wall on NB lane to maintain 10.5 ft sidewalk (or increase width to more than 6 ft min)			
2131	26	Joseph Lee - Design		CV-1568	stationing callouts for "Service Road" is difficult to read. Increase font size.			
2132	27	Joseph Lee - Design		CV-T3581	are we eliminating sidewalk on NB Douglass at prop cond 25+04 cross section?			
2133	28	Joseph Lee - Design		CV-1568	Clearly delineate Caltrans right of way line.			
2134	29	Joanne X - Planning			For awareness, we also received a similar request from the HSR team through our LDR (Local Development Review) team, and they also prepared their own letter to send to HSR. I have cc'd Scott Shelley who is the Branch Chief overseeing LDR, who will provide the email/letter to you when it is ready. We wanted to share the letter with you just as an FYI since the efforts overlap.			
2135	30	Joanne X - Planning		SR-39 (Beach Blvd) – Buena Park Metrolink Station Relocation	Station relocation would move the station between South Coyote Creek and Beach Blvd, situated right next to SR-39, much closer than it is currently.			
2136	31	Joanne X - Planning		SR-39 (Beach Blvd) – Buena Park Metrolink Station Relocation	This relocation may impact/constrain future improvements to SR 39 near this location for things like enhanced bus service, pedestrian and bicycle facilities and infrastructure improvements.			
2137	32	Joanne X - Planning		SR-39 (Beach Blvd) – Buena Park Metrolink Station Relocation	Census tracts along SR-39 near Beach Blvd in Buena Park are officially designated as SB 535 disadvantaged communities based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 criteria, which overlaps at this location. Impacts to this community may include noise, vibrations, access disruptions, pedestrian and active transportation detours, transit delays. Coordination is needed to ensure that long-term multimodal functionality is preserved and that construction mitigation and access improvements are provided to avoid impacts on surrounding communities.			
2138	33	Joanne X - Planning		SR-39 (Beach Blvd) – Buena Park Metrolink Station Relocation	Due to the new location right next to State ROW, Caltrans would need to work closely with train operators and other agencies and stakeholders on all of the upcoming projects at the station and overcrossing impacts that will affect SR 39 mobility. New infrastructure must also be to Caltrans standards, unless a maintenance agreement is signed, or section of the route is relinquished.			
2139	34	Joanne X - Planning		SR-39 (Beach Blvd) – Buena Park Metrolink Station Relocation	According to Caltrans SR 39 CMCP safer infrastructure for pedestrians and active transportation users is a major concern amongst those who travel in the region. Pedestrian and active transportation infrastructure should be upgraded at grade separation. As stated in the CMCP first and last mile linkages should also be looked at to improve mobility for underserved communities nearby.			
2140	35	Joanne X - Planning		SR-39 (Beach Blvd) – Buena Park Metrolink Station Relocation	HSR should work with OCTA as their Beach Blvd. Corridor study may be impacted by these plans, as this would reduce flexibility for future improvement projects. The study emphasizes bicycle access to stations and pedestrian paths, so this may make it more difficult for these users with the proposed overcrossing. OCTA bus routes also travel along this route which may be impacted by this overcrossing and construction.			
2141	36	Joanne X - Planning		SR-91 – North Anaheim Overhead	Proposed HSR overhead crossing may cause vertical and horizontal constraints within State ROW, limiting future improvements to the system including operational or capacity improvements.			
2142	37	Joanne X - Planning		SR-91 – North Anaheim Overhead	This area consists of census tract designated under SB 535 via CalEnviroScreen 4.0, making this area vulnerable to impacts on disadvantaged communities. Take into account potential impacts to this community related to construction, lane closures, noise, congestion and air quality among other impacts.			
2143	38	Joanne X - Planning		SR-91 – North Anaheim Overhead	Crossing could affect freeway operations on SR 91 unit maintenance, without providing much of a benefit to anyone in the community. Must work closely with stakeholders to assure limited impacts on the route, and maintenance agreements and other agreements with stakeholders should be considered to reduce maintenance responsibility and liability.			
	39	Joanne X - Planning		SR-91 – North Anaheim Overhead	Caltrans Transportation Concept Report TCR shows that the 91 is already highly constrained with limited ROW or widening opportunities, which will be further impacted by this crossing. SR 91 is also a major freight corridor, while truck volumes were expected to increase by 50% by 2030, so impacts this may have on freight movement should also be considered.			
2145	40	Joanne X - Planning		SR-57 – Stadium Overhead / ARTIC Area	At ARTIC, HSR station platforms and other facilities and improvements would be added to improve station to be more accommodating for HSR, which goes under SR 57.			
2146	41	Joanne X - Planning		SR-57 – Stadium Overhead / ARTIC Area	This area is located near neighborhoods identified as an environmental justice/disadvantaged community (under Anaheim's General Plan and CalEnviroScreen).			
2147	42	Joanne X - Planning		SR-57 – Stadium Overhead / ARTIC Area	As with the other HSR projects, construction may cause traffic delays, noise and air pollution as well as other impacts to those underserved communities which should be taken into consideration.			
2148	43	Joanne X - Planning		SR-57 – Stadium Overhead / ARTIC Area	According to Caltrans SR 57 CMCP this is a highly trafficked corridor for major attractions in the region. This could have major impacts on local circulation during major events in the area, which is surrounded by the Honda Center and Angels Stadium and OC Vibe, not to mention it is still in close proximity to Disneyland and the Anaheim convention center; both of which will see visitors utilizing transit and rail operations in the area. All these improvements and attractions will likely impact traffic congestion on SR 57 and offramps and onramps may need to be improved to assure minimized impacts as well as other infrastructure improvements on the system. The CMCP as well as the District CAT plan recognized the need for improved bicycle and pedestrian crossings at SR 57 near this area, and connections to the Santa Ana River Trail.			
2149	44	Joanne X - Planning		I-5 Impacts	Due to the proximity of the proposed HSR station in Anaheim, it is expected that I-5 will see increased traffic and usage, but it is believed impacts to the route will be limited.			

