Caltrans

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Railroad Administration

RCTC
RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Appendix D - Response to Comments on the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR

Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program – Combined Final Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR and ROD

June 2022

This page is intentionally blank.

Contents

Tables

Abbreviations/Acronyms

AFL-CIO	American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations
APALA	Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit
BNSF	BNSF Railway Company
BMP	best management practice
BRT	bus rapid transit
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CERP	Community Emissions Reduction Plan
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CHSRA	California High-Speed Rail Authority
CSUSBPD	California State San Bernardino Palm Desert
CV	Coachella Valley
CVR	Coachella Valley Rail
CVSGPRCS	Coachella Valley San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service
CWA	Clean Water Act
DEIR	Draft Environmental Impact Report
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
DHS	Desert Hot Springs
DMU	Diesel multiple unit
DT	Downtown
DTLA	Downtown Los Angeles
EIR	environmental impact report
EIS	environmental impact statement
EJ	environmental justice
EMD	Electro-Motive Diesel

ENS	Emergency Notification Signs
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
EU	European Union
EV	electric vehicle
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FRA	Federal Railroad Administration
FWY	Freeway
GHG	greenhouse gas
HEP	Head end power
HSR	high-speed rail
I	Interstate
IE	Inland Empire
IE-OC	Inland Empire-Orange County
IMTC	Intermodal Transit Center
LA	Los Angeles
LACMTA	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation
LAUS	Los Angeles Union Station
LAX	Los Angeles International Airport
LEDPA	least environmentally damaging practicable alternative
LOSSAN	Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor
MARTA	Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPH	miles per hour
MTA	Metropolitan Transit Authority
NE	Northeast
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
OC	Orange County

OCTA	Orange County Transportation Authority
ONT	Ontario Airport
PE	Press Enterprise
PRCIP	Passenger Rail Corridor Investment Plan
PRIAA	Passenger Rail Investment and Improvements Act of 2008
Program	Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Corridor Service Program
Program Corridor	Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor
PS	Palm Springs
PSP	Palm Springs International Airport
PTC	positive train control
RailPAC	Rail Passengers Association of California and Nevada
RCTC	Riverside County Transportation Commission
ROW	right-of-way
RPS	rail propulsion systems
RT	Route
RTA	Riverside Transit Agency
SB	Senate Bill
SBCTA	San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
SBTC	San Bernardino Transit Center
SBV	San Bernardino Valley
sbX	San Bernardino Express
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCH	State Clearinghouse
SCRRA	Southern California Regional Rail Authority
SDP	Service Development Plan
SGVAG	San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
SGVTA	San Gabriel Valley Transit Authority

SoCal	Southern California
SPS	Special Projects Section
SR	State Route
TBD	to be determined
TUA	Traditional Use Area
U.S.	United States
UC	University of California
UCR	University of California, Riverside
UP	Union Pacific
UPRR	Union Pacific Railroad
US	United States
USC	United States Code
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
VP	vice president
WRCOG	Western Riverside Council of Government
ZEBL	Zero Emission Booster Locomotives
ZEMU	Zero-Emission Multiple Unit

This page is intentionally blank.

1 Introduction

The Draft Tier 1/Program Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program (Program) was distributed for public review from May 21, 2020, through July 6, 2021, in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500–1508), Federal Railroad Association's (FRA) Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (64 *Federal Register* [FR] 28545, May 26, 1999), and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Sections 15000 to 15387.

Comment submissions that were received during the 45-day public comment period included comments from public agencies, organizations, and individuals. Of the 279 total comment submissions received during the 45-day public comment period, 9 comment submissions were received from agencies, 15 comment submissions were received from organizations, and 255 comment submissions were received from individuals. An additional 18 verbal comment submissions were received during public hearings conducted on June 22 and June 26, 2021. Ten comment submissions (all from individuals) were received after the close of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR public comment period (i.e., after July 6, 2021). Responses to these ten comment submissions received after the close of the public comment period are included as a courtesy (Table 1-2).

1.1 Index of Comment Submissions Received on the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR

Table 1-1 indexes the agencies, organizations, and individuals who commented on the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR. Each commenter has been assigned a comment tracking number.

Table 1-1. Comment Submissions Received During Public Review Period

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Submission Date	Format of Comment Submission
Agency			
A-01	San Bernardino County Transportation Authority	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
A-02	City of Colton	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Submission Date	Format of Comment Submission
A-03	San Bernardino County	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
A-04	City of Coachella	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
A-05	United States Environmental Protection Agency	July 6, 2021	Letter/Email
A-06	City of Calimesa	July 1, 2021	Letter/Email
A-07	City of Indio	June 30, 2021	Letter/Email
A-08	California Highway Patrol	June 2, 2021	ceqanet.opr.ca.gov
A-09	City of Redlands	July 7, 2021	Regulations.gov and Letter
Organization			
O-01	The Gardens on El Paseo	June 21, 2021	Regulations.gov
O-02	Visit Greater Palm Springs	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
O-03	Empire Polo Club	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
O-04	Escape Room Palm Springs	June 26, 2021	Regulations.gov
O-05	Rail Passenger Association of California and Nevada	June 27, 2021	Regulations.gov
O-06	Spotlight VIP App	June 28, 2021	Regulations.gov
O-07	Greater Palm Springs Convention & Visitors Bureau	June 29, 2021	Regulations.gov
O-08	PRA Business Events	July 1, 2021	Regulations.gov
O-09	Gelato Granucci	July 1, 2021	Regulations.gov
O-10	The Lautner Compound	July 2, 2021	Regulations.gov
O-11	Union Pacific Railroad	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
O-12	Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL-CIO (APALA) - Inland Empire Chapter	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Submission Date	Format of Comment Submission
O-13	Historical Society of Palm Desert	May 24, 2021	Letter/Email
O-14	National Railroad Passenger Corporation	July 6, 2021	Letter
O-15	San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians	June 15, 2021	Letter/Email
Individual			
I-01	Anonymous	June 3, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-02	Pam Nelson	June 3, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-03	Kirk Olsen	June 3, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-04	Javier Navarro	June 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-05	Jodi Callahan	June 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-06	Raymond Gregory	June 7, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-07	Michael Hayes	June 7, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-08	Virginina Kast	June 11, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-09	Cos Aiello	June 11, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-10	Tim O'Bayley	June 11, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-11	Mikca Ladley	June 11, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-12	John Ohea	June 17, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-13	Russ Martin	June 18, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-14	Sara Cardella	June 18, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-15	Anonymous	June 18, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-16	Marybeth Tarrant	June 20, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-17	Amy Guzzetta	June 21, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-18	Anonymous	June 22, 2021	Regulations.gov

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Submission Date	Format of Comment Submission
I-19	Beth Peerce	June 22, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-20	Olivia Prescott	June 22, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-21	Luke Mauerman	June 22, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-22	Saskia Rhodes	June 22, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-23	Bruce Flamenbaum	June 22, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-24	Bruce Flamenbaum	June 22, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-25	James Turner	June 22, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-26	Beatrice Carter	June 22, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-27	Shelley Kaplan	June 22, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-28	Joe De Hoyos	June 23, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-29	Gerard Kent	June 23, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-30	Gloria Leslie	June 23, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-31	Anonymous	June 23, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-32	Robert Cummins	June 23, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-33	Anonymous	June 23, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-34	Cesar Lopez	June 24, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-35	Donna Green	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-36	Elizabeth Godina	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-37	Lynn Schaan	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-38	Gary Orfield	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-39	Kevin Janasak	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-40	Maribel Aguilar	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Submission Date	Format of Comment Submission
I-41	Robert Ramirez	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-42	Celeste Brackley	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-43	Steven Bohm	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-44	Russ Martin	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-45	Judith Burns	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-46	Jeff Hobson	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-47	John Burke	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-48	Lihn Young	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-49	Simon Holzman	June 26, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-50	David Cohan	June 26, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-51	Heather Ross	June 26, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-52	Tim Ellis	June 26, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-53	H Ross	June 26, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-54	Kathy Heckathorn	June 26, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-55	Anonymous	June 26, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-56	Shannon Clark	June 26, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-57	Anonymous	June 26, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-58	Caroline Yeager	June 27, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-59	Lisa Botts	June 27, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-60	Darren Wallen	June 18, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-61	Karen Schnabel	June 18, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-62	Kyle Canova	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Submission Date	Format of Comment Submission
I-63	Kyle Canova	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-64	Anonymous	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-65	Anonymous	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-66	David T Casares	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-67	Sally Hill	June 26, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-68	Cathy O'Connell	June 26, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-69	Amir Sakr	June 25, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-70	Deborah Kennedy-Comouche	June 28, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-71	Anonymous	June 28, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-72	Revae Reynolds	June 28, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-73	Anonymous	June 28, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-74	Jackc Neff	June 29, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-75	Niraj Rai	June 29, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-76	Carla Barajas	June 29, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-77	Anonymous	June 29, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-78	Sally Robertson	June 29, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-79	Nate Fakes	June 29, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-80	Sage Vandenheuvel	June 29, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-81	Cate Andrew	June 29, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-82	Michael Benitez	June 30, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-83	Kelly Taylor	June 30, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-84	Nancy Ross	June 30, 2021	Regulations.gov

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Submission Date	Format of Comment Submission
I-85	Doug Watson	June 30, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-86	Dan Wentzel	June 30, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-87	Heather Hurley	July 1, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-88	Reggie Lee	July 1, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-89	Fernando Fregoso	July 1, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-90	Fernando Fregoso	July 1, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-91	Anonymous	July 1, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-92	Anthony Bianco	July 1, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-93	Patricia Brockman	July 1, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-94	Alecia Walstrum	July 1, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-95	Joanna Ohanesian	July 1, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-96	Sabina Greco	July 1, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-97	Jana Baumann	July 1, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-98	Tandy Hill	July 1, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-99	Susie and Larry Talbot	July 1, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-100	Anonymous	July 1, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-101	G Jason	July 2, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-102	Mike Zamudio	July 2, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-103	Morgen Bentsen	June 28, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-104	Amanda Hoffman	June 28, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-105	Anonymous	June 28, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-106	Gayl Biondo	June 28, 2021	Regulations.gov

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Submission Date	Format of Comment Submission
I-107	Alexander Cota	June 28, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-108	Anonymous	June 28, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-109	Rubyd Olvera	June 29, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-110	Steve Richards	June 29, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-111	Bill Wolfer	July 2, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-112	Christine Peters	July 2, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-113	Tracy Beckman	July 2, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-114	Anonymous	July 2, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-115	Kelly Groves	July 2, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-116	Janet Malachowsky	July 2, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-117	Keith Coleman	July 2, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-118	Barbara Matis	July 2, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-119	Gary Smith	July 2, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-120	Dex Graham	July 2, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-121	Barbara Shore	July 3, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-122	Anonymous	July 3, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-123	Lise Webb	July 3, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-124	Donna Salazar	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-125	Keith R Bevan	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-126	Sean Treguboff	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-127	Steve Arendt	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-128	Jo Lage	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Submission Date	Format of Comment Submission
I-129	Anonymous	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-130	Charles Willis	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-131	Carlos Vidal	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-132	Anonymous	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-133	Doug Greenman	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-134	Lyle Brennan	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-135	Anonymous	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-136	Jeffrey Bagley	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-137	Anonymous	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-138	Arlene Gotshalk	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-139	Angie Gerber	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-140	Jason Goff	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-141	Anita Diaz	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-142	Anonymous	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-143	Earle Wolfe	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-144	Cinthia Klinger	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-145	Sandra Sternberg	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-146	Trish Webb	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-147	Richard Lunstedt	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-148	Linda Lechlitner	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-149	Anonymous	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-150	Megan Goehring	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Submission Date	Format of Comment Submission
I-151	Robert Schneider	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-152	John Ryan	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-153	Paul Ross	July 4, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-154	Richard Allegra	July 5, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-155	James Wilkinson	July 5, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-156	Suze Datz	July 5, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-157	Rick Fearns	July 5, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-158	Anonymous	July 5, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-159	Anonymous	July 5, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-160	Tamar Cohen	July 5, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-161	Tamar Cohen	July 5, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-162	Taya Gray	July 5, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-163	Gene Brake	July 5, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-164	Ann Arnold	July 5, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-165	Colin Sowa	July 5, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-166	Ellen Greene	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-167	Patty Lasky	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-168	Eric Reese	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-169	Anonymous	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-170	Mary Hawkins	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-171	Anonymous	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-172	M Ell	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Submission Date	Format of Comment Submission
I-173	Scott Pryde	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-174	Lauren Wolfer	July 2, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-175	James Fogarty	July 3, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-176	Ann Greer	July 3, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-177	Kathaleen Hart	July 3, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-178	Patricia Patterson	July 5, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-179	Bill Lehman	July 5, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-180	Jamie Avalos	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-181	Sandra Allen	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-182	Hugh Wakeman	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-183	Mitch Moldenhauer	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-184	Oliver Cleary	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-185	D	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-186	Charlotte Duplay	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-187	Daniel Stiel	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-188	Shawn Pasqualini	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-189	Anonymous	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-190	Anonymous	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-191	Taylor Lee	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-192	Cecelia Garcia	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-193	Donna Feichtmann	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-194	Anonymous	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Submission Date	Format of Comment Submission
I-195	Tim Bustad	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-196	Patrick McCaffrey	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-197	Patrick McCaffrey	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-198	Robert Hedrick	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-199	Terri Neuman	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-200	Anonymous	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-201	Ivan Duran	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-202	Jan Kielmann	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-203	Anonymous	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-204	Jan Kielmann	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-205	Matt Korner	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-206	David Applegate	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-207	Wayne Chandler	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-208	Bill Ford	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-209	Linda Leventhal	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-210	Nikki Reed	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-211	Nick Parra	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-212	Ronald Roy	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-213	Terri Crooks	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-214	David Haugland	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-215	Daniel Teutle	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-216	Edward Neal	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Submission Date	Format of Comment Submission
I-217	Monica Hayes	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-218	John Kephart	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-219	Hubert Hanrahan	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-220	Catherine Barber	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-221	Brian Bower	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-222	Ellen Finan	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-223	Anonymous	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-224	Dave Grothe	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-225	Jan Harnik	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-226	Brenda Direen	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-227	Brian Eggert	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-228	Suzanna Dwight	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-229	Suzanna Dwight	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-230	Adam Behr	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-231	Jim King	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-232	Phillip Snover	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-233	Thomas Tokheim	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-234	Pamela Carnt	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-235	Kevin Holliday	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-236	Anonymous	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-237	Roman Minyaylyuk	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-238	Judy Myall	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Submission Date	Format of Comment Submission
I-239	Walter Bendick	July 6, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-240	Michael Sloan	June 28, 2021	Email
I-241	Michael Moore	May 21, 2021	Email
I-242	Christine Caffrey	May 24, 2021	Email
I-243	Deborah E. Garbe	May 25, 2021	Email
I-244	Shawn Stoller	May 26, 2021	Email
I-245	Tyson Atwood	May 27, 2021	Email
I-246	Gordon Edwards	June 1, 2021	Email
I-247	Andrea Josephson	June 2, 2021	Email
I-248	Joseph Farley	June 14, 2021	Email
I-249	Kelly Watson	June 14, 2021	Email
I-250	Nicola Wong	June 22, 2021	Email
I-251	Alex Croix	June 24, 2021	Email
I-252	Sabina Greco	June 26, 2021	Email
I-253	William Cunningham	July 1, 2021	Email
I-254	John Ulloth	July 6, 2021	Mailed Letter
I-255	Bruce Campbell	July 4, 2021	Mailed Letter
I-256	Brian Yanity	June 22, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing
I-257	Reed Alvarado	June 22, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing
I-258	Anthony Tristan	June 22, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing
I-259	Peter Green	June 22, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing
I-260	Timothy Papandreou	June 22, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Submission Date	Format of Comment Submission
I-261	Barbara DoCouto	June 22, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing
I-262	Margo Bell	June 22, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing
I-263	Lisa Middleton	June 22, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing
I-264	Gary Levin	June 22, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing
I-265	Brian Yanity	June 22, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing
I-266	Genevieve Judge	June 22, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing
I-267	Dan Wentzel	June 26, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing
I-268	Tom Liebman	June 26, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing
I-269	Brian Yanity	June 26, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing
I-270	Mariela Loera	June 26, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing
I-271	Tom Tokeim	June 26, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing
I-272	Heather Ross	June 26, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing
I-273	Ian Stewart	June 26, 2021	Verbal Comment at Public Hearing

As previously mentioned, 10 comment submissions were received after the close of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR public comment period (i.e., after July 6, 2021); however, they are included in the response to comments as a courtesy. Comment submissions received after the close of the 45 -day public comment period are described in Table 1-2. As shown in Table 1-2, each commenter has been assigned a comment tracking number.

Table 1-2. Comment Submissions Received Outside of the Public Review Period

Comment Number	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Format of Comment Submission
Individuals			
I-274	Warren Palmer	July 7, 2021	Regulations.gov
I-275	John Harris	July 7, 2021	Email

Comment Number	Commenter	Date Comment Received	Format of Comment Submission
I-276	Howard Hoffenberg	July 7, 2021	Email
I-277	Richard McCurdy	July 7, 2021	Email
I-278	Jerry Rutledge	July 7, 2021	Email
I-279	Ross Wittman	July 7, 2021	Email
I-280	Esmeralda Sanchez	July 7, 2021	Email
I-281	Friedrich Bellerman	July 11, 2021	Project Website
I-282	Ken Alan	July 12, 2021	Project Website
I-283	Jeffrey Mihalik	August 26, 2021	Project Website

1.2 Master Responses

Many of the comments received on the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the same topics or expressed similar concerns. Based on these common themes, the lead agencies have prepared the following Master Responses. If a Master Response was used to respond to an individual comment, the commenter is directed to that Master Response in the response matrix. Table 1-3 provides a summary of the Master Responses generated for the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.

Table 1-3. Index of Master Responses

Master Response Number	Topic
1	Proposed Station Locations
2	Conceptual Nature of Build Alternative Option Components
3	Freight Train Volume Assumptions
4	Noise Quiet Zones
5	Program Implementation
6	Train Trip Frequency
7	Train Trip Duration
8	Program Funding

Master Response Number	Topic
9	Program Timing
10	Transit Connections
11	Locomotive Technology
12	Environmental Justice

1.2.1 Master Response 1: Proposed Station Locations

Several comments were received that requested clarification regarding the Program's proposed station locations. Comments ranged from: 1) specific location requests for a proposed station location and 2) how many stations are going to be considered.

Potential station catchment areas were refined for purposes of Draft Tier 1/Program-level environmental review. As stated in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.1.1 (2016 Alternatives Analysis Report Screening and Selection Process), at the outset of the alternative analysis process, a comprehensive public outreach plan was developed to serve as the blueprint for community engagement and stakeholder input. During the alternative analysis, various station catchment areas[1] were considered throughout the Program Corridor. Intermediate station stops were located on each route alternative at the largest intermediate cities[2], or as close as possible to the largest intermediate cities, to attract and serve the largest possible ridership. A station stop was assumed within each of the existing and potential station catchment areas for purposes of the alternative analysis.

Based on comments received during the Notice of Intent and Notice of Preparation scoping period, FRA, Caltrans, and RCTC extended the eastern terminus of the Program Corridor beyond Indio to include the adjoining City of Coachella. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3.2 (Build Alternative Options 1, 2, and 3), the environmental evaluation assumed the following potential station study areas:

- Western Section of Program Corridor (for all Build Alternative Options)
    - Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS; existing station to be used for proposed rail service)
    - Fullerton Station (existing station to be used for proposed rail service)

[1] A station catchment area is the area where future station facilities could be constructed in addition to other rail infrastructure improvements along the existing rail ROW. A station stop is the area where a future station facility would be located within an identified station catchment area.

[2] Intermediate cities are cities with a population between 50,000 and 1,000,000 people that generally play a primary role in connecting important rural and urban areas to basic facilities and services.

  - Riverside Station (existing station to be used for proposed rail service)

- Eastern Section of Program Corridor (Build Alternative Option 1)
  - Loma Linda/Redlands Potential Station Area
  - Pass Area Potential Station Area
  - Palm Springs Station (existing station to be used for proposed rail service)
  - Mid Valley Potential Station Area
  - Indio Potential Station Area
  - Coachella Potential Station Area
- Eastern Section of Program Corridor (Build Alternative Options 2 and 3)
  - Loma Linda/Redlands Potential Station Area
  - Pass Area Potential Station Area
  - Palm Springs Station (existing station to be used for proposed rail service)
  - Mid Valley Potential Station Area
  - Indio Potential Station Area

For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area represents the potential area where rail infrastructure improvements (i.e. grade crossings, bridges, sidings, culverts) and station facilities could be implemented and constructed but does not represent the precise location or footprint of the rail infrastructure improvement or station facility. As part of the Tier 2/Project-level environmental review process, the Tier 2/Project Study Area would be developed and would identify where site-specific rail infrastructure improvements (i.e., grade crossings, bridges, sidings, culverts) and station facilities would be located. The Tier 2/Project Study Area would be refined through additional planning and design, in coordination with agencies, organizations, and the public.[3]

[3] After completion of Tier 1/Program-level analysis, the Selected Alternative will be further refined through additional planning and design. Implementation of the Selected Alternative may be accomplished through separate environmental documents and could be funded and led by an agency other than the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), or Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), depending upon the source of funding.

1.2.2 Master Response 2: Conceptual Nature of Build Alternative Option Components

Several comments were received that requested clarification regarding the construction and operation of the conceptual Build Alternative Option components. Comments ranged from 1) concerns that certification and approval of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR would lead to immediate construction and operation of physical components and the associated environmental effects and 2) requests for identification of site-specific analysis and mitigation measures.

The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR represents a program or corridor-level of environmental review, which provides an initial assessment of the types and magnitude of potential environmental effects and impacts that may occur from implementation of the physical components, and identifies programmatic strategies to avoid, minimize, or mitigate significant impacts. Certification of this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR does authorize any construction activities and would not result in any immediate impacts to the environment.