2150	45	Rabindra Bade-EE, Air Quality		Section 3.3 Air Quality: Page#55/194	AQ-IAMF#1Fugitive Dust: At the end of the sentence, please add: SCAQMD Rule 403 will be followed to reduce the fugitive dust and SCAQMD Rule 402 for nuisance during construction.			
2151	46	Rabindra Bade-EE, Air Quality		Section 3.3 Air Quality: Page#56/194:	Please add AQ-IAMF#6: Idling time of diesel vehicles will be limited to 5 minutes.			
2152	47	Rabindra Bade-EE, Air Quality		Section 3.3 Air Quality: Page#56/194:	In the Section 3.2 Transportation under Trans-MM#7, it is detailed that there will be lane addition on SR-57/Westbound Katella Avenue Southbound (SB) on-ramp that increases the capacity. For this activity, further air quality analysis and conformity determination are needed. Thus, please add the following statement on Section 3.3 Air Quality under the Impact AQ-14: Continuous Permanent Direct Impacts on Localized Air Quality-Particulate Matter Hot Spots (NAAQS Compliance). "According to 40 CFR 93.101, this project is regionally significant. As per the regulations outlined in 40 CFR93.105(c)(4), such projects are required to go through interagency consultation even though this project is not federally funded. PM hotspot analysis form will be prepared and submitted to the Southern California Association of Government (SCAG) for conformity determination. This project will be listed in the Federal Transportation Implementation Plan (FTIP) before the submission of PM hotspot analysis form to the SCAG. Air Quality analysis report and air quality conformity report will be also prepared in the PA&ED phase of the project." Also in this section, please include the following statement. "Energy analysis report will be prepared in the PA&ED phase of the project."			
2153	48	Rabindra Bade-EE, Air Quality		Section 3.3 Air Quality: Page#170-171/194:	Section 3.2 Transportation explained scope of work on Route 57/ Katella SB on Ramp (lane addition and capacity increase), Harbor Blvd/Imperial (SR90) (F11) (Traffic restripe and turning lane addition) Anaheim Blvd, Lemon St and SR 91 EB ramps (F28)(Traffic Restripe), SR 57 SB ramps and Nutwood Avenue(F48) (Traffic restripe and turning lane addition). To better understand the proposed work, please provide us with the proposed layout plans. It will help us to determine what further work is needed for air quality decisions. In this section, please include the following statement. "Energy analysis report will be prepared in the PA&ED phase of the project."			
2154	49	Aso Delanian - Env. Eng. For Noise Review		Page 3.4-1, Section 3.4.1 Introduction	Please provide technical report "Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Noise and Vibration Technical Report (Authority 2025) for District 12 Environmental Engineering review.			
2155	50	Aso Delanian - Env. Eng. For Noise Review		Page 3.4-79 and 80	1. Sound Barriers – For areas where the HSR crosses the State's right-of-way and adjacent to areas that has sensitive receptors (e.g. mobile homes/single family dwellings located southeast of railroad at-grade crossing under SR-91), Caltrans' current Total Reasonableness Allowance is set for $170,000 per benefited receptor (2025). Consideration of this higher value is recommended versus $95,000(2018) per benefited residents under the discussion in Appendix 3.4-A NOISE AND VIBRATION MITIGATION GUIDELINES.			