The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR provides a conceptual framework at the corridor-level, which will inform the development of future site-specific analyses and mitigation measures. Development of site-specific analysis and mitigation requires a more refined level of design. At the Tier 1/Program level of evaluation, the agencies relied on a conceptual level of design to assess impacts throughout the corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR assumes a wide Study Area for the Program to capture the full range of potential impacts from implementation of the Build Alternatives. For example, in order to capture the area of potential impact for station-related infrastructure improvements, the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area extends up to 1,000 feet from either side of the centerline, plus a 500-foot buffer for the assessment of indirect impacts, for a total Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area of 1,500 feet from either side of the centerline at each of the individual station location areas. The remaining portion of the Eastern Section’s Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area encompasses up to 300 feet from the railroad centerline to include non-station-related infrastructure improvements, plus a 500-foot buffer for the assessment of indirect impacts, for a total Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area of 800 feet from the railroad centerline.

As the Selected Alternative is further refined through additional planning and design and evaluated in future Tier 2/Project-level efforts, site-specific analysis and mitigation will be developed. It is anticipated the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area will be reduced as site-specific locations of rail infrastructure improvements and station facilities are identified. Site-specific analysis and mitigation will be informed by additional planning and design and will be further evaluated as the Program moves toward implementation.

1.2.3 Master Response 3: Freight Train Volume Assumptions

Several comments were received that requested clarification regarding the Program's assumptions for future freight train volumes if a potential third mainline track were to be constructed within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. Comments ranged from: 1) how many freight trains could be added with operation of a potential third mainline track; 2) how passenger trains and freight trains would operate on a potential third mainline track; and 3) the assumptions used associated with modeling analysis.

Freight traffic growth within the Program Corridor is independent of the Program and would occur with or without Program implementation. The *2018 California State Rail Plan* anticipates rail intermodal traffic in California will increase at a compound annual growth rate of 2.9 percent through 2040, and rail carload traffic will increase at a compound annual growth rate of 1.7 percent through 2040, which could add additional freight trains to portions of Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway's (BNSF) San Bernardino Subdivision and Union Pacific's (UPRR) Yuma Subdivision.

The inclusion of a potential third mainline track within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor would meet the Purpose and Need of the Program (e.g., providing an intercity passenger rail service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley), and, while implementation of the Build Alternative could increase operational efficiency of freight operations, it is not likely to increase the volume of freight traffic beyond the anticipated growth, as demonstrated by the rail operations simulation modeling conducted for the Program, as follows:

- **Rail Operations Simulation Modeling.** Caltrans and RCTC conducted computer--based rail operations simulation modeling to estimate rail performance in the Program Corridor, including impacts on freight rail. The preliminary operations simulation modeling focused on verifying that the Program's proposed rail capacity improvements would meet the Program's Purpose and Need and would specifically meet intercity passenger train and freight service performance goals.

  The inclusion of the two potential third mainline track variations under the Build Alternative Options within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor would also meet the Purpose and Need of the Program by allowing two new, daily intercity round trips to run each day, at 90 percent on-time performance, and on a schedule that provides a competitive trip time, while not unreasonably impairing the freight operations of the host railroad, UPRR (see Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives) for details). The 90 percent on-time performance for the proposed passenger rail service assumes that the potential third mainline track is designed to be interoperable for passenger and freight use. This assumption allows for optimization of passenger operations by permitting passenger trains to

use the adjacent existing tracks in order to maintain service when maintenance work is being performed on the third track or during other periods when the third track is not available for use. In addition, preliminary rail simulation modeling assumed that the UPRR tracks return to a double track railroad east of the city of Coachella.

- **Projected Freight Rail Volumes.** As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the *2018 California State Rail Plan* anticipates rail intermodal traffic in California will increase at a compound annual growth rate of 2.9 percent through 2040, and rail carload traffic will increase at a compound annual growth rate of 1.7 percent through 2040, which could add approximately 40 additional freight trains to BNSF's San Bernardino Subdivision west of Riverside, approximately 60 additional freight trains between Riverside and Colton, and approximately 50 additional freight trains to UPRR's Yuma Subdivision east of Colton. These assumptions were included in the No Build Alternative.

  As part of the planning work to accommodate the forecasted growth of freight service in the operations simulations modeling, Caltrans and RCTC solicited input from UPRR regarding projected future increases in freight rail traffic in the Program Corridor through the year 2044, which is the final year in the Program's 20-year planning horizon. This forecast is to ensure the Program meets Federal requirements that rail projects must determine and accommodate future rail volumes and capacity needs for a period of 20 years beyond implementation date.

  To determine projected freight train growth for the operations simulations, the same freight growth rate applied to projected freight train increases calculated for the Colton Crossing Rail Grade Separation Project sponsored by the California Transportation Commission and Caltrans was used. The growth rate used was consistent with forecasted growth rates in the *2018 California State Rail Plan*, which anticipates that rail intermodal traffic in California will increase at a compound annual growth rate of 2.9 percent through 2040, and that rail carload traffic will increase at a compound annual growth rate of 1.7 percent through 2040.

  While UPRR's actual freight growth may be greater or less than the projected growth rates based on market demands, the forecasted growth rate provides a reasonable basis for estimating future freight movement. In addition, the performance of existing and projected freight trains is not materially different between the No Build and Build scenarios of the operations simulation model. As indicated above, freight traffic growth within the Program Corridor is independent of the Program and will occur with or without Program implementation.

1.2.4 Master Response 4: Noise Quiet Zones

Several comments were received that requested consideration, identification, and development of noise quiet zones along segments of the railroad within the Program Corridor.

Chapter 3.6 (Noise and Vibration) of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR provided analysis on potential rail, station, and traffic noise that could occur during construction and operation of the Program. However, design specifics and locations of the rail infrastructure improvements and station facilities are not known at this time, so the operational noise that could be generated and potential sensitive receptors that could be affected during operational activities could not be quantified at the Tier 1/Program-level evaluation. Once detailed information for the site-specific rail infrastructure improvements or station facility is determined, a quantitative estimate of the noise levels during operation and impacts on sensitive receptors will be conducted as part of the Tier 2/Project level environmental document.

A local jurisdiction may apply to establish a Noise Quiet Zone at any time, independent from the proposed Program. Subsequent development of rail and station infrastructure is required to be consistent with existing Noise Quiet Zones and would not preclude each jurisdiction's decision to implement additional Noise Quiet Zones along the Program Corridor. In addition, the Program will be implemented consistent with any mitigation measures developed in subsequent Tier 2/Project-level evaluations.

1.2.5 Master Response 5: Program Implementation

Several comments were received that requested clarification regarding how the Program would be implemented along the Program Corridor.

Caltrans received Federal funding from the FRA for environmental review and planning activities for the Program, which has resulted in this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR. RCTC is supporting Caltrans through the preparation of the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR and Service Development Plan (SDP). RCTC is the regional transportation planning agency for Riverside County, which contains the majority of the Coachella Valley Rail Corridor Program where a portion of the Western Section and most of the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor is located.

As described in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, Caltrans manages and coordinates statewide intercity passenger rail service that helps to improve California's air quality by reducing highway congestion and fuel consumption. Caltrans contracts with the Amtrak to provide daily operation and maintenance of the Amtrak California service. In addition, Amtrak currently operates passenger rail services throughout the Program Corridor. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR

analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. If during the course of subsequent Tier 2/Project-level analysis, the proposed passenger rail service is operated by a non-Amtrak entity, the modeling assumptions used for the Tier 1/Program-level analysis would need to be revisited.

Following publication of the Final Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR and finalization of the SDP, the Selected Alternative will be refined through additional planning and design to identify the appropriate implementation structure for the Program. Implementation options are currently being evaluated as part of the SDP process, and are expected to continue at the state and regional level with involvement from several regional agencies, local jurisdictions, key transportation stakeholders (e.g., Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA), San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA), Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA), Amtrak, UPRR and BNSF), and the public.

Implementation of the Selected Alternative, will depend on stakeholder feedback, availability of funding, and be informed by additional planning and design. The Program may be implemented in phases building off of this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR. If implementation of the Selected Alternative requires a Federal, state, or local agency to make a decision on proposed actions, including providing permits; financing, assisting, conducting, or approving projects or programs; issuing agency rules, regulations, plans, policies, or procedures; and making land management decisions, additional Tier 2/Project-level studies may be required for NEPA and CEQA clearance. These Tier 2/Project-level studies will be conducted in coordination with the applicable Federal, state, and local agency/agencies.

1.2.6 Master Response 6: Train Trip Frequency

Several comments were received that requested consideration of different train trip frequencies within the Program Corridor. Comments ranged from 1) increasing the frequency of passenger trains from two daily round trips to a higher trip frequency within the Program Corridor and 2) increasing daily passenger trains to accommodate daily desert commuters.

As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.5 (Program Purpose and Objectives), the frequency of the Program's proposed passenger rail service was established as two daily round trips based on a ridership forecasting model service optimization analysis, which found that two round trips per day would attract the greatest number of riders per train while providing an opportunity for passengers to make a limited round trip in 1 day.

As part of the alternatives analysis, a market analysis was conducted to analyze travel patterns in the Program Corridor. The results of the market analysis indicated that the Program Corridor operates as a multi-purpose route and not primarily as a commuter route.[4]

Ridership forecasting conducted during the development of the alternatives analysis indicated that a proposed schedule of two daily round trips, with morning and afternoon departures from each terminus, would attract the highest number of riders per train, rather than schedules timed for peak-period commuting from the Coachella Valley to the Los Angeles Basin. Additionally, the Program's passenger trains were assumed to operate within the Corridor at the same speeds as present-day passenger and commuter trains, enabling the Coachella Valley trains to be slotted into existing commuter-train schedules on the Western Section of the Program Corridor to avoid the necessity for construction of additional main tracks.

As stated in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.6 (Program Need), the Program is needed to address the absence of effective transportation alternatives to personal automobile travel between coastal regions of Southern California (e.g., Los Angeles and Orange Counties) and cities in the Inland Empire (e.g., City of Riverside) and the Coachella Valley (e.g., Cities of Coachella, Indio, Palm Springs), the projected increase in travel demand in the Program Corridor resulting from population and employment growth, and the increasing unreliability of existing transportation systems within the Program Corridor.

An intercity passenger type of model was determined to best meet the Purpose and Need of the Program. As described in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, Caltrans contracts with the Amtrak to provide daily operation and maintenance of the Amtrak California service. In addition, Amtrak currently operates passenger rail services throughout the Program Corridor. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the intercity passenger rail service proposed within the Program Corridor as part of California's state-supported passenger rail system.

Although the Program considers the addition of only two daily round trips initially, implementation of the Program would not preclude future planning efforts undertaken by other Federal, state, and local agencies that may involve increasing the number of passenger trains and/or trips within the Program Corridor.

[4] Intercity passenger rail services are typically established to connect cities and regions on routes with longer distances (typically 100 miles or more) than typical commuter services and with limited intermediate station stops to serve major population, employment, and tourist centers to reduce trip times. By contrast, commuter trains operate within a large metropolitan region on shorter distance (less than 100 miles) routes that connect suburban locations and city centers, with frequent station stops, and typically on schedules designed to serve work commuters and local travelers.

1.2.7 Master Response 7: Train Trip Duration

Several comments were received that requested consideration of different train-trip durations within the Program Corridor. Comments ranged from 1) concerns regarding the length of train trip durations (i.e. 3.5 hours), 2) changing the route alignment in the Western Section of the Program Corridor to save time, and 3) decreasing train trip durations through express passenger rail service with limited station stops.

Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 1 (Program Purpose and Need provided an estimate on anticipated one-way travel times between Los Angeles and Coachella of approximately 180 to 200 minutes. The proposed passenger rail service on train-trip duration assumptions are intended to achieve an endpoint on-time performance of 90 percent and an all stations on-time performance of 90 percent, consistent with Federal and state on-time performance metrics requirements. The train travel times were determined by following the associated track speed limits of the corridor, which includes sections requiring climbing steep grades and navigating existing curves. In addition, as stated in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), maximum authorized passenger train speed in the Western Section of the Program Corridor is 79 miles per hour west of Fullerton and 60 miles per hour east of Fullerton. The maximum authorized freight train speed is 50 miles per hour throughout the Western Section. In the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor, passenger trains have maximum authorized speeds ranging between 30 and 70 miles per hour. The average maximum authorized speed for passenger trains is 59 miles per hour. The maximum authorized freight train speed is 70 miles per hour throughout the Eastern Section although most freight trains operate at much lower maximum speeds due to the rail line’s steep grades and curves that limit freight train speeds.

With respect to the route alignment, Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives) provides a summary of the alternative analysis, which describes the route alignments considered within the Program Corridor. Of the six route alignments considered for the Western Section of the Program Corridor, two of the route alignments met the criteria of the Program’s Purpose and Need by providing a competitive travel mode throughout the Program Corridor. Of the two route alignments, Route Alternative 4-A did not meet the technical and economic screening criteria identified in the alternative analysis conducted for the Program. As identified in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), Route Alternative 4-A proposed the use of the SCRRA San Gabriel Subdivision from LAUS, traveling eastward through Montclair and Rialto to reach a new eastward connection in San Bernardino with the Short Way Subdivision. This route alternative would not travel farther east along the San Gabriel Subdivision to serve the new San Bernardino Transit Center (SBTC) in downtown San Bernardino.

Route Alternative 1, proposed the use of the BNSF San Bernardino Subdivision from LAUS through Fullerton and Riverside to reach Colton. Route Alternative 1 meets the Program's Purpose and Need (e.g. providing a competitive travel mode throughout the Program Corridor) while meeting the technical and economic criteria identified in the alternative analysis methodology. As a result of the alternative analysis, Route Alternative 1 was selected for further consideration in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.

Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.3 (Transportation) identified service goals for train frequency and targeted train trip times for the Build Alternative Options. These service goals were developed to meet the service objectives as described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 1 (Purpose and Need). The frequency of the proposed passenger rail service would be two daily round-trip passenger trains based on a ridership forecasting model service optimization analysis conducted during the preparation of the alternative analysis which is summarized in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives). One of the Program's purposes and objectives is to provide travelers between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley a public transportation service that offers more convenient, reliable, and competitive trip times, better station access, and more frequency than currently available public transportation services.

The use of express trains or service would likely not achieve the Program's Purpose and Need or result in significant travel time savings without sacrificing ridership (i.e., passengers' accessibility to the service). Given the spacing of station catchment areas identified and by providing limited stops as part of an express service within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor, people would not easily be able to go to the next station to catch the train if one of the two daily trains were to skip their closest station. The ridership forecasts indicate that in first year of operation, the total annual ridership (one-way trips) for the 5-station scenario would be 188,300 one-way trips and for the 3-station scenario 150,100 one-way trips. The forecasts for the 20 year projection are estimated to be 312,300 one-way trips for the 5-station scenario and 249,000 one-way trips for the 3-station scenario. As a result, an express service, with fewer station stops could result in a significant reduction in ridership.

In addition, an express service would likely not result in significant time savings within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. For each station removed from the service plan, the travel time savings is 3-3.5 minutes. As described in Appendix B (Conceptual Trains Schedules) of the Transportation Impact Technical Memorandum (Appendix C of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR), with 5 stations east of Colton the total travel time (Indio to LA) is 3 hours and 8 minutes going westbound and 3 hours and 10 minutes going eastbound. Under a scenario with 3 stations east of Colton, the total travel time is 3 hours and 2 minutes going westbound and 3 hours and 3 minutes going eastbound.

Implementation of the Program would not preclude future planning efforts undertaken by other Federal, state, and local agencies, which may consider additional daily passenger rail trains or an express passenger rail service within the Program Corridor.

1.2.8 Master Response 8: Program Funding

Several comments were received that requested clarification on Program funding. Comments ranged from 1) how the Program was going to be funded, 2) when the Program was going to be funded, 3) the use of taxpayer money to fund the Program, and 4) the use of funds for other transportation efforts (such as roadway/highway improvements or airport facilities).

The Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR and Service Development Plan were funded through a Federal grant awarded to Caltrans by FRA. The scope of the grant is for the Tier 1 environmental review and planning activities for the Program with the state contributing matching funds as required by the grant.

The Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR represents one of several steps that may proceed implementation of the Program. Through the Tier 1/Program-level process, the agencies will select an alternative, which may be further evaluated in a Tier 2/Project-level analysis. The state or local agency seeking to advance the Selected Alternative may apply for funding at the state or Federal level through various funding mechanisms (i.e., grants, or loans). If the Selected Alternative advances to construction, the state or local agency may also seek state or Federal funds for construction.

Regarding the use of taxpayer funds and the use of funds for other transportation efforts, the Program will be implemented in consideration of feedback from the public and interested stakeholders. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 1 (Program Purpose and Need), the Program's purpose is to implement a safe, reliable, and convenient intercity passenger rail service in the Program Corridor with the capability to meet the future mobility needs of residents, businesses, and visitors. The Program is needed to address the absence of effective transportation alternatives to personal automobile travel between coastal regions of Southern California (i.e., Los Angeles and Orange Counties) and cities in the Inland Empire (i.e., City of Riverside) and the Coachella Valley (i.e., Cities of Coachella, Indio, Palm Springs), the projected increase in travel demand in the Program Corridor resulting from population and employment growth, and the increasing unreliability of existing transportation systems within the Program Corridor. The Selected Alternative achieves the Program's Purpose and Need by providing daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offering an alternative mode of transportation to communities in and visitors traveling to the Coachella Valley. If Federal or state funds are used to implement the Program, the state and/or local agency implementing the Program will use best efforts to ensure funds are used appropriately.

1.2.9 Master Response 9: Program Timing

Several comments were received that requested clarification regarding the timing of when the Program would be implemented within the Program Corridor. Comments ranged from: 1) timing of construction activities associated with rail infrastructure and station facility development and 2) timing of when passenger rail service would be in operation.

Due to the complexity surrounding the development and implementation of large transportation Programs, it is difficult to accurately estimate the timing of future Tier 2/Project-level phases. The ability to implement the Program, and to construct the improvements necessary to support such service, will depend on many factors, including funding, environmental approvals, market growth, operating agreements, regional cooperation, and practical constraints relating to construction within the Program Corridor. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.2 (Intended Uses of the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR), the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts of the Build Alternative Options broadly within the Program Corridor. After completion of the Tier 1/Program-level analyses, the Selected Alternative will be refined through additional planning and design. At this time, funding for additional stages of Program planning have not been identified, but there are several possible sources of funding at the Federal, state, and local levels. If Federal or state funding is used, or implementation of the Program requires Federal or state approvals, the Selected Alternative will be further evaluated in a Tier 2/Project-level analysis. After completion of Tier 2/Project-level evaluation, the Program may advance to construction and operation.

To ensure that incremental capital investment in the Coachella Valley will result in benefits for the entire Program Corridor, the Selected Alternative will likely be implemented in phases. Phasing ensures that improvements are planned and implemented to meet specific service and operational objectives and to lay the foundation for future phases of work. In this way, travelers will experience near- and mid-term service benefits over the extended period of time that it will take to implement the full-service plan.

1.2.10 Master Response 10: Transportation Connections

Several comments were received that requested clarification regarding the Program's assumptions for future local, regional, state, and national transportation connections within and outside of the Program Corridor. Comments ranged from: 1) local transit connections (e.g., connections to Redlands Passenger Rail [ARROW], Metrolink, Metro, and Ontario Airport); 2) regional transit connections (e.g., connections to Imperial County and San Diego County); 3) intrastate rail connections (e.g., California high-speed rail [HSR]); and 4) national rail connections (e.g., connections to Phoenix and Tucson in Arizona, Las Vegas in Nevada, and New Mexico).

In general, the routing of this service was designed to encourage connections for commuters and travelers. However, extending the Program Corridor further east of the Coachella Valley is not part of the Program's Purpose and Need. As stated in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, the overall goals of the Program are to implement a safe, reliable, and convenient intercity passenger rail service in the Program Corridor with the capability to meet the future mobility needs of the Program Corridor's residents, businesses, and visitors.

The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR is used to analyze broad conceptual alternatives to accomplish the goals of a project. However, implementation of the Program would not preclude analysis of future transit connections to local or regional transit systems like ARROW, Metrolink, Metro, California HSR, or other transit providers in the region; or preclude future rail expansions between the Coachella Valley and other areas, such as Phoenix, Arizona.

Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Table 3.3-3 (Summary of Transportation Networks and Services (Build Alternative Options 1, 2, and 3)) summarizes the existing transportation networks and services within the Program Corridor. This includes the identification of various transportation modes (e.g., aviation, regional highways, bus transit, and passenger rail), along with the transit provider that currently operates those services (e.g., Sunline, Amtrak, Greyhound, Metrolink).

- **Local and Regional Transit Connections.** Multiple comments were received asking for clarification on details associated with the provision of first-/last -mile connections to other multi-modal hubs and active transportation systems, express bus services from potential rail stations, proximity to various city centers throughout the Program Corridor.

  Under existing conditions within the Program Corridor, local and regional transit connections are available for passenger rail travelers. Within the Western Section of the Program Corridor, passenger rail travelers can currently connect with the Metrolink, Pacific Surfliner, and Metro light rail, subway, and bus services via LAUS, Fullerton, and Riverside. Within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor, potential shuttle services that could be considered and developed would allow passenger rail travelers to make connections to transit systems such as ARROW and services provided at the San Bernardino Transit Center which connects to other transit services. Those shuttle services would need to be developed and planned by local agencies, although Tier 2/Project-level elements of the Program may consider capital improvements to facilitate those future connections.

  Given the programmatic nature of this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR (please refer to Master Response 2 for additional discussion), it would be speculative to get into Tier 2/Project-level details related to specific transit connections as the details pertaining to site-specific station locations and infrastructure needed are not known at this time. As part of subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental analysis, additional coordination with federal, state, regional,

and local agencies, jurisdictions, and communities would occur to identify how other transit services, including light rail, public bus, and private shared mobility services, would be coordinated after Tier 2/Project-level design details are known (Mitigation Strategy LU-2, LU-3, and TR-1). Implementation of the Program does not preclude future connections to the local and regional transit systems.

Intermodal system connectivity was considered at each of the potential station areas identified in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR. The alternatives analysis included ridership forecasts prepared by Caltrans that were used during the fine-level screening of various route alternatives. Two of the route alternatives caried forward for fine-level screening included service to the SBTC (Route Alternatives 4-B and 5). As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.1.1 (2016 Alternatives Analysis Report Screening and Selection Process), Route Alternatives 4-B and 5 did not meet the fine-level screening criteria associated with achieving the Program's Purpose and Need, the extent of environmental constraints, technical feasibility, and economic feasibility

Similarly, the alternatives analysis included the evaluation of Route Alternative 3, which included the potential use of the existing UPRR Alhambra Subdivision between Los Angeles and Colton and the UPRR Yuma Subdivision between Colton and Indio (with proposed station stops at Pomona, Ontario Airport, Loma Linda, Cabazon, Palm Springs, Rancho Mirage, and Indio). The coarse-level alternatives analysis screening eliminated Route Alternative 3 from further study. Given the extensive sections of single main line track and presence of heavy unscheduled freight train traffic, the potential for introducing travel unreliability, slow projected running time, high technical complexity, and high cost for expanding capacity, Route Alternative 3 (including a stop at the Ontario airport) was eliminated from further study.

Intrastate Rail Connections. Under existing conditions within the Program Corridor, intrastate rail connections are available for passenger rail travelers. Within the Western Section of the Program Corridor, passenger rail travelers can currently connect with the Amtrak Southwest Chief service, with service to Chicago, Illinois, at the LAUS, Fullerton, and Riverside stations. These existing stations connects passenger rail travelers to existing Amtrak routes such as the Amtrak Surfliner service that connects to San Diego, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo and the Amtrak Coast Starlight service that connects to San Francisco and Sacramento.

While the proposed Program is not part of the California High Speed Rail Program, implementation of the Program does not preclude future connections to the California High Speed Rail Program. As disclosed on the California HSR website, the two California HSR

sections that would be relevant to the Program would be the Los Angeles to Anaheim section (Phase 1 HSR alignment), which provides a potential HSR connection at the existing Fullerton Station, and the Los Angeles to San Diego section (Phase 2 HSR alignment), which provides a potential HSR connection at the existing LAUS. As described in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, the Western Section of the Program Corridor identified the existing rail station at LAUS that would be used for the proposed passenger rail service. There are no California HSR sections currently proposed in Phase 1 or Phase 2 for the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. However, implementation of the Coachella Valley Rail Program would connect passenger rail travelers to that statewide HSR system and services.

- **National Rail Connections.** Under existing conditions within the Program Corridor, national transit connections are available for passenger rail travelers. Within the Western Section of the Program Corridor, passenger rail travelers can currently connect with the Amtrak Southwest Chief service at LAUS, Fullerton, Riverside. The Amtrak Southwest Chief service connects to Albuquerque (New Mexico), Kansas City (Missouri), and Chicago (Illinois). Within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor, passenger rail travelers can currently connect to the Amtrak Sunset Limited service at Palm Springs. The Amtrak Sunset Limited service connects to Los Angeles and New Orleans as well as the Amtrak Coast Starlight service that connects to Portland (Oregon) and Seattle (Washington).

  Implementation of the Program does not preclude future rail expansions eastward to locations within Arizona or Nevada or increasing existing Amtrak Sunset Limited train service frequencies. However, as stated in Section 1.6 (Program Need) of Chapter 1 (Program Purpose and Need) of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, the Program is needed to address the absence of effective transportation alternatives to personal automobile travel between coastal regions of Southern California (i.e., Los Angeles and Orange Counties) and cities in the Inland Empire (i.e., City of Riverside) and the Coachella Valley (i.e., Cities of Coachella, Indio, Palm Springs); the projected increase in travel demand in the Program Corridor resulting from population and employment growth; and the increasing unreliability of existing transportation systems within the Program Corridor. While connections to Arizona and Nevada and increases in Amtrak Sunset Limited train service frequencies would be complimentary to enhancing passenger rail service within the Program Corridor, for purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, the establishment of a regular passenger rail service within the Coachella Valley is the Program's primary Purpose and Need.

  Planning work that was undertaken during the preparation of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR included the development of a Basis of Design to establish the technical criteria to be used for infrastructure conceptual engineering design in the Program Corridor. Key principles of the Program's basis of design, in support of the Program's Purpose and Need,

included upgrading existing rail corridors (instead of developing new rail corridors) and using fossil-fuel burning equipment rather than electric-powered equipment. However, the basis of design also recognized that electrification or higher speed operation could be developed in the future as a means of providing longer-distance passenger rail service between Southern California and Phoenix, Arizona. Accordingly, one additional objective established in the Program basis of design was to not preclude, by choice of alignment or technology, a possible future corridor expansion between the Coachella Valley and Phoenix.

1.2.11 Master Response 11: Locomotive Technology

Several comments were received that requested clarification regarding the assumptions for locomotive technology that will be used as part of the Program. Comments received on this topic requested the consideration of greener rail technology, including the transitioning away from fossil-fuel based rail technology and towards renewable rail technology (e.g., hydrogen, electrified rail) and new rail technology (e.g., Zero-Emission Multiple Units [ZEMU], HSR, hyperloops).

The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR assumes that diesel-powered passenger trains will operate the entire length of the Program Corridor between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley.

As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.1 (Introduction of Environmental Analysis), the Tier 1/Program-level evaluation addresses broad questions and likely environmental effects within the Study Area including the evaluation of the type of services being proposed and identification of major infrastructure components based on conceptual engineering and rail operations simulation conducted as part of the Service Development Planning process. Preliminary planning work included the establishment of the technical criteria to be used for infrastructure conceptual engineering design in the Program Corridor. Key principles of the Program's basis of design, in support of the Program's Purpose and Need, included upgrading existing rail corridors (instead of developing new rail corridors) and using fossil-fuel burning equipment (rather than electric-powered equipment). However, the basis of design also recognized that electrification or higher speed operation could be developed in the future as a means of providing longer-distance passenger rail service between Southern California and Phoenix, Arizona.

Based on stakeholder and public input, users of the proposed Program expressed support for reliable, integrated, and expanded train service to meet both intercity and regional rail travel needs. As such, the Build Alternative Options were developed to meet these needs. Although the proposed Program assumes conventional diesel-powered passenger trains, mitigation measures will be developed during Tier 2/Project-level analysis to address site-specific impacts. For example, in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.5 (Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases), Mitigation Strategy GHG-2 requires the development of an operational energy conservation plan, which will be developed in a

subsequent Tier2/Project-level analysis. The operational energy conservation plan will identify best management practices (BMP) including, but not limited to the identification of state of the art locomotives to maximize fuel efficiency.

In addition, conventional intercity passenger technology would support the Purpose and Need of the Program with fewer costs and environmental impacts than other types of technologies or service delivery options that require electrification or separate, passenger-only ROWs.

1.2.12 Master Response 12: Environmental Justice

Several comments were received that requested clarification regarding effects and impacts associated with implementation of the Program to Environmental Justice (EJ) communities located within the Program Corridor. Comments ranged from: 1) Program support for improving regional mobility options for Coachella Valley communities facing more socioeconomic disadvantages that other communities in Riverside or San Bernardino counties; 2) Program support for reductions to traffic congestion, improved air quality, and generation of new employment opportunities for disadvantaged communities in the Coachella Valley; 3) requests for additional engagement opportunities with impacted EJ communities within the Program Corridor; and 4) potential impacts associated with freight-related implications of the Program on disadvantaged communities within the Program Corridor.

As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 4 (Environmental Justice), the analysis identifies EJ populations within the Study Area that may be impacted as a result of implementation of the Program. Population and demographic data; including race, ethnicity, and income from U.S Census Bureau was used in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR to identify where EJ populations are located relative to the Build Alternative Options. However, because EJ effects are location-specific they cannot be fully quantified until site-specific Project design details (e.g., site-specific construction footprints, road crossings, station locations) and resulting site-specific effects (e.g., related to land acquisition and displacement, noise and vibration, air quality) are known. Consequently, potential effects on EJ populations were described qualitatively within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR (see Chapter 4, Environmental Justice, for details).

As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 4 (Environmental Justice), implementation of the Program will generally have an overall positive effect on the communities within the Program Corridor in terms of generating construction jobs, increasing the potential for new employment and housing opportunities around station areas, reducing congestion on highways, and improving regional air quality and connectivity. However, the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR also acknowledges that potential long-term and short-term effects on EJ populations may result from implementation of the Program. Generally, impacts on EJ populations would occur during construction when land

acquisitions, traffic detours, construction noise and vibration, and air quality impacts would adversely affect people living and working in the Study Area. However, programmatic strategies were identified to mitigate impacts to EJ communities, which will be further developed based on site-specific information.

As detailed in Section 4.6 (Outreach to Environmental Justice Communities) of Chapter 4 (Environmental Justice), a community profile discussing cohesion and community facilities, including additional focus on the communities with stations, will be developed during the Tier 2/Project-level analysis. A demographic analysis at a smaller geography with Tier 2/Project-level analysis may also identify populations that would be affected or benefited from construction and operation. The demographic analysis would also focus on EJ populations to help determine if these populations would be adversely affected by construction and operation. The EJ analysis would review all elements of the environment to determine if there would be adverse effects resulting in disproportionate effects on minority or low-income populations and review the mitigation and potential community benefits and enhancements associated with the Program.

In addition, as noted in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 8 (Public and Agency Outreach), public engagement was conducted during the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR process and will continue during the Tier 2/Project-level analysis to ensure that all communities (disadvantaged or otherwise) have access to information on subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental efforts, and an opportunity to provide input about specific community-based concerns. As part of subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental analysis, additional coordination with federal, state, regional, and local agencies, jurisdictions, and communities would occur to develop Project-specific mitigation measures after Tier 2/Project-level design details are known.

1.3 Overview of Comment Responses

In addition to the Master Responses, FRA, Caltrans, and RCTC have prepared responses to the comments submitted on the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR. Individual responses to comments are included in the following Table 1-4. Where appropriate, the commenter is referred back to the applicable Master Response(s). The agencies also provided responses to comments that were not captured in the Master Responses.

Table 1-4. Response to Written Agency Comments Received During the Public Review Period

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment A-01 (San Bernardino County Transportation Authority)		
A-01-1	This letter represents the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority's (SBCTA's) comments on the draft Tier 1/Program Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) for the Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program, dated May 2021. The EIS/EIR has been prepared by the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), in coordination with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). While SBCTA strongly supports improvements in passenger rail service in Southern California, and has been investing in systems such as Metrolink for almost three decades now, we have several questions/concerns about the Coachella Valley Rail (CV Rail) proposal. Our primary comments are less concerned with the passenger service itself, which involves only two round trip trains per day. We support the concept of this additional passenger rail connectivity, recognizing that there are elements remaining to be worked out with local jurisdictions, such as potential station locations. Rather, our comments are more focused on the increase in overall train volumes that the proposed third track between Colton and Indio/Coachella will enable. The draft EIS/EIR does not touch on this point, and we believe the final EIS/EIR should be more transparent about the potential usage of the third track by freight rail and the framework for agreements	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis, Master Response 3 for a discussion on freight train volumes and assumptions, Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation.

	that will need to be put in place between the CV Rail project sponsors/operators and the Union Pacific Railroad (UP). Some background behind our concern is provided below. For example, page 2-25 of the EIS/EIR states: "The No Build Alternative includes forecast growth in freight traffic on UP's Yuma Subdivision. The California State Rail Plan (Caltrans 2018) anticipates that rail intermodal traffic in California will increase at a compound annual growth rate of 2.9 percent through 2040 and that rail carload traffic will increase at a compound annual growth rate of 1.7 percent through 2040, which could add approximately 50 additional freight trains to UP's Yuma Subdivision. This growth forecast is consistent with growth projections provided by UP for computerized rail operations modeling simulations undertaken by RCTC for the Program." This forecast growth represents a doubling of freight trains through mixed residential/commercial areas of San Bernardino County by 2040 and is consistent with forecasts provided by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Some of the communities along the route are concerned that the third track, that would be environmentally cleared under the auspices of the CV Rail project, will enable this substantial growth in freight rail to occur more readily, with all the associated impacts. This is clearly a possibility, yet the CV Rail EIS/EIR is silent on the subject. At the same time, the agencies verbally acknowledge that UP will be able to use the third track to optimize operations, as discussed in prior CV Rail workshops. It should be noted that all the growth in	

	freight rail volumes is assumed in the no-build scenario, and we question whether this assumption is entirely valid.	
A-01-2	There are already substantial community concerns about gate down time leading to increased vehicular delays on main thoroughfares, as well as rail, engine and train horn noise experienced both day and night, through the San Bernardino County communities of Redlands, Loma Linda, Colton, and Grand Terrace, plus a small section of unincorporated area. A map is attached showing city boundaries and the rail alignment.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.3 (Transportation), a site-specific traffic impact analysis and identification of site-specific traffic mitigation measures shall be required in the future for the specific rail infrastructure or station facility proposed (Mitigation Strategy TR-1). Mitigation Strategy TR-1 requires a Tier 2/Project-level traffic impact analysis that uses the standards and procedures of the applicable local jurisdictions in which the Tier 2/Project facility or improvement is located. The preparation of the Tier 2/Project-level traffic impact analysis would include analysis of both construction and operational related traffic impacts and the identification of site-specific mitigation measures, as applicable. Similarly, as described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.6 (Noise and Vibration), a site-specific noise and vibration assessment shall be required in the future for the specific rail infrastructure or station facility proposed (Mitigation Strategy NOI-2). Mitigation Strategy NOI-2 requires a Tier 2/Project-level noise and vibration assessment that identifies adjacent noise-sensitive land uses that could be impacted by construction and operational activities associated with the specific rail infrastructure or station facility proposed. In addition, Mitigation Strategy NOI-2 requires identification of existing noise levels at the nearest noise-sensitive land uses, as well as mitigation to be implemented (e.g., enclosures, barriers, site orientation) based on what is prescribed by the local jurisdiction's noise regulations or ordinances of where the Tier 2/Project-level improvement is being proposed.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
A-01-3	The sponsoring agencies appear to be positioning the Tier 1 EIS/EIR to enable environmental clearance of the third track in the Tier 2 document showing very limited impact from the CV Rail project, when in fact the third track would enable substantial additional freight rail with potentially major impacts. We think that this potential outcome needs to be mentioned, evaluated, and explained in the Tier 1 final document, in the interest of transparency and sensitivity toward communities that will be further impacted in San Bernardino County. It is difficult to envision how the third track would not allow for additional growth in freight rail volumes.	As summarized in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section ES.1.5 (Summary of Effects), a summary of resource effects is provided by Build Alternative Option, with effects ranging from negligible to moderate to substantial, depending on the resource area that is appropriate for a Tier 1/Program--level environmental evaluation. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis. Please refer to Master Response 3 for a discussion on freight train volumes and assumptions.
A-01-4	SBCTA is sensitive to this issue as there have been other recent developments in the UP and Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) corridors in San Bernardino County that portend a major increase in freight and truck traffic in the coming years in the communities we serve. A major new BNSF intermodal facility in Colton is being environmentally cleared as part of the California High-Speed Rail program's Los Angeles to Anaheim segment. The Colton Intermodal Facility is identified in one sentence on page 80 of the recently-adopted 2020 California High Speed Rail Business Plan, yet from a local standpoint, this facility will have major impacts on traffic, air quality, noise, and visual effects. Spokespersons for the California High-Speed Rail have indicated that the proposed Colton facility will be larger than the current BNSF San Bernardino Intermodal Facility immediately adjacent to SBCTA's offices. See page 80 of the Business Plan at:	FRA, Caltrans, and RCTC appreciate SBCTA sharing its concerns regarding freight-related implications of the proposed Program. It should be noted that the proposed passenger rail service envisioned as part of the Program is not a part of the efforts currently being undertaken by CHSRA. In general, the routing of this proposed service analyzed in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR was designed to encourage connections for travelers between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley taking into consideration the environmental and economical feasibilities and constraints throughout the Program Corridor. Cumulative freight traffic growth within the Program Corridor is independent of the Program and would occur with or without Program implementation. The inclusion of a potential third mainline track within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor would meet the Purpose and Need of the Program (e.g., providing an intercity passenger rail service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley), and, while implementation of the Build Alternative could increase operational

	https://hsr.ca.gov/about/high-speed-rail-business-plans/2020-business-plan/ for reference to the BNSF facility. Union Pacific Railroad also recently announced the transition of their rail facilities just south of Interstate 10 in Fontana, unincorporated County, and west Colton to an intermodal operation, with no environmental review or public input required. The communities that would be impacted by the expanded BNSF and UP operations are some of the most disadvantaged communities in the state. Within this context, we trust that FRA, RCTC, and Caltrans understand why SBCTA and our local jurisdiction members would be concerned with the freight-related implications of the CV Rail project. With California High-Speed Rail, the benefits accrue to Los Angeles and Orange Counties, while the freight impacts would be experienced by the disadvantaged communities in San Bernardino County. These same communities can now envision a scenario in which the well-intended expansion of capacity for passenger rail to the Coachella Valley would have the consequence (intended or not) of increasing freight impacts. It is imperative that this possible scenario be explained in a transparent way by answering the following questions at a minimum:	efficiency of freight operations, it is not likely to increase the volume of freight traffic beyond the anticipated growth already identified in the *2018 California State Rail Plan.* The *2018 California State Rail Plan* is one of seven mode-specific plans that support the vision, goals, and policies of the *California Transportation Plan 2040*. The *California Transportation Plan 2040* uses a "whole system" planning approach to evaluate the impact of plans system-wide—across modes and regions— on transportation and land use scenarios and policies and acts as an umbrella plan and sets a policy framework to organize and guide the development of each subsequent modal plan. The vision for the *California Transportation Plan 2040* is to achieve a fully integrated, multimodal, and sustainable transportation system that supports the environment, the economy, and social equity. Following publication of the Final Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR and finalization of the SDP, the Selected Alternative will be refined through additional planning and design with involvement from several regional agencies, local jurisdictions, key transportation stakeholders (i.e., Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA), San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA), Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA), Amtrak, UPRR and BNSF), and the public. As stated in the Tier 1/Program Draft EIS/EIR, avoiding or minimizing the community-related effects would involve working closely with local governments and planning agencies in the refinement and development of specific projects during the Tier 2/Project-level analysis. Since Executive Order 12898 requires federal agencies to ensure effective public participation and access to information, a more detailed and

		comprehensive outreach effort to potentially affected minority and/or low-income populations would need to be completed and documented at the Tier 2/Project-level. This detailed and comprehensive outreach effort to potentially affected minority or low-income populations would help identify issues of importance that may not otherwise be apparent. Specific EJ outreach efforts that could take place as part of the Tier 2/Project-level environmental review process include provision of meeting notices to EJ interest groups, targeted noticing and translation services in communities with high levels of limited English proficiency, and targeted noticing at community facilities or through community organizations that serve low-income and minority populations. This outreach effort would identify potentially disproportionate effects on minority and low-income populations and develop ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the effects at a Tier 2/Project-level analysis. FRA, Caltrans, and RCTC understand SBCTA's concerns about adequate and transparent environmental review and encourages SBCTA's continued involvement as an important stakeholder and partner during subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental analysis. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis for the Program, Master Response 3 for a discussion on freight train volume assumptions, Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation, and Master Response 12 for a discussion on EJ communities
A-01-5	Given that there are only two round trip CV Rail passenger trains per day, specifically how will the third track be used by UP?	Please refer to Master Response 3 for a discussion on freight train volume assumptions.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	How much additional growth will the third track enable? We understand that a rule of thumb is that an additional track could add capacity for approximately 40 trains per day. The future forecast is for an average of 88 trains per day in demand. The peak season demand would be at least an additional ten percent (based on seasonal variations in port container volumes), so this means potentially 100 trains per day in peak season demand in 2040. A 2007 report by the Association of American Railroads cited a two-track freight rail line could accommodate up to 75 trains per day. How would the additional 25 peak trains be accommodated? The implication is that the third track would be needed to make that happen, particularly when considering the westbound upgrade in the Banning Pass.	
A-01-6	What cost-sharing arrangements are likely to be made on the third track? It would be difficult to justify full 100% public funding of the third track, given two round trip passenger trains per day. What framework is being established for agreements with UP to govern future growth and use of the third track? As stated earlier, SBCTA is supportive of passenger rail network expansion, and we have no objections to the passenger rail service to the Coachella Valley. However, the EIS/EIR is silent on the benefits that will accrue to freight rail on this public investment, and it would be a significant oversight not to address this concern in the final Tier 1 EIS/EIR.	Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation and Master Response 8 for a discussion on Program funding.
A-01-7	We would even suggest that mitigations be developed for the Tier 1 document in anticipation of the additional freight impacts that	As identified throughout the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, programmatic mitigation strategies were identified for further consideration as part of

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	could be expected with the addition of the third track. At a minimum, this would include a statement that any Tier 2 document would specifically quantify the benefits to freight rail, the associated community impacts in San Bernardino County, and a concept for cost-sharing that would be proportional to the benefits, so that public sector funds do not get unnecessarily diverted to a private sector use.	subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental analysis when site specific details and localized impacts would be identified and analyzed like quantification of freight rail and community impacts. Discussion and analysis of alternative financial strategies as it relates to Program cost-sharing is not considered an environmental issue for purposes of NEPA and CEQA. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis, Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation, and Master Response 12 for additional discussion on community impacts.
A-01-8	SBCTA appreciates the opportunity to comment on the CV Rail Tier 1 EIS/EIR and for the inclusion of SBCTA on the Technical Advisory Committee. We are available for further discussions on the topics raised above. Our contact on the project is Steve Smith, Director of Planning who can be reached at (909) 884-8275 or at ssmith@gosbcta.com.	Please refer to Master Response 5 which provides a discussion on Program implementation. Contact information for SBCTA, as identified, will be added to a stakeholder database for subsequent Tier 2/Project--level outreach.
Comment A-02 (City of Colton)		
A-02-1	As mentioned on the draft Tier I/Program Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR), a connector track to transition from BNSF to UPRR tract needs to be constructed here in the City of Colton. In addition, a third track needs to be added from this transition track going east. Below are our comments and questions in regards to the draft EIS/EIR for this project: What will be the impact of 3rd track to the Mt. Vernon Ave. Bridge? The City of Colton is currently working on Mt. Vernon Ave. Over	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3.2 (Build Alternative Options 1, 2, and 3), the analysis assumed the following infrastructure improvements: • Various crossovers connecting the existing mainline tracks to the new third mainline track • A new second Mount Vernon connector track in Colton • A new siding at Loma Linda to allow passenger trains to meet, thereby reducing delay • A new railroad bridge across the Santa Ana River