20.10 Response to Submission 013894 (Barbara McGahey, California Department of Transportation, District 12, Feb 4, 2026)

20.10.1 2106

A 10.5-foot sidewalk at Douglass Road STA 24+35 is not feasible. The retaining wall cannot be shifted because of the location of the proposed high-speed rail (HSR) bridge column, as depicted in STA 25+04, and the proximity of the existing State Route (SR) 57 column foundations. As a result, there would not be enough room along Douglass Road for the sidewalk width to be increased beyond what is currently depicted. The California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) will coordinate with local agencies and stakeholders regarding roadway improvements as project design advances.

20.10.2 2107

A 6-foot sidewalk at Service Road is not feasible. The retaining wall cannot be shifted because of the location of the proposed HSR bridge column, as depicted in STA 21+75. As a result, there would not be enough room along Service Road for the sidewalk width to be increased beyond what is currently depicted. The Authority will coordinate with local agencies and stakeholders regarding roadway improvements as project design advances.

20.10.3 2108

The project is currently at 15 percent design, and the right-of-way information presented in the Preliminary Engineering for Project Definition (PEPD) is based on as-builts or geographic information system data that the Authority has received from cities or is publicly available. Some sheets within the PEPD delineate California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) right-of-way based on data available to the Authority, but at this location of Beach Boulevard, the configuration of the roadway makes it difficult to determine the Caltrans versus city boundaries based on the available data. The Authority will request detailed Caltrans right-of-way information in future phases of design in order to delineate Caltrans boundaries where needed.

20.10.4 2109

The environmental footprint reflects the potential area of impact associated with the proposed bridge widening required for the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section (project section) northbound track. At the time of preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), no permanent modifications to the southbound lanes of Beach Boulevard, such as changes to lane configuration or roadway widening, are proposed as part of the project.

20.10.5 2110

The Authority contacted the commenter on March 5, 2026, and provided the requested materials.

20.10.6 2111

The official species lists are included as an Appendix B of the *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Biological and Aquatic Resources Technical Report*. The official species lists are dated February 20, 2025, because they were assembled prior to publishing the Draft EIR/EIS in December 2025 and were the most current version prior to assembly. No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.10.7 2112

The Authority contacted the Caltrans commenter on March 5, 2026, and provided the requested materials.

Preconstruction surveys for bats will be completed as part of the mitigation measures for bats, specifically BIO-MM#25, Conduct Preconstruction Surveys for Special-Status Bat Species; and BIO-MM#26, Implement Bat Avoidance and Relocation Measures, in Section 3.7.7, Mitigation Measures, of the Draft EIR/EIS. Additionally, should any nonbreeding or nonhibernating individuals be found during surveys, BIO-MM#27, Implement Bat Exclusion and Deterrence Measures, would also be implemented. No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.10.8 2113

The Authority contacted the commenter on March 5, 2026, regarding this request. Per those communications, the Authority does not have higher-resolution versions of the biological resource study area (RSA) figures beyond those presented in the Draft EIR/EIS and supporting biological technical reports.

20.10.9 2114

The Authority contacted the commenter on March 5, 2026, and provided the requested materials.

20.10.10 2115

The Authority acknowledges there are no comments or concerns from Caltrans District 12 on the impact avoidance and minimization features (IAMF) and mitigation measures in Section 3.17, Cultural Resources. No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.10.11 2116

The Authority contacted the commenter on March 9, 2026, and provided the requested materials.

20.10.12 2117

The Authority determined the appropriate RSA for paleontological resources is the project footprint plus a 150-foot buffer around the project footprint, per the Authority's Environmental Methodology Guidelines, Version 5.11 (2022). The RSA also extends subsurface below the project footprint to include geological units below the horizontal RSA that project construction or operation may encounter. No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.10.13 2118

The curation facility will be decided during final design. Cooper Lab in Orange County and the Natural History Museum in Los Angeles will be considered and the Authority acknowledges Caltrans District 12's preference for these facilities. No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.10.14 2119

The Authority contacted the commenter on March 9, 2026, and provided the requested materials.