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	UPRR Track Bridge Widening Project. The project is in the right of way phase and estimated to be in construction by July 1, 2022. What will be the impact of the project if there is no room to add the third track to the existing Hunts Lane overpass bridge?	• Additional infrastructure components throughout the Program Corridor including, but not limited to, wayside signals, drainage structures, and grade -separation structures The specific infrastructure improvements that could be required in the City of Colton would be further refined through additional coordination with regulatory agencies, the City of Colton, and other stakeholders during subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental analysis. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis and Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation.
A-02-2	Since-the connector track between west and east section will be much closer to the residential neighborhoods than the existing tracks, what will be the right of way required to accommodate the connector track? What are the projected noise and vibration impacts on nearby properties and residential neighborhoods?	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3.2 (Build Alternative Options 1, 2, and 3), upon completion of the SDP and the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR process, the specific infrastructure improvements needed would be refined through coordination and additional consultations with regulatory agencies, the City of Colton, and other stakeholders during subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental analysis. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.6 (Noise and Vibration), a site-specific noise and vibration assessment shall be required for the specific rail infrastructure or station facility proposed (Mitigation Strategy NOI-2). Mitigation Strategy NOI-2 requires a Tier 2/Project-level noise and vibration assessment that identifies adjacent noise-sensitive land uses that could be impacted by construction and operational activities associated with the specific rail infrastructure or station facility proposed. In addition, Mitigation Strategy NOI-2 requires identification of existing noise levels at the nearest noise-sensitive land uses, as well as mitigation to be implemented (e.g., enclosures, barriers, site orientation) based on what is prescribed by the local jurisdiction's noise regulations or

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		ordinances of where the Tier 2/Project-level improvement is being proposed. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis and Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation.
A-02-3	How will construction of the connector and third track impact traffic on local roads leading to the site during construction?	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.3 (Transportation), construction of rail infrastructure improvements, such as sidings, additional main line track, wayside signals, drainage, grade separation structures, and stations could require temporary closure of lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes and routes, driveways, streets, and freeway lanes. All construction activities affecting roadways, bicycle paths, and pedestrian paths would be required to meet the requirements of the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. A site-specific traffic impact analysis shall be required in the future for the specific rail infrastructure or station facility proposed (Mitigation Strategy TR-1). Mitigation Strategy TR-1 requires a Tier 2/Project-level traffic impact analysis that uses the standards and procedures of the applicable local jurisdiction(s) in which the Tier 2/Project facility or improvement is located. The preparation of the Tier 2/Project-level traffic impact analysis would include analysis of both construction and operational related traffic impacts and the identification of site-specific mitigation to be implemented based on what is prescribed by the local jurisdiction's traffic regulations and/or applicable agency requirements. In addition, Mitigation Strategy LU-2 provides for the preparation of a construction management plan based on subsequent Tier 2/Project-level analysis and recommendations from lead agencies and local jurisdictions where the construction activities would

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		take place. Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation.
A-02-4	We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this rail project. This is a worthwhile transportation project; however, we are concerned about the project's potential impacts in the City of Colton and how these impacts will be mitigated. Please feel free to contact me at vortiz@coltonca.gov if you have questions or need additional information.	Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis and Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation. Contact information for the City of Colton will be added to a stakeholder database for subsequent Tier 2/Project-level outreach.
Comment A-03 (San Bernardino County)		
A-03-1	Please consider these comments from San Bernardino County (the County) on the subject Draft Tier 1 Program EIS/EIR for the Coachella Valley – San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program proposed by the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), in partnership with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). As a member agency of the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA) the County fully supports the comments submitted under separate cover by SBCTA Executive Director, Dr. Raymond Wolfe. The comments in this letter are intended to echo the concerns outlined by Dr. Wolfe and to amplify some points from the broader perspective of County government. San Bernardino County supports expansion of passenger rail service, but not at the expense of the health and well-being of our residents who are already severely impacted by poor air quality.	Thank you for your comments. As identified throughout the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, programmatic mitigation strategies were identified for further consideration as part of subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental analysis when site-specific details and localized impacts would be identified and analyzed. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis, Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation, and Master Response 12 which provides a discussion on EJ populations located within the Program Corridor. The San Bernardino Muscoy CERP participants, County Equity Element Group, San Bernardino County and SBCTA will be added to a stakeholder database for subsequent Tier 2/Project-level outreach.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	In June of 2020, the County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution declaring racism a public health crisis. At the same time, an Equity Element Group was formed to advance the Countywide Vision with a focus on promoting equity in efforts to improve the quality of life in all communities of San Bernardino County. With this focus on equity in mind, the County foresees unintended but significant adverse impacts on County residents resulting from implementation of the Coachella Valley – San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program. These impacts require complete and transparent analysis, engagement with impacted communities and an innovative strategy to mitigate the impacts on disadvantaged communities of color who have labored in the rail industry and suffered ill effects of living next to rail lines for multiple generations.	
A-03-2	In 2018, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) identified the San Bernardino – Muscoy area as an Environmental Justice community severely impacted by poor air quality and initiated a Community Emissions Reduction Plan (CERP) for the area. The CERP identified the existing BNSF rail yard in the community of Colton as a significant stationary source of pollutants affecting the planning area, as well as the adjacent community of Colton. Now the California High Speed Rail Authority plans to introduce high-speed passenger rail service from Los Angeles to Anaheim. This is wonderful from the perspective of expanded regional transportation service offerings, but the new rail service will require relocation of a BNSF multi-modal rail yard to be added to the existing facility in Colton.	The proposed passenger rail service envisioned as part of the Program is not a part of the efforts currently being undertaken by CHSRA and would not be considered an HSR project. In general, the routing of this proposed service analyzed in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR was designed to encourage connections for travelers between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley. Please note that the Program Corridor crosses many areas considered EJ communities. As depicted on Figure 4-1 of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, the minority population percentage is generally higher in the Western Section compared with the Eastern Section and exceeds 50 percent at many locations throughout the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area. The minority population percentage is highest (exceeding 75 percent) in census block groups within the Western Section of the Program Corridor between Los Angeles and Fullerton and in the vicinity of the Cities

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	As stated in the SBCTA comment letter, adding a third track to the Union Pacific rail lines to implement the Coachella Valley – San Gorgonio Pass passenger service will create additional capacity for freight service through these impacted communities of Colton and San Bernardino. The cumulative impact of multiplying the freight facilities in Environmental Justice communities of San Bernardino County to facilitate passenger rail service to more affluent communities must be addressed.	of Corona and Colton. Within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor, the minority population percentage is highest in census block groups in the vicinity of the Cities of Indio and Coachella. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis, Master Response 3 for a discussion on freight train volume assumptions, Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation, and Master Response 12 for additional discussion on EJ communities.
A-03-3	To summarize the County's comments on the Draft Tier 1 Program EIS/EIR, more analysis is necessary to quantify and disclose the indirect and cumulative impacts of the 3rd rail line proposed to be constructed in the County.	Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 6 (Statutory Considerations) provides a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, a summary comparison of the Build Alternative Options, and significant and unavoidable effects for each of the Build Alternative Options. In addition, Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.17 (Cumulative Effects) describes cumulative effects for each of the environmental topic areas for the Build Alternative Options. Cumulative freight traffic growth within the Program Corridor is independent of the Program and would occur with or without Program implementation. The inclusion of a potential third mainline track within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor would meet the Purpose and Need of the Program (e.g., providing an intercity passenger rail service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley), and, while implementation of the Build Alternative could increase operational efficiency of freight operations, it is not likely to increase the volume of freight traffic beyond the anticipated growth identified in the *2018 California State Rail Plan.* Additional details are provided in Master Response 3 – Freight Volume Assumptions.
A-03-4	Going forward in Tier 2 of the program, transparent public engagement with San Bernardino – Muscoy CERP participants,	Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation and Master Response 12 for additional discussion on EJ

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	Environmental Justice groups, the County Equity Element Group, and the general public of San Bernardino County is absolutely necessary. This engagement will be an opportunity for RCTC, Caltrans and the FRA to involve our residents in a clean air strategy for rail operations. We need zero emission locomotives, cranes and other freight facility vehicles to be introduced first in our communities, where the need and the cumulative impact of emissions is greatest. Let this be a commitment of the Coachella Valley – San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program, not only as environmental mitigation, but as a good neighbor policy toward the most adversely impacted neighbors of the rail corridor. Please continue to consider SBCTA the County's representative on technical aspects of this transportation project. To discuss our recommendations for public engagement addressing issues of Environmental Justice and social equity, please contact Bradley Jensen, Legislative Director at Bradley.Jensen@cao.sbcounty.gov.	communities. The San Bernardino Muscoy CERP participants, County Equity Element Group, San Bernardino County and SBCTA will be added to a stakeholder database for subsequent Tier 2/Project-level outreach.
Comment A-04 (City of Coachella)		
A-04-1	Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments regarding the proposed rail corridor service project. This project would provide much needed rail services that currently does not exist in the Coachella Valley. Due to the lack of rail service places, vehicle transportation is the only timely and feasible mode of travel along the proposed rail route, thereby increasing vehicles miles traveled and congestion along freeways and roads, contributing to greenhouse gas emissions, and limiting mobility to disadvantaged communities who rely on public transportation.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies and Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	The City of Coachella supports the proposed Option 1 identified in the Program EIS/EIR, which would provide train service to a train station in the City of Coachella. The City of Coachella historically had a train station location in the City's Downtown when the City was originally known as Woodspur. The rail line currently traverses diagonally through the middle of the City in close proximity to residential neighborhoods. The City encourages a train station for the proposed rail service in the City's historic Downtown where the surrounding neighborhoods are walkable designed according to the traditional grid pattern that provides pedestrian access to the station, thereby reducing automobile trips. The Downtown area is located to the West of the railroad and is the final destination of the Sun line transit main bus route 1. The City has planned for walkable, higher density residential neighborhoods, neighborhood commercial development and employments centers east of the historic Downtown and railroad in a 206-acre area known as the Zona Central. Zona Central is located adjacent to the CV Link, a planned active transportation multi-use trail, currently under construction and would provide bicyclists opportunities access to a train station located in the Coachella Downtown.	
A-04-2	A train station location in the City of Coachella would provide greater options for mobility for our community that experiences a more disadvantages socio economic conditions than the surrounding communities in the Coachella Valley. The Coachella community is disproportionately burdened by and vulnerable to	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 4 (Environmental Justice), during Program construction and operation in the Eastern Section, Build Alternative Options 2 and 3 would have slightly reduced effects when compared to Build Alternative Option 1 due to the shorter route alignment, reduced station options, and (for Build Alternative Option

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	multiple sources of pollution according to CalEnviroScreen 3.0 with a score of 81-90% and unincorporated rural communities further east at 71-80%. The City of Coachella has three census tracts identified as Disadvantaged Communities under SB 535. Additionally the city has: • A child poverty rate of 40 percent with some of the nation's poorest citizens living there just miles from some of the wealthiest. The median household income is $34,300; • Only 52.2% of the population holds a high school diploma and only 3.9% hold a Bachelor's degree; early childhood education enrollment is 21.3% • Many of Coachella's low-income residents cannot afford home ownership at all, or even the opportunity to live in housing that is not substandard, as numerous houses are affected by blight, code violations, and disrepair; • The liquid asset poverty rate is 55% (which is the percentage of households without sufficient liquid assets to subsist at the poverty level for three months in the absence of income) and the percentage of unbanked households is 15.8%, which is the percentage of people without a checking or savings account; Currently, more than 12.4% of Coachella residents are unemployed, which ranks the city as having the highest unemployment rate in the county of Riverside. The Environmental Justice section of the Draft Tier EIR/Program EIS/EIR identifies that there would be more impacts borne by Option1, than Options 1 and 2. Rather, the City of Coachella	3 only) reduced third track infrastructure. However, the magnitude of effects would be similar when compared to the No Build Alternative. At the conceptual level, the Build Alternative Options are unlikely to result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income communities. Socioeconomic benefits would also be generated for all populations, including EJ populations in the form of expanded job and economic opportunities and improved regional accessibility and mobility. As part of Tier 2/Project-level analysis, a more detailed and refined study will be completed to document the presence of low-income and minority communities and then to evaluate if there would be disproportionately high and adverse site-specific effects on those communities. Please refer to Master Response 12 for additional discussion on EJ communities.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	contends that the Option 1 would lead to reduced traffic congestion, improved air quality, and result in new employment opportunities for a new train station location that is most accessible to disadvantaged communities in the Coachella Valley. There are available in-fill properties adjacent to the railroad in Coachella where a new station would not reduce sales or property tax, but would rather create new employment opportunities around new station and support the rail service goals of reducing congestion on highways and improving regional connectivity.	
Comment A-05 (United States Environmental Protection Agency)		
A-05-1	Thank you for the opportunity to review the Tier 1/Program Environmental Impact Statement for the Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Services Program. Our review was completed pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The EPA supports the program goals of providing an alternative travel mode that would reduce travel times and improve transit service reliability between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley by providing intercity and commuter rail service. We also support the goal of assisting regional agencies in meeting federal and state air quality and greenhouse gas emission reduction targets. We understand that additional, site-specific analysis will be performed in the Tier 2/Project-level environmental review process. We offer the following recommendations for avoidance and	Thank you for your comments. This Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts of the No Build Alternative and the three Build Alternative Options broadly within the Program Corridor. The Program Corridor provides a flexible regional context for the best location of an enhanced passenger rail system while providing opportunities for the Build Alternative Options within the Program Corridor to account for engineering and environmental constraints, as well as public input. Although the proposed passenger rail service would serve rail commuters throughout the Program Corridor, the Program would serve other users such as those traveling for local and regional recreational activities and leisure opportunities.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	minimization of impacts through the remainder of the Tier 1 process and during the Tier 2 process.	
A-05-2	**Air Quality** **General Conformity.** The document states that site-specific information required to assess the need for a general conformity determination would be available in a Tier 2/Project-level analysis. The DEIS includes estimated annual railroad emissions for operation of the Build Alternative Options for the horizon years and these estimates indicate that the estimated Build Alternative Options locomotive emissions would not exceed General Conformity de minimis levels in the South Coast Air Basin or Salton Sea Air Basin. **Recommendation:** • If required, we encourage FRA to include the draft general conformity determination in the Tier 2 DEIS. A conformity determination includes public notice requirements (40 CFR 93.156) and this can be performed in coordination with the NEPA process. **Transportation Conformity.** If any components of the project or related facilities will be funded or approved by the Federal Highway Administration or the Federal Transit Administration, a transportation conformity analysis is required. **Recommendation:** • If transportation conformity is required for components of the project or related facilities, include the transportation	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.5 (Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases), a site-specific air quality analysis will be conducted in the future for the specific rail infrastructure or station facility proposed (Mitigation Strategy AQ-1). As identified in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, proposed programmatic mitigation strategies are required to be consistent with state and federal regulations. As described in Mitigation Strategy AQ-1, a Tier 2/Project-level conformity determination will be conducted, if required, for projects located within areas designated as non-attainment at the federal level, consistent with the General Conformity Rule.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	conformity analysis for those components in the DEIS. Consultation with the EPA and other relevant agencies is required to determine whether the components are a Project of Air Quality Concern as part of that process.	
A-05-3	The PEIS states that although construction of site-specific rail infrastructure and station facilities would be subject to applicable regulations and best management practices, short-term localized construction air quality effects could be substantial within the Program Corridor under the Build Alternatives if the implementation of BMPs would not bring emissions to below South Coast Air Quality Management District construction emission thresholds. The document states that operational activities could also result in substantial localized air quality effects. Recommendation: If the Tier 2/Project-level analysis indicates that construction or operational emissions are estimated to exceed emission thresholds, consult with the EPA and SCAQMD to determine mitigation options.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.5 (Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases), a site-specific air quality analysis shall be required in the future for the specific rail infrastructure or station facility proposed (Mitigation Strategy AQ-1). As identified in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, proposed programmatic mitigation strategies are required to be consistent with state and federal regulations. Mitigation Strategy AQ-1 requires a Tier 2/Project-level air quality analysis that uses the standards and procedures of the SCAQMD and applicable jurisdictions in which the Tier 2/Project facility or improvement is located. The preparation of the Tier 2/Project-level air quality analysis would include analysis of both construction and operational emissions and whether such emissions are expected to exceed applicable emission thresholds. As part of subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental analysis, additional coordination and consultation with the applicable regulatory agencies would occur. The recommendations identified by the commenter for additional consultation with the U.S. EPA and SCAQMD on mitigation options for air quality emissions have already been identified as part of Mitigation Strategy AQ-1, and, as such, will be implemented by the applicable lead agency or agencies during Tier 2/Project-level environmental review.
A-05-4	**Biological Resources**	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.7 (Jurisdictional Waters and Wetland Resources), examples of programmatic mitigation

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands. The PEIS includes a preliminary identification of jurisdictional waters and wetlands in the project area. Estimates of impacted waters and wetlands will be included in the Tier 2/Project-level analysis. Given the number of water bodies in the project area, this project may involve the discharge of dredged or fill material into jurisdictional wetlands and waterways. Discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S. require authorization by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under Clean Water Act Section 404. The Federal Guidelines at 40 CFR Part 230 promulgated under CWA Section 404 (b)(1) provide substantive environmental criteria that must be met to permit such discharges into waters of the United States. In accordance with the guidelines, FRA must clearly demonstrate that the preferred alternative is the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA). Identification of the LEDPA is achieved by performing an alternatives analysis that estimates the direct, secondary, and cumulative impacts to jurisdictional waters resulting from each alternative considered. **Recommendations:** • The EPA encourages FRA to meet and discuss potential impacts and permit requirements of the preferred alternative with the Corps and EPA during preparation of the Tier 2-Project-level DEIS. • The EPA recommends that the level of analysis required for a potential Clean Water Act Section 404 permit be performed and included in the DEIS.	strategies for wetland resources include those designed to avoid effects and impacts, when possible, and minimize effects and impacts where complete avoidance is not feasible, particularly to jurisdictional waters. In addition to those mitigation strategies proposed, mitigation for unavoidable effects and impacts on wetland resources (if identified in the Tier 2/Project-level analysis) could include in-lieu fees and on- or off-site mitigation, such as habitat or vegetation restoration or payment into a conservation bank. Coordination with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife would occur to develop Project-specific mitigation measures during the Tier 2/Project-level analysis after design details are known (Mitigation Strategies BIO-1, HWQ-1, HWQ-2, and HWQ-3). As identified in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, proposed programmatic mitigation strategies are required to be consistent with state and federal regulations. As part of subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental analysis, additional coordination and consultation with the applicable regulatory agencies would occur. As explained in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR and in Master Response 8, Tier 2 projects could be funded and led by a federal and/or state agency other than FRA, Caltrans, and/or RCTC; however, the recommendations identified by the commenter for mitigation strategies pertaining to jurisdictional waters and wetland resources have already been identified as part of Mitigation Strategies BIO-1, HWQ-1, HWQ-2, and HWQ-3, and, as such, will be implemented by the applicable lead agency or agencies during Tier 2/Project-level environmental review.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	• The analysis of impacts in the DEIS should be of an appropriate scope and detail to identify sensitive areas or aquatic systems with functions highly susceptible to change. The EPA recommends that the analysis include: • The classification of waters and the geographic extent of waters and adjacent riparian areas. • Characterization of the functional condition of waters and adjacent riparian areas. • The extent and nature of stream channel alteration, riverine corridor continuity, and buffered tributaries. • Wildlife species affected that could reasonably be expected to use waters or associated riparian habitat and sensitive plant taxa that are associated with waters or associated riparian habitat. • Potential flood flow alteration. • The hydrologic linkage to any impaired water body. • Techniques proposed for minimizing surface water contamination due to increased runoff from additional impervious surfaces.	
A-05-5	To demonstrate compliance with CWA Guidelines, FRA must explore on-site alternatives to avoid or minimize impacts to specific waters. Typically, transportation projects can accomplish this by using spanned crossings, arched crossings, or oversized buried	Please refer to Response A-05-4 related to minimizing impacts associated with jurisdictional waters and wetland resources and Response A-05-6 related to minimizing impacts associated with wildlife passage. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	box culverts over drainages to encourage continuity of sediment transport and hydrological processes and wildlife passage. **Recommendations:** • Include in the DEIS a complete analysis of drainage crossings which identifies and prioritizes the potential for improvements to the aquatic system and for wildlife use at each crossing, as applicable. • Identify measures and modifications to avoid and minimize impacts to water resources. • Estimate temporary and permanent impacts to waters of the U.S. • Commit to use newer technology culverts and less damaging culverts such as large bottomless or arched culverts and commit to span washes and major waterway crossings. • Identify measures to preserve water and manage stormwater runoff. We recommend commitments to implement "green infrastructure" in onsite stormwater management features, such as bioretention areas, vegetated swales, porous pavement, and filter strips. These features can serve as both stormwater treatment and visual enhancements.	The recommendations identified by the commenter on mitigation strategies pertaining to jurisdictional waters/wetland resources, water quality, and sensitive biological resources have already been identified as part of Mitigation Strategies BIO-1, HWQ-1, HWQ-2, and HWQ-3, and, as such, will be considered by the applicable lead agency or agencies during Tier 2/Project-level environmental review.
A-05-6	**Wildlife Movement Corridors** The PEIS states that the existing rail alignment crosses drainages, roadways, and culverts that serve as crossing structures for wildlife	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.8 (Biological Resources), potential impacts associated with wildlife movement and wildlife movement corridors depend on the location of infrastructure improvements, which are currently unknown. The Eastern Section under Build Alternative Options 1, 2, and 3 crosses multiple drainages, roadways,

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	movement corridors, and construction activities often deter wildlife from using existing crossing structures. **Recommendations:** • Include in the DEIS an analysis of drainage crossings which identifies and prioritizes the potential for improvements to the aquatic system and for wildlife use at each crossing, as applicable. • The EPA encourages FRA to work with wildlife agencies to identify any opportunities to improve or provide wildlife movement corridors and crossings, including natural bottom culverts and other natural features where culverts are being modified and constructed. Include any additional planned improvements or wildlife crossing considerations in the DEIS.	and culverts, however, the Tier 2/Project-level analysis would identify and evaluate impacts related to site specific impacts associated with wildlife movement and wildlife movement corridors. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR includes programmatic mitigation strategies (Mitigation Strategies BIO-1 through BIO-5) that require additional analysis for biological resources during Tier 2/Project-level environmental review. These recommend subsequent Tier 2/Project-level biological resource assessments, design alterations; further technical studies (e.g., protocol surveys); and/or consultations with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and other local, state, and federal agencies for biological resources, particularly on protected and sensitive species and their associated habitats, and wildlife movement corridors and linkages. The recommendations identified by the commenter on mitigation strategies pertaining to wildlife movement and wildlife movement corridors are included in Mitigation Strategies BIO-1 through BIO-5, and, as such, will be considered by the applicable lead agency or agencies during Tier 2/Project-level environmental review.
A-05-7	**Community Impacts and Environmental Justice** The PEIS notes that the project could result in disruptions to local communities and may require displacement or relocations of residences, businesses, and community facilities. In particular, the document notes that land acquisition for new passenger rail stations could be extensive, depending on siting of station locations. Recommendations:	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.16 (Socioeconomics and Communities Affected), examples of programmatic mitigation strategies for community resources include those designed to avoid effects and impacts, when possible, and minimize effects and impacts where complete avoidance is not feasible, particularly to relocation of residents and businesses. As part of subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental analysis, additional coordination with federal, state, regional, and local agencies, jurisdictions, and communities would occur to develop Project-specific

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	• The EPA recommends that station siting decisions aim to minimize displacement of residences, businesses, and community facilities, particularly if these displacements could impact low-income or minority communities. • If displacement is unavoidable, the EPA recommends that relocation assistance go beyond what is required by the Uniform Relocation Act, if additional assistance is desired by impacted community members. • The EPA supports the goals of the relocation mitigation plan, as described in the PEIS, including provision of a high level of individualized assistance to impacted community members, minimizing the permanent closure of businesses, and provision of regulatory compliance assistance to businesses who require complex permitting. • As stated in the PEIS, avoiding and minimizing community impacts would involve working closely with local governments and planning agencies in the refinement and development of the project. We encourage engagement with local housing and economic development agencies to facilitate additional resources for impacted community members.	mitigation measures after Tier 2/Project-level design details are known (Mitigation Strategies PH-1, LU-2, and LU-3). Please refer to Master Response 12 for additional discussion on EJ communities. The recommendations identified by the commenter on mitigation strategies pertaining to community impacts and EJ have already been identified as part of Mitigation Strategies PH-1, LU-2, and LU-3, and, as such, will be implemented by the applicable lead agency during Tier 2/Project-level environmental review.
A-05-8	The PEIS states that at the conceptual level, the Build Alternative Options are unlikely to result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income communities, but that a more detailed and refined study will be completed as part of the Tier 2/Project-level analysis. **Recommendations:**	As described in Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 4 (Environmental Justice), public outreach will continue during the Tier 2/Project-level analysis to ensure that low-income and minority populations have access to information on the Program and have an opportunity to provide input about any specific community-based concerns.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	• As part of the Project-level analysis, the EPA recommends that FRA continue outreach to community groups and community leaders to encourage involvement in the process by all potentially impacted community members. Efforts could include participation in community events to engage community members who may be unable to participate in traditional public meetings. • We recommend that mitigation of any community impacts, including community benefits and enhancements, be developed in coordination with relevant community groups, leaders, and members.	As stated in Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 8 (Public and Agency Outreach), RCTC began the public engagement process early in 2014 to ensure stakeholder feedback was incorporated into the scope of the environmental document, as well as analysis required to identify potential effects and determine appropriate mitigation strategies. During the outreach process, the lead agencies, which include FRA, Caltrans, and RCTC, engaged the public (i.e., citizens, elected officials, and key stakeholders), as well as local, state, tribal, and federal agencies during the early stages of the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR evaluation. Public engagement was conducted during the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR process and will continue during the Tier 2/Project-level analysis by the applicable lead agency or agencies during Tier 2/Project-level environmental review to ensure that low-income and minority populations have access to information on the Tier 2/Project-level efforts, and an opportunity to provide input about specific community-based concerns. Please refer to Response A-05-7 related to minimizing community impacts associated with EJ populations.
A-05-9	Coordination with other Transportation Projects and Services The PEIS identifies other transportation services that utilize the rail corridor proposed for use in this project, as well as other public transit services in the area. **Recommendations:** • The EPA recommends that the DEIS include a detailed discussion of how the passenger rail service proposed in this project would integrate and coordinate with other passenger rail service that uses the rail corridor, including service	As part of subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental analysis, additional coordination with federal, state, regional, and local agencies, jurisdictions, and communities would occur to identify how other transit services, including light rail, public bus, and private shared mobility services, would be coordinated after Tier 2/Project-level design details are known (Mitigation Strategies LU-2, LU-3, and TR-1). Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation and Master Response 10 for a discussion on transportation connections within and outside of the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	proposed by the California High Speed Rail Authority, and existing Metrolink and Amtrak service. Include a discussion of coordination with the responsible agencies. • We also recommend that the DEIS include a discussion of how other transit services, including light rail, public bus, and private shared mobility services, would be coordinated with the service proposed in this project. Include a discussion of coordination with the responsible agencies and businesses.	
Comment A-06 (City of Calimesa)		
A-06-1	Thank you for providing the City of Calimesa the opportunity to review and comment on the Tier 1/Program Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) for the Coachella Valley – San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Project (Project). The City strongly supports the Project and concurs with the analysis, conclusions, and mitigation measures contained in the Draft Program EIS/EIR. The Project would extend approximately 144 miles between downtown Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley. The Project would utilize existing railroad tracks that primarily parallel Interstate 5, State Route 91, and Interstate 10. The Project would enhance access to four existing stations along the corridor and proposes development of five new rail stations over time. In addition, new tracks are proposed in strategic locations to improve travel speeds, minimize delays, and maintain safety. The City believes the Project would result in numerous benefits, including but not limited, to the following:	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	• Reduced traffic volumes on corridor freeways: Figure 1-5 of the EIS/EIR identifies various segments of I-10, SR-60 and SR-91 that currently experience regular weekday congestion. The annual population is anticipated to continue to grow in Riverside County and San Bernardino County at a rate of 1.0 percent and 1.1 percent, respectively, through 2050 (EIS/EIR, page 1-27). As population in these counties increases, freeway congestion is anticipated to increase as well, as residents commute to employment centers. The EIS/EIR concludes that, upon implementation of the Project, auto trips would shift to intercity trips, thereby reducing vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled on regional highways. The anticipated reduction in vehicle trips and VMT would result in a reduction in air quality/greenhouse gas emissions associated with fuel combustion and improve safety on regional highways. In addition to a reduction in environmental effects, drivers on regional freeways would benefit from reduced travel times due to decreased roadway congestion. • Increased access to employment Opportunities: Improving connectivity to our passenger rail network is a major goal for our region, not only between existing and future rail services but also with local transit serving rail stations (SCAG 2021). The Project would provide a reliable mode of transportation for residents in more rural and suburban communities to access urban areas with more employment opportunities. Los Angeles is projected to remain the major employment center of the region (i.e., Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties) over the next 30 years, accounting for 60	

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	percent of total employment opportunities. Extension of the passenger rail would provide access for residents, which may not have a reliable mode of transportation, to employment opportunities outside their existing communities, strengthening the overall regional work force and economy. • Access to tourist destinations and recreation opportunities along the corridor: Visitors traveling to the Corridor's many destinations including, but not limited to downtown areas; recreational facilities; art, history, and natural history museums; shopping destinations such as those in Cabazon; casinos and related entertainment venues; and special event generators, such as the annual Palm Springs Film Festival and the Coachella Valley Music and Arts Festival held in Indio. The frequently severe congestion of the nearby serving the Project corridor would make intercity passenger rail an attractive alternative to automobile travel, particularly for visitors. In addition, passenger rail service would provide affordable transportation service to popular tourist destinations and recreational facilities for residents that do not own a private vehicle.	
A-06-2	The City of Calimesa believes its residents could benefit greatly from implementation of the Project, but the City's main concern is access to the rail stations. The closest potential new station proposed to the City of Calimesa would be sited in "The Pass Area," between Beaumont and Cabazon. The City would prefer the station be located in Beaumont to provide opportunities for the City to coordinate feasible public transit options between the City and	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Pass Area which encompasses the communities of Beaumont, Banning, and Cabazon. Preparation of Tier

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	the future rail station. If "The Pass Area" station is sited further east near Cabazon, convenient public transit access to the station would not be feasible from the City of Calimesa. Thank you in advance for your consideration of our comments. The City acknowledges that the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR is a procedural planning document that evaluates the effects of implementing the passenger rail service from a regional context and broad areas of potential environmental effect associated with construction and operation of the Project. Once Tier 2 is initiated, the City looks forward to the opportunity to review the future project-level impact analysis for specific infrastructure improvements. When future environmental documentation associated with the Coachella Valley – San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Project, please send notice to Kelly Lucia, Planning Manager at 908 Park Avenue, Calimesa, CA 92320. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our recommendations, please contact Kelly Lucia at (909) 796-9801 ext. 229 or klucia@cityofcalimesa.net.	2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies, Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation, and Master Response 10 for a discussion on future potential transportation connections within the Program Corridor. Contact information for the City of Calimesa will be added to a stakeholder database for subsequent Tier 2/Project-level outreach.
Comment A-07 (City of Indio)		
A-07-1	I am the appointed City Manager for the City of Indio, California, and on behalf of the City, I am pleased to submit the City's written comments for the Draft Tier 1 /Program Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/Environmental Impact Report [EIR]) – Coachella Valley San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Program. The City of Indio is appreciative of the partnership efforts of the Federal Railroad Administration, the California Department of Transportation, and the Riverside County Transportation Commission to bring	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. Although the proposed passenger rail service would serve rail commuters throughout the Program Corridor, the Program would serve other users such as those traveling for local and regional recreational activities and leisure opportunities. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	passenger rail service as an alternate mode of travel across southern California, connecting desert communities such as Indio with Los Angeles, Orange County, and the Inland Empire. The City of Indio is the oldest incorporated City in the Coachella Valley having incorporated on May 16, 1930; however, Indio's community history began much earlier as an early western railroad town. Specifically, Indio sprung to life in 1876 as the Southern Pacific Railroad built lines between Yuma, Arizona and Los Angeles, California. Because the engines needed a plane to refill their water, and the workers needed somewhere to recharge their own batteries, Indio, which is located halfway between Yuma and Los Angeles was a natural stopping point, and the first permanent building was erected. This building was the Southern Pacific Depot Station and Hotel (refer to Attachment 1). For many years, Indio served as the economic and cultural hub of the Coachella Valley that was significantly tied to its role as a railroad town. In its modern history, the City of Indio has become an internationally recognized community that is home to the Coachella and Stagecoach Music Festivals together with many other events that bring citizens from all over the country - and the world - to Indio. As can be seen, Indio has a rich history of being a railroad stopping point. As a modern and growing city, it is time for Indio's strategic value as a railroad community to once again be recognized with a train station that can serve visitors and residents in accessing the many economic and cultural attributes our community has to offer. The City of Indio is the largest City in the	2/Project-level studies, and Master Response 10 for a discussion of transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	Coachella Valley. The City's current population of approximately 92,000 is projected to grow to over 135,000 people by 2040. On September 18, 2019, the City of Indio City Council adopted the Indio General Plan 2040 that establishes a 20-year vision with supporting goals and policies for the growth and development of the community and includes a Mobility Element (ME). This Mobility Element establishes the development of a train station in the City of Indio near its Downtown as a high community priority. Specifically, Goal ME-3 (Transit) states that the "The City will work with Sunline Transit and other regional partners to enhance bus transit, and to implement a future transit station in conjunction with the planned commuter rail extension to and from Riverside" [emphasis added]. Further, Policy ME-3.1 (Riverside Commuter Transit) states "Support a potential expansion of commuter rail transit from Riverside to the Coachella Valley, including support for a transit station adjacent to the City's Downtown area [emphasis added]."	
A-07-2	The City of Indio is committed to working with federal, state, regional and local partners to establish a train station stop and already has the ideal location, namely, the Indio Transportation Center. The Indio Transportation Center (refer to Attachment 2) is a strategically located existing multi-modal facility located adjacent to Downtown Indio. It is 6.2 acres in size with approximately half of the parcel already developed as an asphalted surface parking lot of 240 spaces. The remainder of the property is currently undeveloped that could be utilized for future transit-oriented	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Indio Area which encompasses the community of Indio. The Indio Transportation Center as referenced in the commenter's letter is within the Indio Station Area Study Area identified in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	development. Currently, the Center serves as the location for a locally operated Greyhound bus facility that serves in-state and out-of-state passengers. In early 2019, the Center was identified as the location for a temporary train station for special Amtrak trains to be run for both Coachella and Stagecoach. The temporary train station was intended to be an alternative mode of transportation to get some of the hundreds of thousands of festival attendees out to Indio. The $8.6 million project was funded by a $5.9 million grant from the California State Transportation Agency and $2.7 million from the Riverside County Transportation Commission. Because of complications resulting from negotiations with Union Pacific over access to its railroad right-of-way, this project did not go forward. However, the fact that there was a serious effort by state and regional entities to fund and construct a train station facility demonstrates Indio's value and importance as a train station location. The construction and operation of a train station in Indio under the auspices of the Coachella Valley San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Program is a logical conclusion to this recent effort and should be pursued with all haste.	documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
A-07-3	In May 2018, the City of Indio received a California Department of Transportation Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant and executed a restricted grant agreement with the California Department of Transportation, Division of Transportation Planning, to prepare a Multi-Modal Feasibility Study, The Study's purpose was to identify and evaluate potential locations for the construction of a multi-modal transportation facility in the City of Indio. The	Please refer to Master Response 10, which provides a discussion of transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	Study also analyzed the best ways to connect transportation services that include commuter and intercity rail, bus rapid transit, regional and local buses, and active transportation elements at a single location for Indio residents and visitors. The first part of the Study assessed the existing land uses, transportation network, demographics, topography and economic conditions in the City. The second part of the study analyzed strategic alternatives to enhance multi-modal traffic and circulation in and around Indio including the viability of Indio as a passenger rail station stop for Amtrak along its existing Sunset Limited train service, On February 5, 2020, the Indio City Council unanimously approved Resolution No. 10129 adopting the Indio Multi-Modal Feasibility Study (refer to Attachment 3). This Study identified the Indio Transportation Center as the preferred location for a future multi-modal facility. Figures 4.3 and 4.4 (refer to Attachment 4) from the Study demonstrate how a train station could be successfully developed at the Indio Transportation Center.	
A-07-4	The City of Indio supports Build Alternative Option 1 specified in the Draft Tier 1 /Program Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/Environmental Impact Report [EIR]) – Coachella Valley San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Program that currently reads as follows: **Build Alternative Option 1 (Coachella Terminus)** For purposes of this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, Build Alternative Option 1 assumes the following infrastructure improvements within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor:	Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process and Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	• Station construction. Build Alternative Option 1 identifies six potential station location areas in the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor where passenger rail stations could be located. Build Alternative Option 1 would use the existing station in the City of Palm Springs. Additionally, up to five new potential stations could be constructed in the following areas: 1) Loma Linda/Redlands Area (serving the Cities of Loma Linda and Redlands), 2) the Pass Area (serving the communities of Beaumont, Banning, and Cabazon), 3) the Mid-Valley Area (serving the communities of Cathedral City, Thousand Palms, the Agua Caliente Casino area, Rancho Mirage, and Palm Desert), 4) the City of Indio. [emphasis added] and 5) Coachella as the eastern terminus of the Program Corridor. • Third main track: A third main line track would augment the existing two main tracks along the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor to Coachella. The City of Indio concurs with the findings and conclusion in Chapter 7 (Evaluation of Alternatives) of the Draft Tier 1/Program Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/Environmental Impact Report [EIR]) that identifies this Option as the preferred alternative and environmentally superior alternative. The City of Indio's support for Build Alternative Option 1 is contingent upon the future construction of a train station/platform at the Indio Transportation Center. As noted before, the City has already analyzed and identified the Center as the optimal location for a multi-modal	

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	facility inclusive of direct connections to passenger rail service via an active train station. Therefore, the City of Indio strongly encourages the Federal Railroad Administration, the California Department of Transportation, and the Riverside County Transportation Commission to formally approve Build Alternative Option 1 as the preferred alternative and take all necessary current and future actions to initiate design and construction of the Indio train station. We believe that our City is a natural location for this type of facility due in large part to the fact that we have the basic infrastructure in place and, as the landowner, our City is well positioned to move expeditiously to support the construction and operation of a train station at the Indio Transportation Center. Thank you again for the opportunity to provide the City of Indio's comments regarding the Draft Tier 1/Program Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/Environmental Impact Report [EIR]) – Coachella Valley San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Program. Our City is and will be a strategic partner in the construction and operation of a new train station at the Indio Transportation Center, We look forward to working with the Federal Railroad Administration, the California Department of Transportation and the Riverside County Transportation Commission in the development of a new train station/platform at the Indio Transportation Center in the near future.	

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment A-08 (California Highway Patrol)		
A-08-1	Special Projects Section (SPS) recently received the referenced "Notice of Completion" environmental impact document from the State Clearinghouse (SCH). Please use the attached checklist to assess its potential impact to local Area operations and public safety. If it is determined that departmental input is advisable, your written comments referencing the above SCH number must be emailed to CHP-EIR@chp.ca.gov. Your written comments must be received no later than July 1, 2021. If a project of interest impacts more than one Division, the SPS is responsible for coordinating any necessary response from the Divisions to the appropriate agency. For reference, additional information can be found in General Order 41.2, Environmental Impact Documents.	The comment includes the California Highway Patrol's EIR Evaluation/Response Checklist for Area Section. No additional comments or input was received from the Department of California Highway Patrol's Southern Division. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment A-09 (City of Redlands)		
A-09-1	The City of Redlands City Council recently learned that the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) is developing a new passenger rail project to connect the desert communities of Indio or Coachella with Union Station in downtown Los Angeles. A portion of the Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Service Project passes through the City of Redlands and will negatively impact our community if mitigating measures are not considered and included in the project. On behalf of the community, the Redlands City Council is compelled to comment on the draft EIS/EIR.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section ES.1 (Executive Summary), this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR represents the first step within a tiered approach to NEPA analyses in accordance with the CEQ's Regulations for Implementing NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508), FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (64 Federal Register 28545, May 26, 1999), and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15170. Tiering under NEPA and CEQA involves the evaluation of broad level programs and issues in an initial Tier 1/Program level evaluation followed by more detailed evaluation of specific improvements in subsequent Tier 2/Project-level analyses.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	Two (2) City of Redlands arterial streets, San Timoteo Canyon Road and Alessandro Road, intersect with the existing UPRR rail corridor. Both are major motor vehicle transportation routes connecting the City of Redlands with the City of Yucaipa and unincorporated areas within Riverside County, and are used by recreational cyclists as well. Although commercial rail traffic through the UPRR corridor has increased significantly in recent years, UPRR has not constructed safety improvements at either street intersection. The addition of a third rail to serve multiple daily commuter trains without constructing these safety improvements will increase the likelihood of a tragic train-to-vehicle or train-to-cyclist collision.	This Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts of the No Build Alternative and the three Build Alternative Options broadly within the Program Corridor. The Program Corridor provides a flexible regional context for the best location of an enhanced passenger rail system while providing opportunities for the Build Alternative Options within the Program Corridor to account for engineering and environmental constraints, as well as public input. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis and to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation. Chapter 3.15 (Safety and Security) of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR considers the operational and infrastructure aspects of each of the Build Alternative Options, including the safety and security of passenger rail as a travel mode compared with other modes (motor vehicle and aviation), access to the existing railroad ROW, and how it is secured and maintained. Safety and security aspects include the safe operation of the passenger railroad, equipment, and infrastructure (e.g., tracks, structures, systems, stations, yards, etc.), as well as access to the ROW. Safety considerations are consistent with FRA's mission to improve railroad safety and reduce the number of accidents by reducing the number and rates of accidents involving railroad train collisions or derailments, highway-rail grade crossings, trespassers, and railroad infrastructure. The provision of rail service would be governed by the FRA Risk Reduction Program (RRP) (49 CFR Part 271). An RRP is a structured program with proactive processes and procedures, developed and implemented by railroads to identify and mitigate or eliminate hazards to reduce the number and rates of railroad accidents, incidents, injuries, and fatalities.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		Table 3.15-4 of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR summarizes the number of at-grade railroad crossing incidents for all cities crossed by the existing railroad ROW between 2013 and 2017. A total of 101 at-grade crossing incidents occurred in the 32 cities crossed by the existing railroad ROW between 2013 and 2017. Of these, 53 occurred within the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area. For the City of Redlands, no at-grade rail incidents (which included incidents with fatalities, incidents with injuries and incidents with property damage) were reported. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 3.15 (Safety and Security), safety-related impacts associated with operation of the proposed train service would be minimized with implementation of Mitigation Strategy SS-1 (preparation of a project-specific collision hazard analysis) and SS-2 (preparation of safety and security certification plans), which would be developed during the Tier 2/Project-level analysis. As part of subsequent Tier 2/Project-level analysis, additional stakeholder outreach will be conducted. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis and Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation.
A-09-2	For several years, City of Redlands staff has appealed to the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) to create a "Quiet Zone" and associated public transportation safety improvements through its rail corridor along the west end of Redlands. We have not been successful in securing a commitment from UPRR to do so. The Redlands City Council strongly urges the RCTC to include the following public safety elements at the San Timoteo Canyon Road and Alessandro Road/UPRR intersections in this project:	For responses related to recommendations for specific public safety elements at the San Timoteo Canyon Road and Alessandro Road/UPRR intersections, please refer to Response A-09-2. For responses related to the development of quiet zones, please refer to Master Response 4. Please also refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis and Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	• Installation of quad railroad signals; • Installation of non-traversable medians. • Installation of new crossings through the UPRR right-of-way; • Widening and improvement of street approaches to the UPRR right-of-way. These improvements are necessary to increase safety for rail passengers, as well as motor vehicle operators and cyclists at each intersection, and should not be considered as enhancements or options to the project. In addition to the improved public transportation safety benefits, construction of these elements must be coordinated with UPRR to create a "Quiet Zone" through this west Redlands corridor. The addition of commuter train service along the corridor will exceed the outdoor day-night average noise limit of 55 decibels, beyond which public health and welfare is jeopardized by interfering with speech and disturbing sleep within nearby health care facilities and residential areas.	