20.10.15 2120

Resource P-30-120020 is discussed in the Draft EIR/EIS in Section 3.17. It is assumed to be National Register of Historic Places eligible under Criterion D, and will undergo phased study in accordance with the stipulations included in the Programmatic Agreement and Memorandum of Agreement. As a confidential property, it is not included on the current engineering plans. Regarding paleontological resources, the commenter is correct in stating that this area has low potential for paleontological resources.

20.10.16 2121

As discussed in Section 3.17.6, Affected Environment, in Section 3.17, there are no known cultural historic properties in the vicinity of SR 91 in the area of potential effects. Regarding paleontological resources, the commenter is correct in stating that this area has low potential for paleontological resources.

20.10.17 2122

As discussed in Section 3.17.6, there are no known cultural historic properties in the vicinity of SR 57 in the area of potential effects. Regarding paleontological resources, the commenter is correct in stating that this area has low potential for paleontological resources.

20.10.18 2123

Refer to Standard Response LAA-Response-GENERAL-02: Consideration of Plans and Projects, in Chapter 18, Standard Responses.

Design plans in Volume 3.3A, General and State College Grade Separations (By OCTA), of the Draft EIR/EIS for State College Boulevard were prepared by the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) and the City of Anaheim.

20.10.19 2124

The Authority will coordinate with local agencies and stakeholders regarding pedestrian and bicycle facilities within the local right-of-way.

20.10.20 2125

Property boundaries will be further defined as the design advances. For public right-of-way in Volume 3.1, General, Track Alignment, and Right-of-Way, of the Draft EIR/EIS (Sheet Number 332 Drawing Number RW-M1581 crosses Beach Boulevard SR 39, Sheet Number 357 Drawing Number RW-M1606 crosses SR 91, and Sheet Number 374 Drawing Number RW-M1623 crosses SR 57), it is anticipated that temporary and permanent easements would be required. Specific easement needs would be confirmed during later stages of design. The public right-of-way is depicted separately from private right-of-way (which includes Assessor's Parcel Numbers) to distinguish ownership and indicate potential areas of impact. Duration of temporary construction easements will be determined as the design advances.

20.10.21 2126

1. HSR trains would operate on existing OCTA-owned and Southern California Regional Rail Authority–maintained tracks that pass below SR 91. The existing vertical clearance from the top of rail and the soffit of SR 91 is approximately 23 to 24 feet, and the proposed project design would not alter this condition. Under the Authority's current design standard, HSR trainsets will be approximately 15.5 feet high, which can be accommodated under the existing clearance.

2a. The cross section for this location is in Section VV-VV on TT-D3031 in Volume 3.1 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

2b. The vertical clearance between the proposed track (top of rail) and the soffit of SR 57 is 24 feet.

2c. The existing rail bridge over Douglass Road will remain in place. A new two-track bridge to accommodate the HSR tracks and passenger platform will be built south of the existing structure, which will require a reprofiling of Douglass Road. The roadway design for this modification is included in Volume 3.3, General and Grade Separations, of the Draft EIR/EIS.

20.10.22 2127

Cross-Sections B through D on Drawing Number CV-T3581 intersect the Caltrans right-of-way perpendicularly, so the Caltrans right-of-way line would not appear on those sections. The Caltrans right-of-way is only applicable to Section E on Drawing Number CV-T3581 and is depicted on the current plans.

20.10.23 2128

The existing and proposed cross slopes are depicted on Drawing Number CV-T3581, Volume 3.3 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

20.10.24 2129

There is no existing northbound sidewalk on Douglass Road STA 23+35, so no removal would be required. As depicted on Drawing Number CV-T3581, existing conditions would be maintained.

20.10.25 2130

Refer to response to comment #2106 above.

20.10.26 2131

The font size for station callouts is consistent with the Authority's 2019 CADD Guidelines Technical Memorandum 1.1.5. No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.10.27 2132

The northbound Douglass Avenue sidewalk will match the existing sidewalk conditions. The cross section is taken at the intersection of Service Road and Douglass Road and is not visible in the cross section.

20.10.28 2133

The existing Caltrans right-of-way is depicted on Drawing Number CV-T1586, near Service Road STA 23+00, in Volume 3.3 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

20.10.29 2134

The Authority acknowledges that a separate letter was submitted by the Caltrans Local Development Review team. A separate response was prepared. Please refer to Submission 013844 in this chapter.

20.10.30 2135

The commenter is correct in stating that the Buena Park Metrolink Station would be relocated between South Coyote Creek and Beach Boulevard. The Buena Park Metrolink Station would be approximately 0.75 mile northwest of its current location.

20.10.31 2136

Section 3.19, Cumulative Impacts, of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzes potential impacts on planned development and transportation improvements identified in local and regional plans. The project design would not prevent the reinstallation of the existing or implementation of future facilities identified in Buena Park. Under Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, no existing or planned bicycle facilities would be modified in a manner that would conflict with adopted plans or policies. With incorporation of TR-IAMF#2, Construction Transportation Plan; TR-IAMF#4, Maintenance of Pedestrian Access; TR-IAMF#5, Maintenance of Bicycle Access; TR-IAMF#11, Maintenance of Transit Access; TR-IAMF#12, Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety; and TR-IAMF#13, Stakeholder Coordination with Transportation Agencies, potential impacts on transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities would be avoided during construction and operation.

20.10.32 2137

The intent of Chapter 5, Community Analysis, is to evaluate disproportionately high and adverse effects (DHAE) on minority and low-income communities within RSAs. Section 5.4.3, Disadvantaged Communities, describes how the Authority incorporated CalEnviroScreen 4.0 criteria. Applicable avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures from each resource topic are considered in this methodology. DHAE are summarized in Section 5.7, Summary of Disproportionately High and Adverse Effects Prior to Consideration of Measures to Minimize Harm.

Block groups along SR 39 (Beach Blvd) in Buena Park include 60591106032, 60591106034, 60591106042, 60591106043, 60591106061, 60591106072, and 60591106073. Table 5-5 in Section 5.3.1.2, Identifying the Resource Study Areas, lists the block groups and RSA each block group is included in. Impacts on these block groups include diminished access to or use of recreational resources (Impact PR-4), temporary exposure of sensitive receivers to construction noise and vibration (Impacts N&V-1 and N&V-2), permanent exposure of sensitive receivers to operational noise and vibration (Impacts N&V-4 and N&V-5), handling of hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school (Impact HMW-6), impacts on visual quality during operation (Impact AVQ-3), temporary impacts from use of heavy construction equipment (Impact EMF/EMI-1), temporary impacts from operation of electrical equipment (Impact EMF/EMI-3), and permanent interference with sensitive equipment (Impact EMF/EMI-9). These impacts are summarized and described at the block group level in Chapter 5; for further detail, please refer to corresponding sections of Chapter 3, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures.

Operational vibration from all alternatives and HSR station options would have a DHAE on minority communities residing in block groups 60591106072 and 60591106073, directly adjacent the HSR alignment near SR 39. To reduce impacts, the Authority would implement N&V-MM#4, Implement Operational Vibration Mitigation Measures, which includes vehicle suspension enhancements, special track support systems, building modifications, and other measures. Although N&V-MM#4 will reduce vibration impacts, adverse effects would remain. Therefore, operational vibration from all alternatives and HSR station options would have a DHAE in minority communities in these block groups. These block groups correspond with Senate Bill (SB) 535 disadvantaged communities displayed on CalEnviroScreen 4.0.

To reduce effects on minority and low-income communities identified in Chapter 5, the Authority will incorporate CA-IAMF#1, Authority Community Ombudsperson and Contractor's Community Liaison, which would create a community ombudsperson position to address the needs of adversely affected communities. For further detail, refer to Section 5.8, Community Analysis–Specific Measures to Minimize Harm.

No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.10.33 2138

The Authority will coordinate with Caltrans and other agencies and stakeholders to manage implementation of the project section and other projects in Anaheim in proximity to the Buena Park Metrolink Station Relocation as the project advances. HSR design and construction will adhere to applicable codes, design standards, and recommendations including Caltrans Design Standards.

20.10.34 2139

As it pertains to pedestrian and bicycle access to stations, the Authority is incorporating LU-IAMF#2, Station Area Planning and Local Agency Coordination, which includes designing stations to enhance pedestrian and bicycle access. As discussed under Impact TR-5 in Section 3.2, Transportation, of the Draft EIR/EIS, the Authority will incorporate TR-IAMF#2, TR-IAMF#4, TR-IAMF#5, TR-IAMF#11, TR-IAMF#12, and TR-IAMF#13. TR-IAMF#2 requires implementation of a traffic control plan to implement elements such as providing for safe pedestrian and bicycle access or detours. TR-IAMF#4 and TR-IAMF#5 require the Authority-designated contractor to prepare specific Construction Management Plans as part of the Construction Transportation Plan to address maintenance of pedestrian and bicycle access during the construction period, to the extent feasible, in accordance with design, safety, and Americans with Disabilities Act requirements. TR-IAMF#11 requires the Authority-designated contractor to prepare specific Construction Management Plans to maintain transit access and safe and adequate access for transit users during construction. TR-IAMF#12 requires the contractor to provide a technical memorandum describing how pedestrian and bicycle accessibility and safety will be provided and maintained across the HSR corridor to and from stations. TR-IAMF#13 requires the Authority to coordinate with transit agencies so that bus routes serving the existing and relocated passenger rail stations will be maintained and rerouted during construction.