Table 1-5. Response to Written Organization Comments Received During the Public Review Period

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment O-01 (The Gardens on El Paseo)		
O-01-1	The Gardens on El Paseo would like to express its support of the proposed Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor extending approximately 144 miles between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley with stops in Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, and Riverside counties. The proposed project would provide certain benefits to all stakeholders which include but are not limited to the following: *Improving Quality of Life and Sustainable Economic Growth In addition to contributing to less traffic and cleaner air, rail service from Los Angeles to Indio/Coachella is essential for equitable access to and from our Coachella Valley communities to the rest of Southern California. It would allow more visitors, locals and workers at all income levels to travel for leisure, employment opportunities, and business, thus improving the local economy and quality of life for our residents. This rail service is also key to sustainable growth in the Coachella Valley, as the addition of regular, reliable rail service would increase the ease of rail travel from other, more populated areas of Riverside County, encouraging job growth in tourism by increasing our employee pool. *Boosting Tourism from Our SoCal Drive Market We are excited about the positive impact this new rail service could have in bringing additional visitors from Southern California's coastal regions to Greater Palm Springs. This	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

	region relies heavily on these drive markets for tourism throughout the year. Expanding their access to the region will increase visitation and our tourism economy.	
O-01-2	It is important any new rail service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley take no more than 3 hours.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.5 (Program Purpose and Objectives), the Program could result in scheduled one-way travel times between Los Angeles and Coachella of approximately 180 to 200 minutes to achieve an endpoint on-time performance of 90 percent and an all-stations on time performance of 90 percent which would be in compliance with on-time performance metrics established by FRA. Please refer to Master Response 7 for additional discussion on train trip durations.
O-01-3	The number of new stations along this route should be carefully reviewed to ensure potential passengers see rail service as a viable alternative to driving.	Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
O-01-4	*Increasing the Number of Overseas Visitors Overseas international visitors play a key role in our efforts to promote the summer season and make Greater Palm Springs a year-round destination. Most overseas travelers are visiting California in the summer months and typically stay longer and spend more than domestic travelers. These visitors are accustomed to rail travel. In the EU alone, estimates state that 258.4 billion passenger miles were completed in 2019, up 3.4% from the previous year – continuing its growth for the sixth year in a row. In comparison in North and South America in 2019, passengers traveled around 16.7 billion miles on railways. Currently, Palm Springs International Airport does not provide U.S. Border and Customs services and only	Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in and visitors to the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion of transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.

	services international flights originating from airports with pre-clearance facilities. Therefore, the vast majority of international visitors utilize larger airports such as LAX and drive into Greater Palm Springs. The addition of rail service from an international gateway city such as Los Angeles will increase our number of overseas visitors. *Supporting Regional Events Rail service from LA through the Inland Empire is essential to the Coachella Valley's continued growth. The new Coachella Valley Arena, currently under construction and slated to begin events in late 2022, has the potential to generate $141million in annual economic impact for our region, and this rail service would help make the Arena and its events more accessible to visitors from other areas of Southern California. Thank you for your consideration of these remarks. We are hopeful this project moves forward in the near future.	
Comment O-02 (Visit Greater Palm Springs)		
O-02-1	Tourism is the number one industry for the Coachella Valley supporting over 53,000 jobs and attracting over 14 million people each year. Over 60% of our visitors are from Southern California and easy access is critical. In addition to contributing to less traffic and cleaner air, rail service from Los Angeles to Indio/Coachella is essential for equitable access to and from our Coachella Valley communities to the rest of Southern California. It would allow more visitors, locals and workers at all income levels to travel for leisure, employment	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

	opportunities, and business, thus improving the local economy and quality of life for our residents. This rail service is also key to sustainable growth in the Coachella Valley, as the addition of regular, reliable rail service would increase the ease of rail travel from other, more populated areas of Riverside County, encouraging job growth in tourism by increasing our employee pool. We are excited about the positive impact this new rail service could have in bringing additional visitors from Southern California's coastal regions to Greater Palm Springs. This region relies heavily on these drive markets for tourism throughout the year. Expanding their access to the region will increase visitation and our tourism economy.	
O-02-2	It is important any new rail service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley take no more than 3 hours.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.5 (Program Purpose and Objectives), the frequency of the Program's proposed passenger rail service was established as two daily round trips based on a ridership forecast model service optimization analysis, which found that two round trips per day would attract the greatest number of riders per train while providing an opportunity for passengers to make a limited round trip in 1 day. The Program could result in scheduled one-way travel times between Los Angeles and Coachella of approximately 180 to 200 minutes to achieve an endpoint on-time performance of 90 percent and an all-stations on time performance of 90 percent which would be in compliance with on-time performance metrics established by FRA. Please refer to Master Response 7 for additional discussion on train trip durations.
O-02-3	The number of new stations along this route should be carefully reviewed to ensure potential passengers see rail service as a viable alternative to driving.	Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
O-02-4	Overseas international visitors play a key role in our efforts to promote the summer season and make Greater Palm Springs a year-round destination. Most overseas travelers are visiting California in the summer months and typically stay longer and spend more than domestic travelers. These visitors are accustomed to rail travel. In the EU alone, estimates state that 258.4 billion passenger miles were completed in 2019, up 3.4% from the previous year – continuing its growth for the sixth year in a row. In comparison in North and South America in 2019, passengers traveled around 16.7 billion miles on railways. Currently, Palm Springs International Airport does not provide U.S. Border and Customs services and only services international flights originating from airports with pre-clearance facilities. Therefore, the vast majority of international visitors utilize larger airports such as LAX and drive into Greater Palm Springs. The addition of rail service from an international gateway city such as Los Angeles will increase our number of overseas visitors. Rail service from LA through the Inland Empire is essential to the Coachella Valley's continued growth. The new Coachella Valley Arena, currently under construction and slated to begin events in late 2022, has the potential to generate $141million in annual economic impact for our region, and this rail service would help make the Arena and its events more accessible to visitors from other areas of Southern California.	Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in and visitors to the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion of transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.
Comment O-03 (Empire Polo Club)		

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
O-03-1	My organization fully supports passenger rail service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley. We would like to see it extended all the way to the City of Coachella. Very important for the Music Festivals, other special events, and tourism in general for the region!	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which includes providing service to the City of Coachella.
Comment O-04 (Escape Room of Palm Springs)		
O-04-1	As both a business owner and a consumer, I have been fantasizing about rail service between the Los Angeles Metro area and the Coachella Valley my entire life. My grandmother my crippled with polio in the 1920s and in the 1960s when I was a little girl, she used to drive me out to Desert Hot Springs from Long Beach with great difficulty as she had only one functional leg. She had a second home in DHS and we would visit The Desert Hot Springs Spa Hotel for the healing mineral waters because she swore that the waters were the only thing that brought her any relief from her constant pain. It was in the 1960s and 1970s during my childhood and on those trips with my grandmother that I fell in love with the Coachella Valley. In the 1980s, my grandmother got too old and infirm to make the drive out here herself, and she used to bitterly lament that there was no train/rail service from Los Angeles to the valley. I tried to drive her a few times, but by then, I was busy with high school and later in the 1990s, I was busy with college. I know she suffered without her healing waters, and I felt terrible that I was unable to help her more. If only there had been a train she could have taken to get her	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

	out here! What a life-changing difference that would have made for her, and by proxy, for me. She died in 1996. I made it my goal to move to the Palm Springs are and that dream came true. I'm now 58 years old and I own a tourist attraction that barely survived the pandemic. As a business owner, I know that I could get so many more visitors who do not own reliable transportation but who do have the means for a weekend getaway and ride share transportation once they get there. The Greater Palm Springs area is the most affordable and closest resort area near Los Angeles or Riverside/San Bernardo. Please find the money to create this long overdue rail system. Thank you for hearing my story and for considering my remarks.	
Comment O-05 (Rail Passenger Association of California and Nevada)		
O-05-1	The Rail Passengers Association of California and Nevada (RailPAC) is pleased to offer these comments to the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Division of Rail and Mass Transportation on the Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program May 2021 Tier 1/Program Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report. RailPAC is a 501c3 volunteer group of railroad professionals and advocates that has campaigned for	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section ES.1 (Executive Summary), this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR represents the first step within a tiered approach to NEPA analyses in accordance with the CEQ's Regulations for Implementing NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508), FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (64 *Federal Register* 28545, May 26, 1999), and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15170. Tiering under NEPA and CEQA involves the evaluation of broad level programs and issues in an initial Tier 1/Program level evaluation followed by more detailed evaluation of specific improvements in subsequent Tier 2/Project-level analyses.

	improved personal mobility in California and the west since 1978. RailPAC applauds this effort to advance additional intercity rail service between Los Angeles Union Station ("LAUS") and the Coachella Valley. This new rail service has long been a goal of our organization, the California State Rail Plan, and Riverside County, and has been studied at least seven times by public agencies since the early 1990s. The time for action is now. We recognize that this draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR is one step of a multi-phased iterative process, and that details such as passenger station locations will be evaluated and selected in the subsequent Tier 2/Project-level analyses. We look forward to reviewing this Tier 2 analysis. RailPAC also wants to emphasize how this project can open the door for future projects and goals much greater than the proposed new passenger rail service of two daily round-trip LAUS-Coachella Valley trains evaluated by the Tier 1 EIR.	This Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts of the No Build Alternative and the three Build Alternative Options broadly within the Program Corridor. The Program Corridor provides a flexible regional context for the best location of an enhanced passenger rail system while providing opportunities for the Build Alternative Options within the Program Corridor to account for engineering and environmental constraints, as well as public input. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis and to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation.
O-05-2	**Third Mainline Track from Colton to Coachella** RailPAC fully supports the main feature of the preferred Build Alternative Option 1: the construction of a new third mainline track along 76 miles of the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing Yuma Subdivision between Colton and Coachella. Given the capital costs of the third mainline track proposed from Colton to the Coachella Valley, RailPAC wants to emphasize the variety of benefits to passenger and freight rail that are possible with this investment in additional track	Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Build Alternative Option 1 would include a new third mainline track from Colton to the Coachella Valley along UPRR's existing Yuma subdivision.

	capacity. Any proposed service in the Coachella Valley Rail (CVR) corridor, and the capital improvements associated with it, must be recognized as a building block for future expansion. The initiatives described below would add significant public value to any capital grant request for a Colton-Coachella third mainline track:	
O-05-3	**Greater frequency and speed of CVR passenger trains.** Improvements to the level of CVR service evaluated by this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR recommended by RailPAC, would require and be enabled by the third mainline track: far greater frequency (minimum of 6 round-trips per day, preferably 12 or more) and higher speed (a goal of at least 60 mph average speed, up from the roughly 45 mph currently proposed). Fast and frequent service, competitive with driving, is essential to attract a rail ridership significant enough to provide major public benefits of reduced traffic congestion and pollution on the I-10 corridor.	Please refer to Master Response 6 for a discussion on train trip frequency, and Master Response 7 for a discussion on train speed.
O-05-4	**Daily Amtrak Sunset Limited.** Increase of the frequency of Amtrak's Sunset Limited from tri-weekly to daily service has long been a goal of RailPAC. Of the multiple congestion bottlenecks along the Sunset Limited route between LAUS and New Orleans, which need to be relieved to allow daily service of this long-distance Amtrak train, the San Gorgonio Pass/Coachella Valley segment in Southern California is among the most important. There has long been wide-ranging support in the Coachella Valley for a daily Sunset Limited. Indio has been pushing for the Sunset Limited to return	In general, the routing of this proposed service analyzed in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR was designed to encourage connections for travelers between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley. Extending the Program Corridor further east is not part of the Program's Purpose and Need. Please refer to Master Response 1 for a discussion on station locations, Master Response 6 for a discussion on train trip frequency, and Master Response 10 for a discussion on transportation connections within and outside of the Program Corridor within the context of the Program's Purpose and Need.

	service to their community as well; and a new station built for the CVR service could also serve Amtrak trains. A daily Sunset Limited could complement the regional CVR service. One of the markets served by Amtrak long-distance trains are shorter distance corridors. The Sunset Limited can add an extra schedule at off-peak times to add options and customer value to the CVR. The current schedule of the Sunset Limited which serves the Palm Springs station late in the evening/early in the morning almost certainly offers such an opportunity.	
O-05-5	**Benefits to UP freight rail.** Steady growth of UP freight traffic on the Yuma Subdivision is projected to increase to 88 daily one-way freight trips on the Colton-Coachella segment by 2044 (pg. 2-26), more than double the 2018 average of 42 one-way freight trains per day (pg. 2-18). While UP has invested in many track capacity improvements on the Sunset Route over the years, one of its chokepoints remains the San Gorgonio Pass/Coachella Valley. With the new third main track, UP could run more conventional long-distance freight trains on the Sunset Route, and future short and medium-haul freight trains from LA/Inland Empire to the Coachella Valley and Arizona could be justified on public benefit of getting trucks off of I-10.	Please refer to Master Response 3 for a discussion on freight train volume assumptions.
O-05-6	**New California-Arizona regional passenger service.** Amtrak's May 2021 Connects US 'Corridor Vision' proposed one daily roundtrip of a LA-Arizona regional service, between LAUS, the Coachella Valley, Yuma, Phoenix and Tucson. For	Please refer to Master Response 6 for a discussion on train trip frequency and Master Response 10 for a discussion on transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.

	the long term, a daily Sunset Limited on its own is not sufficient to be the prime mover of rail passengers between LA, Coachella Valley, Phoenix and Tucson. RailPAC recommends that dedicated Southern California-Arizona corridor passenger trains should start with a minimum service of two daily trains each way, morning and evening from LA and Phoenix/Tucson (further complementing other future LAUS-Coachella Valley and Tucson-Phoenix trains).	
O-05-7	**Imperial Valley extension.** Some trains of the LAUS-Coachella Valley service should extend to Brawley, El Centro and Calexico in the Imperial Valley (as described RCTC's 1991 Los Angeles - Coachella Valley - Imperial County Intercity Rail Feasibility Study). The combined population of the bi-national region of the Imperial County/Mexicali Municipality is over 1.2 million people, providing a valuable international connection opportunity and ridership driver for CVR service.	In general, the routing of this proposed service analyzed in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR was designed to encourage connections for travelers between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley. Extending the Program Corridor further east to the Imperial Valley is not part of the Program's Purpose and Need. Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion on transportation connections within the context of the Program's Purpose and Need.
O-05-8	**Noise and Vibration of Passenger Rail Operations** In relation to Section 3.6 (Mitigation Strategy LU-3 "land use consistency", pg. 3.6-42), RailPAC recommends that sound walls and sound-dampening ballast in railbed should be implemented where the track passes close to residential areas, such as in Loma Linda.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.6 (Noise and Vibration), a site-specific noise and vibration assessment shall be required in the future for the specific rail infrastructure or station facility proposed (Mitigation Strategy NOI-2). Mitigation Strategy NOI-2 requires a Tier 2/Project-level noise and vibration assessment that identifies adjacent noise-sensitive land uses that could be impacted by construction and operational activities associated with the specific rail infrastructure or station facility proposed. In addition, Mitigation Strategy NOI-2 requires identification of existing noise levels at the nearest noise-sensitive land uses, as well as mitigation to be implemented (e.g., enclosures, barriers, site orientation) based

		on what is prescribed by the local jurisdiction's noise regulations or ordinances of where the Tier 2/Project-level improvement is being proposed. The commenter's recommendations related to sound walls and sound-dampening ballast in railbeds where the track passes close to residential areas will be taken into consideration at the Tier 2/Project-level when additional rail infrastructure details for the Program Corridor are known.
Comment O-06 (Spotlight VIP)		
O-06-1	The normal shutting down of the Coachella Valley's cities during the summer months is over due to permanent movement from cities to the Coachella Valley during Covid. The traffic in town confirms that we have new residents and visitors coming from the LA area. They still have to go back and forth making the 10 an unpredictable traffic nightmare. The are no set traffic patterns and impossible to make a trip the Riverside/ LA easy to come or go.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment O-07 (Greater Palm Springs Convention and Visitors Bureau)		
O-07-1	This is an amazing opportunity to support International Tourism, the drive market within Southern California and our environment. Engaging for a greener Southern California.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment O-08 (PRA Business Events)		
O-08-1	Bringing Amtrak to the valley will boost tourism and allow easier access to the Greater Palm Springs	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment O-09 (Gelato Granucci)		
O-09-1	We are in favor of rail service from LA to the Coachella Valley. It will be economic benefits and is environmentally friendly. We urge the approval of this rail project.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment O-10 (The Lautner Compound)		
O-10-1	My business strongly supports the Coachella Valley San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program.	Thank you for your comment. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment O-11 (Union Pacific Railroad)		
O-11-1	Union Pacific Railroad Company (UPRR) submits these comments in response to the Coachella Valley - San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program - Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR as prepared by the Federal Railroad Administration, California Department of Transportation Division of Rail and Mass Transportation, and Riverside County Transportation Commission (Agencies). The DEIR seeks to evaluate new passenger rail service and to construct stations and rail infrastructure along corridors that the Agencies do not operate over today. UPRR has a direct interest in the proposed projects because it owns and operates a significant portion of the rail corridor noted throughout the DEIR. UPRR owns and operates a common carrier freight railroad network in the western two thirds of the United States, including the State of California. Specifically, UPRR owns and operates rail main lines connecting the San Francisco Bay	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would include a new third mainline track from Colton to the Coachella Valley along UPRR's existing Yuma subdivision. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor through Amtrak's statutory operating rights. Please refer to Master Response 5 which provides a discussion on Program implementation.

	Area to Sacramento and points east and north, and to Los Angeles and points east and southeast. UPRR is the largest rail carrier in California in terms of both mileage and train operations. UPRR also has a multitude of public private partnerships across the state, including active and planned projects with various state agencies and passenger rail partners. UPRR's network in California is vital to the economic health of the state and the nation as whole, and its rail service to California customers is crucial to the current and future success and growth of those customers. The proposed Coachella Valley - San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program (Program) is conceived as operating across a portion of UPRR's Yuma Subdivision between Colton, CA and either Indio, CA or Coachella, CA. This subdivision is an integral component of UPRR's Sunset Route franchise corridor that connects West Coast ports and the LA Basin to the Midwest and Gulf. UPRR has been cooperating with the Agencies to ensure the safety and efficiency of the UPRR system, including UPRR's ability to move goods fluidly into and out of the LA Basin and to serve current and future customers on demand, has been preserved during initial planning and modeling, and would be preserved if the Program were to proceed to construction and operation. The Program DEIR proposes a Preferred Alternative alignment that seeks to utilize approximately 77 miles of UPRR owned right of way along which UPRR owns track and facility infrastructure that would result in a shared corridor, raising several operating, engineering, real estate and	

	commercial franchise challenges throughout the corridor. Except where UPRR has, following negotiation with the Agencies, implemented significant capacity improvements and other mitigation measures to address adverse impacts to its franchise, UPRR will not allow any part of the Program service to be located on UPRR-owned property.	
O-11-2	With these general principles as context, UPRR offers these specific points: • Any infrastructure proposal comprising less than full three main tracks along the entirety of the route on UPRR right of way will be considered insufficient to protect the fluidity and reliability of freight movement on the corridor. • All Program facilities that may cross above or below UPRR right of way must clear-span the UPRR property and be constructed a sufficient distance away to permit UPRR's full utilization of its property for railroad purposes. • Any new facilities that cross UPRR's right of way in relation to the Program, including new or realigned roads, must be grade-separated and comply with UPRR's then-current minimum engineering standards. • Pedestrian crossings at station locations along the proposed shared UPRR right of way must be grade separated.	Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would include a new third mainline track from Colton to the Coachella Valley along UPRR's existing Yuma subdivision. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), upon completion of the SDP and the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR process, the specific infrastructure improvements would be designed and refined through coordination and additional consultations with UPRR, Federal, State, and regional lead agencies and stakeholders. Potential infrastructure improvements could include the following: • Various crossovers connecting the existing mainline tracks to the new third mainline track • A new second Mount Vernon connector track in Colton • A new siding at Loma Linda to allow passenger trains to meet, thereby reducing delay • A new railroad bridge across the Santa Ana River • Additional infrastructure components throughout the Program Corridor including, but not limited to, wayside signals, drainage structures, and grade-separation structures

	Depending on the design and proximity of the Program facilities to the UPRR right of way, special conditions such as safety barriers may be required. It is not clear whether the DEIR has examined the impact that construction of the Program alignment may have on the future ability of cities or other road authorities to grade-separate roads that cross the UPRR tracks along the route. State and federal policies encourage the elimination of railroad grade crossings for the benefit of safety and the efficient movement of trains and vehicular traffic. The design of the Program alignment and its proximity to the UPRR right of way under the Preferred Alternative may permanently prevent roads that currently cross the freight tracks at grade from being grade-separated in the future. UPRR requests that an analysis be completed to determine the extent of these potential impacts and that the results be formally communicated to the respective roadway authorities who might be impacted and to UPRR. Considering the potentially serious and detrimental impacts to UPRR facilities, operations, current and future customer access, and to long-term roadway accessibility over UPRR tracks along the Preferred Alternative route, it is imperative that the Agencies continue working with UPRR to develop an alignment that meets UPRR safety and engineering guidelines and addresses the concerns identified in this letter or that have yet to be identified.	Chapter 3.15 (Safety and Security) of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR considers the operational and infrastructure aspects of each of the Build Alternative Options, including the safety and security of passenger rail as a travel mode compared with other modes (motor vehicle and aviation), access to the existing railroad ROW, and how it is secured and maintained. Safety and security aspects include the safe operation of the passenger railroad, equipment, and infrastructure (e.g., tracks, structures, systems, stations, yards, etc.), as well as access to the ROW. Safety considerations are consistent with FRA's mission to improve railroad safety and reduce the number of accidents by reducing the number and rates of accidents involving railroad train collisions or derailments, highway-rail grade crossings, trespassers, and railroad infrastructure. The provision of rail service would be governed by the FRA Risk Reduction Program (RRP) (49 CFR Part 271). An RRP is a structured program with proactive processes and procedures, developed and implemented by railroads to identify and mitigate or eliminate hazards to reduce the number and rates of railroad accidents, incidents, injuries, and fatalities. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 3.15 (Safety and Security), safety-related impacts associated with operation of the proposed train service would be minimized with implementation of Mitigation Strategy SS-1 (preparation of a project-specific collision hazard analysis) and SS-2 (preparation of safety and security certification plans), which would be developed during the Tier 2/Project-level analysis. The commenter's recommendations related to rail infrastructure and facilities within or that cross UPRR ROW will be taken into consideration at the Tier 2/-Project level when additional rail infrastructure details for the Program Corridor are known. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the