20.10.35 2140

The Authority acknowledges Caltrans' support for collaboration between state and local agencies and encouragement for the Authority to coordinate with OCTA on its Beach Boulevard Corridor Study. The commenter refers to impacts on bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit from a proposed overcrossing. The relocated Buena Park Metrolink Station design does not propose any new overcrossings, nor would it modify Beach Boulevard in any way. The Authority will continue to work with OCTA and stakeholders to ensure the relocated Buena Park Metrolink Station does not preclude future plans for Beach Boulevard.

20.10.36 2141

HSR trains would operate on the existing tracks that cross under SR 91. There are no proposed modifications to the SR 91 overcrossing beyond the installation of the overhead contact system. The project would not introduce new vertical or horizontal constraints from the HSR track alignment. The

Authority will continue to coordinate with Caltrans and other agencies and stakeholders on the installation of the overhead contact system as the project design advances.

20.10.37 2142

Regarding Chapter 5's incorporation of CalEnviroScreen information, please refer to the response to comment #2137 above. Block groups along SR 91 in north Anaheim and south Fullerton include 60590116021, 60590116022, 60590864041, 60590864043, 60590865011, and 60590865021 (refer to Table 5-5 and Figure 5-2). Impacts on these block groups include permanent exposure of sensitive receivers to operational vibration (Impact N&V-5), handling of hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school (Impact HMW-6), continuous permanent impacts on signalized intersections (Impact TR-10), continuous permanent impacts on roadway segments (Impact TR-12), construction near sites of potential environmental concern or Cortese List sites (Impact HMW-4), and operational delays to emergency response times (Impact SS-12). These impacts are summarized and described at the block group level in Chapter 5; for further detail, please refer to corresponding sections of Chapter 3. As discussed in Section 5.6.3.2, Air Quality, these block groups are not affected by localized air quality—exposure to diesel particulate matter (health risk) (Impact AQ-15), but would be affected by potential regional air quality impacts, discussed in Section 3.3, Air Quality and Global Climate Change.

Operational vibration from all alternatives and HSR station options would have a DHAE on minority communities residing in block groups 60590116021, 60590116022 and 60590865021, directly adjacent to the HSR alignment near SR 91. To reduce impacts, the Authority would implement N&V-MM#4, which includes vehicle suspension enhancements, special track support systems, building modifications, and other measures. Although N&V-MM#4 will reduce vibration impacts, adverse effects would remain. Therefore, operational vibration from all alternatives and HSR station options would have a DHAE in minority communities in block groups 60590116021, 60590116022, and 60590865021. These block groups correspond with SB 535 disadvantaged communities displayed on CalEnviroScreen 4.0.

The Orange County North Basin site is a Superfund site (listed in September 2020) that features a contaminated groundwater plume that extends to mixed residential, commercial, and industrial areas in Anaheim, Fullerton, and Placentia, and has affected the Orange County Groundwater Basin. This Superfund site is likely associated with Autonetics/Raytheon at 311 S Highland Avenue and Fullerton Manufacturing/Raytheon at 310 E Walnut Avenue in the southeast and downtown neighborhoods of Fullerton. The site includes block group 60590116022 (minority), west of the HSR alignment and north of SR 91 in Fullerton and Anaheim. Even with HMW-IAMF#1, Property Acquisition Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments, Additional Preconstruction Investigations, and Associated Actions to Control Site Contamination; HMW-IAMF#3, Work and Vapor Barriers; HMW-IAMF#4, Known, Suspected, and Unanticipated Environmental Contamination; HMW-IAMF#6, Spill Prevention; HMW-IAMF#9, Environmental Management System; and GEO-IAMF#3, Gas Monitoring, risks associated with construction near the Superfund site represent an adverse impact on minority communities in block group 60590116022. This block group corresponds with SB 535 disadvantaged communities displayed on CalEnviroScreen 4.0.

No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.10.38 2143

Refer to response to comment #2141 above.

20.10.39 2144

Refer to response to comment #2141 above.