	If the Agencies do select the Preferred Alternative route, then the Agencies must mitigate any and all impacts to UPRR and our customers. The Agencies must provide solutions to overcome the impacts to UPRR noted above and any others UPRR identifies as the design of the Preferred Alternative route is developed in more detail.	difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis and Master Response 5 which provides a discussion on Program implementation.
Comment O-12 (Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL-CIO – Inland Empire Chapter)		
O-12-1	The Inland Empire California Chapter of Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance (APALA) wishes to express our enthusiastic for the Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Rail Corridor Project. Our organization is centered on advocacy where worker rights and protections intersect with the existing equity issues which are already present in our communities. Our members work, reside, conduct business, study, and worship throughout our region, and we are present in several spaces as actively involved and civilly engaged community residents. We strongly urge the RCTC to consider the option which includes a triple track between City of Colton and City of Coachella, as this optimizes environmental benefits by increasing access and encouraging ridership in our Eastern Coachella Valley communities, which are experiencing very rapid population growth. On behalf of our Chapter, I respectfully request that this public comment is included and retained for the official record.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Build Alternative Option 1 would include a new third mainline track from Colton to the Coachella Valley along UPRR's existing Yuma subdivision.
Comment O-13 (Historical Society of Palm Desert)		

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
O-13-1	Attached please find Harry M. Quinn's response for the Historical Society of Palm Desert. Based on this review, the project appears to need several tiers of environmental studies: 1) a cultural study, both Pre-Historic (1a) and Historic (1b); 2) Paleontological study; and 3) Hazardous Waste study.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section ES.1 (Executive Summary), this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR represents the first step within a tiered approach to NEPA analyses in accordance with the CEQ's Regulations for Implementing NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508), FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (64 *Federal Register* 28545, May 26, 1999), and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15170. Tiering under NEPA and CEQA involves the evaluation of broad level programs and issues in an initial Tier 1/Program level evaluation followed by more detailed evaluation of specific improvements in subsequent Tier 2/Project-level analyses. This Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts of the No Build Alternative and the three Build Alternative Options broadly within the Program Corridor. The Program Corridor provides a flexible regional context for the best location of an enhanced passenger rail system while providing opportunities for the Build Alternative Options within the Program Corridor to account for engineering and environmental constraints, as well as public input. Subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental analysis and public outreach would be conducted. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.13 (Cultural Resources), additional Section 106 and Assembly Bill 52 consultation with all applicable consulting parties, resource agencies, and/or Native American tribes over potentially affected properties would be key to developing successful Tier 2/Project-level documents for any of the Build Alternative Options. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.10 (Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources), paleontological research for the Tier 1/Program-level analysis included a geologic map review, paleontological sensitivity map review, soil typology review, and search of readily available

		literature. Similarly, as described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 3.11 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials), the Tier 1/Program service level evaluation was limited to a desktop evaluation of the data sources described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 3.11.3 (Methods for Evaluating Environmental Effects). Decisions on avoidance methods would be evaluated and determined during Tier 2/Project-level analysis when site-specific details on the rail infrastructure improvement or station facility are known. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis and Master Response 5 for a discussion associated with Program implementation.
O-13-2	This line was installed well before Environmental Laws were in effect so many of the pre-Historic resources may have already been disturbed. However, a new study may locate and document any remaining sites. The line has seen many changes through its history, from Steam Locomotives to present day Diesel-Electric Locomotives. These locomotive changes need to be documented. Sidings and watering towers that are no longer need and removed should be documented.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.13 (Cultural Resources), a preliminary cultural resource screening shall be conducted by the identified lead agency or agencies to determine if the Tier 2/Project-level improvement being proposed has the potential to impact cultural resources. If the proposed Tier 2/Project-level improvement has the potential to impact cultural resources, a qualified cultural resources specialist shall conduct a cultural resources assessment report to document the existing cultural resources within the Tier 2/Project-level Study Area. The cultural resources assessment report may include, but not be limited to, a survey and inventory for archaeological resources, historic/built-environment resources, and tribal cultural resources. The recommendations identified by the commenter for additional prehistoric resource studies have already been identified as part of Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Mitigation Strategy CUL-1.
O-13-3	The line passes through portions of Ancient Lake Cahuilla so a paleontological study should be conducted in the lakebed portion. While not old enough to be classified as fossils by	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.10 (Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Paleontological Resources), the lead agency or agencies shall determine if a paleontological resources assessment report is required for the

	age, the materials can be considered non-renewable resources.	specific infrastructure or station facility proposed. If the proposed Tier 2/Project-level improvement has the potential to impact paleontological resources, a paleontological resources assessment report shall be prepared. If the paleontological resources assessment report identifies that paleontological resources are present at the site or if the geologic units to be encountered by the Tier 2/Project infrastructure or facility, a paleontological resources impact mitigation program shall be prepared and implemented. The recommendations identified by the commenter for additional paleontological resource studies have already been identified as part of Mitigation Strategy PAL-1.
O-13-4	A Hazardous Materials study may need to be conducted prior to the other studies to document any known past spill areas. This may be needed as a safety valve for those conduction the physical portions of the first two studies.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.11 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials), during Tier 2/Project-level analysis, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) shall be conducted to determine the significance of impacts on hazardous waste or materials site due to the siting of specific rail infrastructure or station facility proposed. The site-specific Phase I ESA shall adhere to ASTM-conforming requirements and include recommendations on if a subsequent Phase II ESA is required for the selected site. The recommendations identified by the commenter for a hazardous materials study have already been identified as part of Mitigation Strategy HAZ-1.
Comment O-14 (National Railroad Passenger Corporation)		
O-14-1	As the sole operator of the nationwide intercity passenger rail network, serving more than 500 destinations in 46 states, Amtrak applauds the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) for its efforts to establish additional passenger rail service in the Coachella Valley. To that end, we	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

	are writing in support of the Coachella Valley – San Gorgonio Pass rail corridor project.	
O-14-2	In March, Amtrak released "Amtrak Connects US", which is Amtrak's vision plan for intercity passenger rail expansion nationwide. This vison will connect up to 160 communities throughout the United States by building new or improving existing rail corridors in over 25 states, including California. Specifically, our vision recognizes the importance of Coachella Valley as a potential location where additional intercity passenger rail service should be considered and we support RCTC's vision of providing two daily round trips between Los Angeles and Coachella Valley. Additionally, Amtrak's vision includes one daily train between Tucson, Phoenix, and Los Angeles, via the Coachella Valley with multiple stops along the proposed Coachella Valley – San Gorgonio Pass rail corridor service. Thus, making the RCTC proposed Coachella Valley rail project an important part of the "Amtrak Connects US" vision. Furthermore, the proposed project has the potential of transforming the region by providing additional transportation options for the disadvantaged and underserved communities, easing traffic demand along the I-10 highway, boosting economic development, improving air quality and encouraging tourism. Moreover, as the population in the region continues to grow it will be more important than ever to provide well planned connectivity options among various cities, counties and regions. In addition to being well positioned to connect to	Please refer to master Response 6 for a discussion on train trip frequency and Master Response 10 for a discussion on transportation connections within and beyond the Program Corridor.

	existing passenger rail service, this project will also provide important connectivity to future high-speed rail service in Southern California.	
Comment O-15 (San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians)		
O-15-1	We have consulted our maps and determined that the project as described is not within the boundaries of the recognized San Pasqual Indian Reservation. It is, however, within the boundaries of the territory that the tribe considers its Traditional Use Area (TUA). Furthermore, we would like to engage consultation so that San Pasqual can have a voice in the developing the measures that will be taken to protect these sites and mitigate any adverse impacts. We would appreciate being given access to any cultural resource reports that have been or will be generated during the environmental review process so we can contribute most effectively to the consultation process. We appreciate involvement with your initiative and look forward to working with you on future efforts, If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me by telephone 760-651-5142 or by e-mail at THPO@sanpasqualtribe.org and angelinag@sanpasqualtribe.org.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.13 (Cultural Resources), on October 15, 2019, FRA mailed invitations to consult to the list of Native American tribes identified in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Table 3.13-5, which included the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians. On November 5, 2019, a follow-up email was sent to those mailing recipients whose letters were returned undeliverable. On December 20, 2019, a final follow-up email was sent to all Native American tribes who had not yet responded, using the original October 15, 2019, letter as an attachment. For any Native American tribe where an email was either unavailable or undeliverable, a follow-up phone call was made. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR (containing Chapter 3.13, Cultural Resources) along with Appendix H (*Cultural, Historic, and Tribal Resources Technical Memorandum*) of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR is available for download to the public online at: https://railroads.dot.gov/environment/environmental-reviews/coachella-valley-san-gorgonio-pass-corridor-investment-plan. Additional contact information provided by the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians will be added to the Tier 2/Project-stakeholder database for further communication and consultation during subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental reviews.

Table 1-6. Response to Written Comments Received from Individuals During the Public Review Period

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-01 (Anonymous)		
I-01-1	I would suggest having the trains run as far as Niland. The train can be turned there as there is a yard there and it is closer to the Calexico area.	Thank you for your comments. In general, the routing of this proposed service analyzed in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR was designed to encourage connections for travelers between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley. Extending the Program Corridor further east to Niland or Calexico is not part of the Program's Purpose and Need. Please refer to Master Response 10 for further discussion of transportation connections within and outside of the Program Corridor.
Comment I-02 (Pam Nelson)		
I-02-1	Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program: I have 3 main concerns: Cost for riders, clean engines and wildlife crossings. Cost for riders need to be inexpensive. Public transit is not popular unless it is affordable. This is the only way to success. Clean engines: Truck engines have been electrified. It's time to improve engines so this is a good replacement to car travel (cars are becoming more efficient) wildlife crossings: wildlife has been fragmented by our transportation and residential infrastructure. We need to have multiple and functional crossings.	Thank you for your comments. Passenger rail services, amenities, and ticketing pricing would be similar to those services and amenities offered by similar Amtrak routes within the Southern California region. Please refer to Master Response 11 for a discussion on train technology. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.8 (Biological Resources), potential impacts associated with wildlife movement and wildlife movement corridors depend on the location of infrastructure improvements, which are currently unknown. The Eastern Section under Build Alternative Options 1, 2, and 3 crosses multiple drainages, roadways, and culverts, however, the Tier 2/Project-level analysis would identify and evaluate impacts related to site specific impacts associated with wildlife movement and wildlife movement corridors. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR includes programmatic mitigation strategies (Mitigation Strategies BIO-1 through BIO-5) that require additional analysis for biological resources during Tier 2/Project-level environmental review. These induce subsequent Tier 2/Project-level

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		biological resource assessments, design alterations; and/or consultations with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and other local, state, and federal agencies for biological resources, particularly on protected and sensitive species and their associated habitats, and wildlife movement corridors and linkages. Further analysis associated with wildlife movement corridors throughout the Program Corridor will be considered by the applicable lead agency or agencies during Tier 2/Project-level environmental review.
Comment I-03 (Kirk Olsen)		
I-03-1	I frequently travel by car from Rancho Mirage to El Segundo, and taking the train would be a fantastic alternative to driving. Therefore, I strongly support rail service between the Los Angeles Basin and the Coachella Valley.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
I-03-2	However, none of the Build Option Alternatives would work for me because there are no connections to the Metro Green/C Line. My business destination in El Segundo is within walking distance of the Metro Green/C Line Aviation Station, and the proposed train routes go right past the Metro Green/C Line Norwalk Station. It would make sense to travel by rail from my home to El Segundo if I didn't have to detour all the way to LAUS and then take multiple Metro trains to get there. This is such a missed opportunity to gain passengers like myself who travel between the Coachella Valley and the South Bay. I have attached annotated maps clearly indicating the missing connection.	In general, the routing of this proposed service analyzed in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR was designed to encourage connections for travelers between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley. Within the Western Section of the Program Corridor, passenger rail travelers can currently connect with the Metrolink, Pacific Surfliner, and Metro light rail, subway, and bus services via existing station facilities located at LAUS, Fullerton, and Riverside. Travelers looking to access the Metro Green/C Line Norwalk Station could feasibly make a connection at the existing Fullerton station instead of LAUS within the Western Section of the Program Corridor. Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion regarding transit connections within the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-04 (Javier Navarro)		
I-04-1	The way the San Gorgonio pass corridor study is set up, it is more of a billion dollar taxpayer giveaway to a for profit company.	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 8 for a discussion on Program funding.
I-04-2	If money is going to be spent triple tracking the corridor for Union Pacific, there needs to be more than two round trips per day. A minimum of six rounds trips would actually make the corridor useful to commuters. As it is set up, people will continue to drive on interstate 10 because it would not be useful to take the train to work.	Please refer to Master Response 6 for a discussion on the Program's proposed trip frequency.
Comment I-05 (Jodi Callahan)		
I-05-1	I think it's a great idea and long overdue. Definitely recommend that the service be extended to Coachella due to the concerts and other projects being built out in that area. It will provide easier access without having to drive. The rail will also provide other transportation opportunities for shuttling people from the rail stations as well to their final destinations. This proposal cannot be completed soon enough.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-06 (Raymond Gregory)		
I-06-1	The Coachella Valley and San Gorgonio Pass communities are growing rapidly and are a magnet for business and leisure travel. Concurrently, the growing population in the region means more trips for business and leisure to the LA and Orange County areas. This project makes sense. To ease congestion, to stimulate smart development, to address affordable housing concerns, to get vehicles off the roads and address climate change; this project	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	makes sense. It's past time for all those involved to make the needed investment and move this project forward.	
Comment I-07 (Michael Hayes)		
I-07-1	As a transit advocate and frequent rider, I'd love to see regular service from LA to the Coachella Valley. There is tremendous appeal and demand as evidence by the reliable amount of traffic on the 10 and 60 freeways, especially on weekends. I think the success and utilization of the rail would hinge critically on the regions eagerness to embrace density near stations so that, the train is a convenient and viable option for both commuting and leisurely travel. Our current rail network is stunted by poor regional planning that situates station platforms in a sea of parking lots. People want to be transported from point A to point B, not Point A to Point A.1 then take an uber to Point B... the "first mile - last mile" dilemma is a real problem at most west coast transit stops. The station must be more than a parking lot, but a destination in and of itself.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program-level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies and Master Response 10, which provides a discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
I-07-2	To that point, I'd recommend the removal of PSN for a combined station for Palm Springs and Cat City at Date Palm Drive and Vista Chino so that a destination can spring up at the new station with connections to downtown Palm Springs and points of interest in a downtown-less Cathedral City. See attached image for Transit Village suggestion.	Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program-level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-08 (Virginia Kast)		
I-08-1	AS a resident of Palm Springs, I think this is a wonderful addition to public transportation. I would use it often.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-09 (Cos Aiello)		
I-09-1	Yes! Sorely needed.	Thank you for your comment. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-10 (Tim O'Bayley)		
I-10-1	I fully support an expansion of passenger rail service through the pass to Indio/Coachella. It is shocking that better service doesn't already exist, and I consider the current state of passenger rail to be completely inadequate and insufficient. It has taken far too long to get to this phase, and I urge you to proceed as swiftly as possible.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-11 (Mikca Ladley)		
I-11-1	This is a GREAT idea, and perfect timing! The Valley is expanding, and so with it, must be transportation. With the new hockey / entertainment arena being built, the train will be needed. The 111 is already backing up with many, many cars on Sunday with visitors leaving the Valley. Keep the train moving!	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-12 (John Ohea)		
I-12-1	As a Coachella Valley year round resident for almost 4 decades I welcome this project. Getting to and from downtown LA can frequently be almost twice the 3 hour time the rail system estimates. I believe any environmental impact the project may have will be offset by the reduction in vehicle traffic and convenience from getting to and from the nearest metropolitan hub of our valley.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-13 (Russ Martin)		
I-13-1	The Coachella Valley is one of the premier vacation destinations in the world. We enjoy great year round weather, the finest resort hotels, Vegas style Casinos, international sporting events (golf, tennis and soon ice hockey!) hiking and world class live entertainment. Air travel to the Coachella Valley has increased as more tourists flock to our desert to enjoy what we have to offer. Rail service to the valley is imperative.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-14 (Sara Cardella)		
I-14-1	I moved to Coachella Valley in 2003. I came from a city with different types of public transportation (San Francisco) and it was wonderful. I have visited many cities in Europe and Asia that have various types of public transit and trains are the best. I believe if you build this, it will definitely improve the Coachella Valley immensely. The traffic on I-10 can be ridiculous going towards LA. It would be fabulous to be able to have a regular train stops going to and from LA decent times.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
I-14-2	Also, please ensure that creating usable, safe, and clean train stations are part of the deal. You have my vote.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.15 (Safety and Security), operation of the Program would implement similar safety and security principles and guidelines currently used by rail operators in the Program Corridor. These safety and security principles and guidelines currently include onboard safety and security programs, such as regular safety meetings for front line employees, forward facing camera systems to help aid in accident investigation, and inward facing cameras for onboard security. In addition, rail operators and transit system providers along the Program Corridor currently coordinate with local police departments for safety and security presence onboard trains and at stations.
Comment I-15 (Anonymous)		
I-15-1	Improving Quality of Life and Sustainable Economic Growth In addition to contributing to less traffic and cleaner air, rail service from Los Angeles to Indio/Coachella is essential for equitable access to and from our Coachella Valley communities to the rest of Southern California. It would allow more visitors, locals and workers at all income levels to travel for leisure, employment opportunities, and business, thus improving the local economy and quality of life for our residents. This rail service is also key to sustainable growth in the Coachella Valley, as the addition of regular, reliable rail service would increase the ease of rail travel from other, more populated areas of Riverside County, encouraging job growth in tourism by increasing our employee pool.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
I-15-2	Boosting Tourism from Our SoCal Drive Market We are excited about the positive impact this new rail service could have in bringing additional visitors from Southern California's coastal regions to Greater Palm Springs. This region relies heavily	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.5 (Program Purpose and Objectives), the frequency of the Program's proposed passenger rail service was established as two daily round trips based on a ridership forecast model service optimization analysis, which found that

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	on these drive markets for tourism throughout the year. Expanding their access to the region will increase visitation and our tourism economy. It is important any new rail service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley take no more than 3 hours. The number of new stations along this route should be carefully reviewed to ensure potential passengers see rail service as a viable alternative to driving.	two round trips per day would attract the greatest number of riders per train while providing an opportunity for passengers to make a limited round trip in 1 day. The Program could result in scheduled one-way travel times between Los Angeles and Coachella of approximately 180 to 200 minutes to achieve an endpoint on-time performance of 90 percent and an all-stations on time performance of 90 percent which would be in compliance with on-time performance metrics established by FRA. Please refer to Master Response 7 for additional discussion on train trip durations. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
I-15-3	Increasing the Number of Overseas Visitors Overseas international visitors play a key role in our efforts to promote the summer season and make Greater Palm Springs a year-round destination. Most overseas travelers are visiting California in the summer months and typically stay longer and spend more than domestic travelers. These visitors are accustomed to rail travel. In the EU alone, estimates state that 258.4 billion passenger miles were completed in 2019, up 3.4% from the previous year – continuing its growth for the sixth year in a row. In	Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in and visitors to the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion of transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	comparison in North and South America in 2019, passengers traveled around 16.7 billion miles on railways. Currently, Palm Springs International Airport does not provide U.S. Border and Customs services and only services international flights originating from airports with pre-clearance facilities. Therefore, the vast majority of international visitors utilize larger airports such as LAX and drive into Greater Palm Springs. The addition of rail service from an international gateway city such as Los Angeles will increase our number of overseas visitors.	
I-15-4	Supporting Regional Events Rail service from LA through the Inland Empire is essential to the Coachella Valley's continued growth. The new Coachella Valley Arena, currently under construction and slated to begin events in late 2022, has the potential to generate $141million in annual economic impact for our region, and this rail service would help make the Arena and its events more accessible to visitors from other areas of Southern California.	Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-16 (Marybeth Tarrant)		
I-16-1	We need this railroad!!!!	Thank you for your comment. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-17 (Amy Guzzetta)		
I-17-1	This is so imperative to our quality of life here in Southern California! Once this railway is up and running we can travel without sitting for hours in traffic, wasting precious gas, time that we can	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	never get back, and destroying the air quality with the fumes from all of the cars inching down the freeway. This railway should have been built decades ago, we are so behind the times! I can't wait until the day when I can travel to Orange County and LA for the day to shop, lunch, see friends, go to the beach, and then hop on the train and return to the Coachella Valley. What a dream that is going to be!	and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-18 (Anonymous)		
I-18-1	While “passenger” trains used to be a delightful way to travel, what is being proposed will actually evolve into another San Francisco BART system, most likely with additional departures and returns. I have lived in the Bay Area and have commuted to work via BART. It has turned into a commute from hell for those having no choice but to use the system for employment.	Thank you for your comments. The San Francisco BART system is a heavy-rail public transit system that connects the urban communities between the San Francisco Peninsula and the East Bay and South Bay, whereas the proposed Program is an intercity passenger rail program specifically designed to address the absence of alternative transportation between coastal regions of Southern California (e.g., Los Angeles and Orange Counties) and cities in the Inland Empire (e.g., City of Riverside) and the Coachella Valley (e.g., Cities of Coachella, Indio, Palm Springs). Please also refer to Master Response 6, which provides a discussion on train trip frequency.
I-18-2	Surely you must be aware of the rampant crime associated in riding BART. Commuters are harassed by bums marauding through the trains wanting money; the homeless live in the various BART stations defecating anywhere they like. Vehicles are broken into and stolen from the parking lots. Eventually, this idea of a corridor rail service will succumb to these exact pitfalls of BART.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 3.15.5 of Chapter 3.15 (Safety and Security), operation of the Program would implement similar safety and security principles and guidelines currently used by rail operators in the Program Corridor. These safety and security principles and guidelines currently include onboard safety and security programs, such as regular safety meetings for front line employees, forward facing camera systems to help aid in accident investigation, and inward facing cameras for onboard security. In addition, rail operators and transit system