20.10.40 2145

The commenter is correct that HSR station platforms and other facilities and improvements would be added to Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center (ARTIC).

20.10.41 2146

Refer to Standard Response LAA-Response-Section 3.12 SOCIO-01: Relocations, Right-of-Way Process, Eminent Domain, in Chapter 18.

Regarding Chapter 5's incorporation of CalEnviroScreen information, please refer to the response to comment #2137 above. Block groups near SR 57 and ARTIC include 60590761041, 60590761043, 60590761051, 60590762041, 60590762042, and 60590863036. Some of these block groups (north of Taft Avenue/Ball Road, and east of the Santa Ana River) correspond with SB 535 disadvantaged communities displayed on CalEnviroScreen 4.0.

No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.10.42 2147

Block groups near SR 57 and ARTIC include 60590761041, 60590761043, 60590761051, 60590762041, 60590762042, and 60590863036. Table 5-5 in Section 5.3.1.2 lists the block groups and the RSA the block group is included in. Impacts on these block groups include continuous permanent impacts on signalized intersections (Impact TR-10), temporary exposure of sensitive receivers to construction noise (Impact N&V-1), disruption or division of existing communities related to community access and displacements during construction (Impact SO-1), effects on visual quality during operations (Impact AVQ-3), and business displacements and relocations (Impact SO-3). As discussed in Section 5.6.3.2, these block groups are not affected by operational localized air quality—exposure to diesel particulate matter (health risk) (Impact AQ-15). There are no DHAE in these block groups, as described in Table 5-35.

However, all communities along the alignment could experience both adverse and beneficial air quality impacts from project construction and operation. Adverse effects include temporary direct and indirect impacts on air quality within the applicable air basin (Impact AQ-1), temporary direct impacts on implementation of an applicable air quality plan (Impact AQ-2), and temporary direct and indirect impacts on global climate change—greenhouse gas emissions (Impact AQ-3). As discussed in Section 3.3, Air Quality and Global Climate Change (Impacts AQ-4, AQ-5, AQ-6, AQ-11, AQ-12, AQ-13, AQ-14, and AQ-16), project operation would also result in regional air quality benefits. These benefits are associated with a decrease in vehicle miles traveled from travel mode shifts: from vehicles and aircraft to HSR (which has fewer emissions relative to these other modes of transportation). Section 3.3 summarizes these impacts.

Additionally, Chapter 5 summarizes these impacts at the block group level.

No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.10.43 2148

Impacts on the SR 57 ramps are discussed under Impact TR-14 in the Draft EIR/EIS. An increase to the westbound Katella Avenue on-ramp is expected to exceed the transportation impact threshold in the AM peak hour. However, implementation of TRAN-MM#7, Add Lane to State Route 57/ Westbound Katella Avenue Southbound On-Ramp, would provide lane capacity for vehicles exiting SR 57 from Katella Avenue, reducing queue length exceeding the impact threshold. As for local roadways near ARTIC, as discussed in Impact TR-11, three signalized intersections in the vicinity of ARTIC would exceed the impact threshold in the Horizon Year 2040 Plus Project scenario. TRAN-MM#2, Restripe Intersections; and TRAN-MM#4, Add Exclusive Turn Lanes to Intersections, would reduce adverse effects at the affected intersections to below the threshold. The HSR project would not modify intersections along the SR 57 corridor or affect access to the Santa Ana River and would not preclude Caltrans from implementing any planned bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

20.10.44 2149

As discussed under Impact TR-1, construction would temporarily affect access to and circulation around the project site, and construction-related trips may affect freeway facilities. Incorporation of TR-IAMF#1, Protection of Public Roadways During Construction; TR-IAMF#2; TR-IAMF#3, Off-Street Parking for Construction-Related Vehicles; TR-IAMF#6, Restriction on Construction Hours;

TR-IAMF#7, Construction Truck Routes; and TR-IAMF#8, Construction During Special Events, will avoid or minimize adverse effects related to access and circulation. As discussed under Impact TR-7 and Impact TR-14, there would be no impacts during construction or operation on freeway mainline segments, including Interstate 5.

Introduction of HSR service would provide an alternative mode of travel and would shift intercity travel from automobiles to reliable HSR. This would reduce vehicle miles traveled and limit traffic on Interstate 5.

20.10.45 2150

The comment appears to request a change to an IAMF, namely AQ-IAMF#1, Fugitive Dust Emissions. The comment requests that this IAMF be revised to reflect incorporation of two rules set forth by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) (Rules 402 and 403).

Draft EIR/EIS Section 3.3.2, Laws, Regulations, and Orders, identifies these and numerous other SCAQMD rules as part of the rules and regulations that may be applicable to the project. Because the Authority has acknowledged these rules, and because the Authority has developed IAMFs to apply statewide (in other words, in areas outside SCAQMD jurisdiction), the Authority has not changed AQ-IAMF#1 at this time. However, at SCAQMD's request, the Final EIR/EIS includes revisions to Draft EIR/EIS Section 3.3.2 to include other SCAQMD rules that may apply to the project (including 1110.2, 1166, 1401, 1466, and 1470). Refer to Final EIR/EIS Section 16.5.3, Section 3.3: Air Quality and Global Climate Change, for these revisions.

20.10.46 2151

Construction diesel fuel vehicles would be required to comply with Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations Section 2485, which restricts diesel engine idling to no more than 5 minutes at any location. No revisions have been made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to this comment.

20.10.47 2152

The comment asserts that implementation of a transportation mitigation measure would result in a need for additional analysis as well as a determination of transportation conformity. The Authority respectfully disagrees with these assertions.

Impact TR-14 concludes that operation of HSR would result in queue length increases along one freeway on-ramp. TRAN-MM#7 calls for a reconfiguration of the affected on-ramp and merge area that would reduce queue lengths. As described in Draft EIR/EIS Section 3.2.8, NEPA Impacts Summary; and Section 3.2.9, CEQA Significance Conclusions, Impact TR-14 is only an impact under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), not the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Under Section 176 of the Clean Air Act, federally supported transportation activities must be reviewed for conformity with the applicable air quality management plan. Transportation conformity regulations are set forth at 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 93, subpart A. Per 40 CFR Part 93.102(a)(iii), transportation conformity is required for projects approved, funded, or implemented by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), or both. Notably, per 40 CFR 93.102.(a)(2), individual projects that are not FHWA or FTA projects are not subject to conformity determinations unless "regionally significant" as defined at 40 CFR Part 93.101.

No approval, funding, or implementation from FHWA or FTA is anticipated for this proposed ramp reconfiguration. Moreover, the project is relatively minor in scale and thus appears to fall short of the exception at 40 CFR Part 93.121 for "regionally significant projects" to be subject to transportation conformity even in the absence of FHWA or FTA approvals or funding. The Authority anticipates that the improvements required under TRAN-MM#7 would be exempt under "projects that correct, improve, or eliminate a hazardous location or feature" (40 CFR Part 93.126 Table 2 - Exempt Projects.)

Accordingly, the project does not appear to be subject to transportation conformity or any of the associated analytical requirements; the requested revisions to Impact TR-14 are therefore not

warranted. However, the Authority will continue coordination with Caltrans during project design to ensure that the project improvements comply with all pertinent federal, state, and local requirements.

Notwithstanding, as set forth in TRAN-MM#7, the reconfiguration would be designed in accordance with pertinent Caltrans standards; final improvement plans would be subject to Caltrans' approval.

20.10.48 2153

Refer to Standard Response LAA-Response-Section 3.2 TRAN-02: Design of Traffic Mitigation Measures, in Chapter 18.

Please refer to the response to comment #2152 above. The Authority anticipates that the proposed improvements to the on-ramp in question would be exempt from 40 CFR Part 93.126 as a project "that correct(s), improve, or eliminate a hazardous location or feature" (Table 2, 40 CFR Part 93.126). Accordingly, the proposed improvements do not appear to be subject to transportation conformity or any of the associated analytical requirements. In addition, per Volume 1, Chapter 13 (Energy) of Caltrans' Standard Environmental Reference, an energy analysis report or memorandum would not be required for exempt projects. However, the Authority will continue coordination with Caltrans during project design to ensure that the project improvements comply with all pertinent federal, state, and local requirements.

20.10.49 2154

The Authority contacted the commenter on March 5, 2026, and provided the requested materials.

20.10.50 2155

Potential noise impacts from HSR operations were assessed at all sensitive receptors within the RSAs defined in Table 3.4-4 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Based on the results of the assessment, noise impacts were not identified at sensitive receptors in areas near where the HSR alignment crosses the state's right-of way. For soundwall mitigation, the Authority has established a reasonableness allowance of $95,000 (2018) per benefited residence in the noise and vibration mitigation guidelines that have been applied to all HSR project sections statewide. In this case, increasing the allowance to $170,000 is not necessary given that mitigation does not need to be considered for any of the areas near the state's right-of-way.