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		providers along the Program Corridor currently coordinate with local police departments for safety and security presence onboard trains and at stations.
I-18-3	You boast a 3 hour and 15 minute one-way commute time—what's so great about that? One can make it faster via their car. Yes, there are accidents and congestion, but there are ways to combat that: Ridesharing to use faster lanes and incentives for doing so, there are toll roads, and best of all, with a vast majority of people having worked from home for over a year and successfully being productive, the agencies proposing this service should make a concerted effort to urge more employers, more companies to adopt that strategy permanently—even part-time at home would alleviate much of the traffic.	As identified in Section 1.6.1 (Limited and Constrained Travel Options) in Chapter 1 (Program Purpose and Need) of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, while the Program Corridor is served by a transportation system that includes air, highway, transit, and rail modes, few of these alternatives provide regular intercity transportation within the Program Corridor between the Coachella Valley, Inland Empire, and coastal regions of Southern California. In addition, the existing transportation system is constrained due to the limited travel alternatives to driving a private vehicle. Similarly, emergency closures of I-10 through San Gorgonio Pass still undermine the reliability of the Program Corridor's transportation system. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.6 (Program Need), future growth will result in more congestion and even longer travel times, causing more highway travel unreliability; thus, driving is an increasingly unattractive and inconvenient mode of travel through the Program Corridor. The Program Corridor currently faces substantial mobility challenges that are likely to continue. Based on population and travel forecasts, as well as the amount of available open land within the Program Corridor, population, employment, and tourism activity is expected to continue to grow in the future; however, opportunities to increase the carrying capacity of the region's roadway network are limited. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.3 (Transportation), if the Program were to be built under Existing Year (2018) conditions, travel time savings could range between 1 hour, 25 minutes for

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		Build Alternative Option 1 and 1 hour, 38 minutes for Build Alternative Options 2 and 3. With congestion likely to increase in the future, the Program would likely save more travel time in Opening Year (2024) and Future Year (2044) conditions as traffic congestion in the Program Corridor increases and slows down travel speeds on the highway system.
I-18-4	Further, I certainly do not want my tax dollars going towards this project.	Please refer to Master Response 8 for a discussion on Program Funding.
I-18-5	I moved to Indian Wells a couple of years ago for its serenity and what appears to be a safe place to live. Even though this project was created with good intentions, please look beyond your idyllic depiction of what this could be, but with the reality of what it will end up being—a commuter train bringing in undesirables—druggies and the homeless—and those with crime on their minds. We already are burdened with the governor releasing several thousand hard-core felons into our communities—you can bet some of them will be riding this train.	Please refer to Response I-18-2.
Comment I-19 (Beth Peerce)		
I-19-1	We believe that such a railway is a splendid idea and long overdue! We think it will be used by a great number of people as there is no other means of transportation between the Coachella valley and Los Angeles other than private car. And therefore riders will not only save time plus wear and tear on their automobiles but the cities will save millions of unnecessary drivers on their highways! The taxi and bus industry in both the Coachella Valley and in Los Angeles will gain far more usage from the train passengers as will the Metro in LA - it's a win for all!	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-20 (Olivia Prescott)		
I-20-1	This would be absolutely amazing for our destination and our economy as a whole! Not to mention reducing carbon emissions & reducing traffic during highly congested times. 1,000% YES I SUPPORT THIS!	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley and reduce regional air quality and greenhouse gas emissions.
Comment I-21 (Luke Mauerman)		
I-21-1	Of course it's expensive; these things always are, and never are they on time or on budget. But as a twice-weekly commuter to LA from Palm Springs I can't begin to describe the nightmare that I have to suffer every time I undertake the drive. The nominal 125 mile trip can take up to six hours by car. My last trip before COVID I had to be at LAX at 7:20 a.m., so I dutifully left my home at 3 a.m. And I was STILL twenty minutes late to work. Over four hours to get through, at 3 in the morning tells us all we need to know. Cars pollute, crash, get jammed up; so many variables…and by the time you reach this level of saturation we're no longer talking about freedom of the road and the will to travel. The route is saturated, ailing, crumbling and it will only get worse from here. I leave you with one further question: Will the train have a cocktail lounge?	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. It is anticipated that the passenger rail services and amenities would be similar to those services and amenities offered by similar Amtrak routes within the Southern California region.
Comment I-22 (Saskia Rhodes)		
I-22-1	This project will impact the poorest areas with noise and construction.	Thank you for your comments. As identified throughout the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, programmatic mitigation strategies were identified for further consideration as part of subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental analysis when site-specific details and localized impacts would be identified and analyzed. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		Tier 2/Project-level analysis and Master Response 12 for a discussion on EJ effects.
I-22-2	It is obviously the second stage of the backroom deal that is constructing a hockey stadium and concert venue right next to thousand palms on incorporated land after it was turned down elsewhere. This fantasy rail system will not lead to dazzling tourists spending money, it will bring infrastructure and social problems to the community and few benefits to fulltime residents. It is the equivalent of claiming a statue of Marilyn Monroe is a business generator. We will lose the last good parts of native Coachella valley to the same spread that has left LA an abysmal I affordable contested place to be. Groups will challenge this proposal based on reality not transit politicians pipe dreams.	Planning efforts for a passenger rail system to service the Coachella Valley have occurred since 1991, a span of 30 years. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 1 (Program Purpose and Need), the Program is needed to address the absence of effective transportation alternatives to personal automobile travel between coastal regions of Southern California (e.g., Los Angeles and Orange Counties) and cities in the Inland Empire (e.g., City of Riverside) and the Coachella Valley (e.g., Cities of Coachella, Indio, Palm Springs), as well as the projected increase in travel demand in the Program Corridor resulting from population and employment growth and the increasing unreliability of existing transportation systems within the Program Corridor.
I-22-3	MTA has low ridership and very low use, why bring a failed idea here?	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 1 (Program Purpose and Need), the intent of the proposed passenger rail service is to implement a safe, reliable, and convenient intercity passenger rail service in the Program Corridor with the capability to meet the future mobility needs of residents, businesses, and visitors and meet multiple objectives for residents, commuters, and tourists residing, working, or visiting the Coachella Valley.
Comment 1-23 (Bruce Flamenbaum)		
I-23-1	yes, we need a train to LA now!! It will save energy and decrease traffic.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment 1-24 (Bruce Flamenbaum)		
I-24-1	yes, we need a train to LA now!! It will save energy and decrease traffic.	This comment appears to have been submitted in duplicate. Please refer to Response I-23-1.
Comment I-25 (James Turner)		
I-25-1	If train service in the Coachella valley becomes a reality, have a stop within walking distance to our new arena.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
Comment I-26 (Beatrice Carter)		
I-26-1	This is a wonderful idea, having this option would allow for me to visit family more often.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-27 (Shelley Kaplan)		
I-27-1	I whole heartedly support this plan, As a former City Council member in Cathedral City and RCTC representative I have	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	supported this proposal for years and would like to see the final construction and operation phases to be reached as quickly as possible.	passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
I-27-2	I agree that a station location at Bob Hope is well located and certainly close to Sunline transit which can support local movement from the train station to various locations in the Valley.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies and Master Response 10, which provides a discussion of transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.
I-27-3	I also agree that having more than two trips per day would be preferable as well as special trips for major events like the Coachella Festival, since the economy of the Valley is reliant on tourism economic impact of over $7.5 billion a year. This connection provides opportunities to encourage increased tourism, reduced pollution from vehicular travel, more opportunities for employment both locally and though commuting, and improved safety by providing an alternative to Interstate 10 in case of an emergency. You have all my support!!	Please refer to Master Response 6, which provides a discussion on the proposed Program's service frequency.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-28 (Joe De Hoyos)		
I-28-1	We need a train from LA to Palm Springs. This is a major destination and should be accessible by public transit. A twin to Fullerton? What's at Fullerton? Why do people need to go there on their way to the Desert Cities? Please make it easy to travel back and forth from LA to Palm Springs.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), under the existing agreements, passenger/commuter rail frequencies in the busiest part of the Western Section of the Program Corridor, between Los Angeles and Fullerton, are currently at capacity. However, specific capacity improvement projects planned or in construction along Route Alternative 1 in the Western Section of the Program Corridor would create additional passenger/train commuter train slots between Los Angeles and Fullerton by 2024 or sooner. RCTC has the ability to commit four of these additional slots to the proposed passenger rail service without the need to reduce existing passenger/commuter rail services by an equivalent number of frequencies between Los Angeles and Fullerton. The additional passenger/commuter slots associated with the near-term capacity improvement projects planned or in construction between Los Angeles and Fullerton would also support other service increases in commuter and intercity passenger rail traffic that are anticipated to occur regardless of the proposed passenger rail service implementation. Please refer to Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives) of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, which provides a detailed explanation of the Program Corridor alternatives analyses and route selection process.
Comment I-29 (Gerard Kent)		
I-29-1	We need this rail service to stop in Desert Hot springs CA	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
Comment I-30 (Gloria Leslie)		
I-30-1	I would like to see the Coachella Valley San Gorgonio Pass Rail have service to Los Angeles. The rail is in place and would relieve the 10 Freeway of the weekend traffic jams.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-31 (Anonymous)		
I-31-1	I'm a long time resident of Ventura County but have now made my forever home in Palm Desert, CA. The drive from Palm Desert to Thousand Oaks/Moorpark is grueling. With freeway construction delays, freeway shootings and traffic the trip is cumbersome. I can't fly from Palm Springs to Van Nuys or Camarillo. The train is effortlessly efficient. Less pollution and would be a boost for Coachella Valley tourism. I rode the train daily from Moorpark to Union Station when I worked for LACMTA. It would be great if other employers subsidized train fare for their employees just as LACMTA does who also by the way provide van pool transportation from the stations to work or the nearby subway trains. Mass Transit is efficient, mostly on time and cost-effective. We need to use the Federal grant in efficient ways and the San Gorgonio Pass to Union Station is an excellent choice.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation and Master Response 8 for a discussion on Program funding.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	Even better than the bullet train. Tracks are already laid out here in Coachella valley.	
Comment I-32 (Robert Cummins)		
I-32-1	Many people who travel into the LA area are trying to get to LAX. This proposed line should connect with the Norwalk light rail station that goes directly to LAX and will avoid people having to travel to downtown LA and catch the FlyAway Bus - getting them to the airport in a more timely manner.	Thank you for your comments. In general, the routing of this proposed service analyzed in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR was designed to encourage connections for travelers between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley. Within the Western Section of the Program Corridor, passenger rail travelers can currently connect with the Metrolink, Pacific Surfliner, and Metro light rail, subway, and bus services via existing station facilities located at LAUS, Fullerton, and Riverside. Please refer to Master Response 10, which provides a discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
Comment I-33 (Anonymous)		
I-33-1	I think it would be great for the economy of the valley allowing people to travel easier between LA and here for work or visiting as well as making it easier for tourists to visit	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
Comment I-34 (Cesar Lopez)		
I-34-1	I would love the training to make it to the East end of the Coachella Valley so low income families can also have access to the train. A great idea would be a station on Grapefruit and 6th in Coachella. This would allow families in the Eastern Coachella Valley access to this proposed line.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Coachella Area which encompasses the community of Coachella. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
Comment I-35 (Donna Green)		
I-35-1	So vital to our community! This will enable the Valley to join the rest of Southern California. San Diego next please!	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion of transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.
Comment I-36 (Elizabeth Godina)		
I-36-1	I think it's an amazing idea! We need more public transportation available from our desert to greater cities. This train can ease traffic and prevent possible accidents. We need to invest to our community and this is a great way.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-37 (Lynn Schaan)		
I-37-1	We would love to see a rail service connecting the Coachella Valley to the coastal area. We have a home in the valley and absolutely hate the drive to Los Angeles area but would be frequent travelers by train.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion of transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-38 (Gary Orfield)		
I-38-1	Overseas international visitors play a key role in our efforts to promote the summer season and make Greater Palm Springs a year-round destination. Most overseas travelers are visiting California in the summer months and typically stay longer and spend more than domestic travelers. These visitors are accustomed to rail travel. In the EU alone, estimates state that 258.4 billion passenger miles were completed in 2019, up 3.4% from the previous year – continuing its growth for the sixth year in a row. In comparison in North and South America in 2019, passengers traveled around 16.7 billion miles on railways. Currently, Palm Springs International Airport does not provide U.S. Border and Customs services and only services international flights originating from airports with pre-clearance facilities. Therefore, the vast majority of international visitors utilize larger airports such as LAX and drive into Greater Palm Springs. The addition of rail service from an international gateway city such as Los Angeles will increase our number of overseas visitors.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in and visitors to the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion of transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.
Comment I-39 (Kevin Janasak)		
I-39-1	I fully support the expedited completion of the Coachella Valley San Grogonio Pass Rail Corridor! The mass transit project will facilitate easy and safe travel between LA and the Palm Springs area.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-40 (Maribel Aguilar)		
I-40-1	Yes this is definitely something the Coachella valley needs. Please pass it.	Thank you for your comment. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-41 (Robert Ramirez)		
I-41-1	With family in the L.A., Orange County & Riverside Areas, we would all definitely utilize this rail service on a regular basis.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-42 (Celeste Brackley)		
I-42-1	I am looking forward to seeing this Coachella Valley San Gorgonio Pass Rail happen in my lifetime! It is necessary and will make traveling to and from Palm Springs so much easier! It will increase tourism and will benefit the whole valley! Thank you!	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-43 (Steven Bohm)		
I-43-1	I am a independant meeting planner. I work with groups that meet in the palm springs area and also meet in the coastal area, i am talking large groups of 400 rooms or more who would use this service and more meetings would be able to book in both area's. as well as smaller meetings.. I fully support the train service coming out to the palm springs area,	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

I-44-1	There is rail service to Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Diego. Yet the Coachella Valley, arguably one of the premier vacation and entertainment destinations in the country does not. Air service at the Palm Springs Airport has expanded to accommodate increased demand for travel to the valley. It's time to make a change and bring rail service to our desert communities.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
I-45-1	I am in full support of a rail system coming to Coachella Valley, I m not a fan of driving far places and I would definitely be taking advantage of a train.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
I-46-1	YES! This is a no-brainer. Rail service would be a massive boom to the local economy of the Coachella Valley not to mention the community service. The drive from our Valley to Los Angeles is absolute hell 98% of the time. This would be a revenue generator for them State as well! Go! Go!	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
I-47-1	I support establishing commuter rail service to the Coachella Valley; it will decrease traffic congestion while increasing tourism to and from the valley.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-48 (Lihn Young)		
I-48-1	I think having a passenger rail route from Los Angeles to the Coachella Valley is a necessary and much needed service. It would alleviate congestion on the 10 freeway and in turn be a greener option. It would be nice to also be connected to the existing railway in Perris as well.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-49 (Simon Holzman)		
I-49-1	I love the idea of railways... they are hugely more efficient and comfortable (and can be faster) than driving BUT in practice they don't ever work as well as I would like. This plan is proposing a slow, inconvenient, and almost certainly, expensive service that almost no-one will use. And the proposal will take too long to happen anyway.	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion related to Program implementation, Master Response 6 for a discussion related to train trip frequency, Master Response 7 for a discussion related to train trip duration, and Master Response 8 for a discussion related to Program funding.
I-49-2	1. The plan is proposing two trains a day... This is functionally useless. The train needs to run at least once every half hour 24 hours a day, (well, maybe it can go down to once an hour between midnight and 6am), to provide an acceptable level of service. If you miss the evening train, you don't want to be stranded until the next day. If people can't reliably and conveniently get home, they will stick with their car.	Please refer to Master Response 6, which provides a discussion on the Program's proposed service frequency.
I-49-3	2. If the journey is slower than driving, people won't use it... three hours from Palm Springs to LA is at least an hour too long. Having too many stops makes a train service dramatically slower without adding much functionality since most passengers can be assumed	Please refer to Master Response 7 for a discussion on train trip durations.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	to have their own car and bus services are available for those who don't.	
I-49-4	3. Intercity Trains are generally expensive. Even in Britain, where gas is expensive, it is usually cheaper for one person to drive than for them to take a train to travel from one city to another, if they already own the car. Once two or three people are travelling together, the train gets prohibitively expensive. This service would need to cost about $10 per passenger each way for it to be affordable.	Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. It is anticipated that the passenger rail services, amenities, and ticketing pricing would be similar to those services and amenities offered by similar Amtrak routes within the Southern California region.
I-49-5	4.They are talking about this taking 10 years AFTER it all gets approved and to cost a Billion dollars (and we know that estimate is probably a half the real cost based on past estimates like this). What's the use in that and why does it have to take so long?	Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation and Master Response 9 for a discussion on Program timing.
I-49-6	Instead, run a single carriage train (with free WiFi if cell service isn't reliable for the whole route) from Indio to LA every hour, stopping at the North Palm Springs halt, starting tomorrow with a bus that runs Highway 111 from Indio to the North Palm Springs stop. See how busy it gets and add carriages to the busy times over time. There's no need for an environmental review or for building new tracks or a new station or any huge financial commitment - Just make it easy, affordable, and reliable.	Implementing intermediate train service between Indio and Los Angeles would not meet the Program Purpose and Need. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 1 (Program Purpose and Need), the Program's Purpose is to implement a safe, reliable, and convenient intercity passenger rail service in the Program Corridor with the capability to meet the future mobility needs of residents, businesses, and visitors. Environmental review is required for this Program pursuant to federal (NEPA) and state (CEQA) laws to adequately evaluate and disclose the potential environmental consequences of the Program and ensure that a proposed passenger rail service can be implemented safely and reliably.
I-49-7	It probably won't be that fast because it'll be running on freight rails, but it won't be much slower than driving through LA traffic and the	Although the commenter indicates that it would be relatively easy to increase passenger rail trip capacity, there are multiple existing shared use

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	people that would have been driving will be able to work or otherwise entertain themselves electronically. Plenty of people will still drive but the service will get decent use and it would be relatively easy to increase capacity if there's an accident blocking the 10 or for events like Coachella.	agreements and Memorandum of Understandings (MOU) between RCTC and railroad stakeholders throughout the Western Section of the Program Corridor. However, such agreements and MOUs do not exist for the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation.
Comment I-50 (David Cohan)		
I-50-1	Residents, as well as visitors, need a reliable, affordable and sustainable alternative means of transportation between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley. The communities along this rail corridor also need this transportation option. Driving in a car is the only practical option for most people now and it creates even more traffic volume on the highways, traffic jams, spent fuel, air pollution, wasted hours, accidents, and missed opportunities. Aside from the direct economic benefits of reducing car trips, a rail option will create multiple nodes to allow for additional and more affordable housing development where it is desperately needed, as well as allowing for greater movement of people, visitors and the associated economic activity from tourism and inter-business trade.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-51 (Heather Ross)		
I-51-1	The original I-10 corridor was originally designed for a railway track. Why is that option not considered.	Thank you for your comments. As illustrated in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Figures ES-2 and ES-3, the majority of the Build Alternative Option alignment within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor follows the I-10 corridor. In addition, as described in the Executive Summary of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, the proposed third main line track would be constructed primarily within the existing UPRR ROW, which also generally follows the I-10 corridor. Please refer to Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), which provides a

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		detailed explanation of the Program Corridor alternatives analyses and route selection process.
I-51-2	As a resident along the San Timoteo canyon corridor, we strongly oppose the addition of another train track.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section ES.1 (Executive Summary), this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR represents the first step within a tiered approach to NEPA analyses in accordance with the CEQ's Regulations for Implementing NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508), FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (64 Federal Register 28545, May 26, 1999), and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15170. Tiering under NEPA and CEQA involves the evaluation of broad level programs and issues in an initial Tier 1/Program level evaluation followed by more detailed evaluation of specific improvements in subsequent Tier 2/Project-level analyses. This Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts of the No Build Alternative and the three Build Alternative Options broadly within the Program Corridor. The Program Corridor provides a flexible regional context for the best location of an enhanced passenger rail system while providing opportunities for the Build Alternative Options within the Program Corridor to account for engineering and environmental constraints, as well as public input. Subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental analysis and public outreach would be conducted.
Comment I-52 (Tim Ellis)		
I-52-1	As a long term Tourism professional I 100% I whole heartedly support the train to and from Palm Springs area and Los Angeles. The 1-10 continues to be more and more congested. Besides Tourism benefits it will allow people living in both areas to move back and forward with no traffic.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-53 (H Ross)		
I-53-1	Has this been synchronized with the development of transportation links between the hyper loop to Ontario airport and the connection to Palm Springs?	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 10 for discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor, including information on why the UPRR Alhambra Subdivision (which included a proposed station at the Ontario International Airport) was eliminated from consideration during the alternatives analysis. Please also refer to Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), which provides a detailed explanation of the Program Corridor alternatives analyses and route selection process.
Comment I-54 (Kathy Heckathorn)		
I-54-1	One of the joys of traveling to other countries is being able to ride the trains, which are fast, convenient, economical, and fun. It's time for California to step up. Please move full speed ahead with this project.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-55 (Anonymous)		
I-55-1	Please give the Coachella Valley rail transpotation to big cities of LA and San Diego if possible. Seniors who no longer drive or do not risk driving the freeways need good form of travel. Not by bus or costly limo driver etc. This has been an ongoing request since I retired here 26 yrs ago. Golly havent you had enough time to think it over. Just do it. Thank you	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-56 (Shannon Clark)		
I-56-1	Absolutely it would be a benefit to the Coachella Valley to have rail service to/from Los Angeles.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-57 (Anonymous)		
I-57-1	Having a passenger rail service to Coachella Valley will benefit southern CA as a whole. It will benefit tourism and transportation for all levels of society as well as help with global warming challenges.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-58 (Caroline Yeager)		
I-58-1	This would be a welcome return to service.	Thank you for your comment. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-59 (Lisa Botts)		
I-59-1	A passenger rail system to Palm Springs is a great idea! I was born and raised in LA and am now a full time resident and business owner in Palm Springs. I've often wondered why there wasn't a passenger option on the rail system. With few options outside of hiring a private plane or sitting in traffic for hours a passenger train system will bring more people to our beautiful city. And it makes a trip into LA a more enticing option. Please, please do it!	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-60 (Darren Wallen)		
I-60-1	I am a resident of Indian Wells who lived in Los Angeles for almost 17 years. I am STRONGLY in favor of this rail project. It is badly	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	needed to make traveling between L.A. and the Coachella Valley cheaper, easier and more environmentally friendly. Let's get this done!	passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-61 (Karen Schnabel)		
I-61-1	Rail service to the Coachella Valley would be good thing, in my opinion. Eventually, if it could connect to other cities like Las Vegas and Phoenix, I think it would be a really great transit option. Also, exporting goods from this area would get a boost.	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 10, which provides a discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
Comment I-62 (Kyle Canova)		
I-62-1	This project would be a spectacular addition to the Coachella valley. My suggestion for a station is at the Jefferson street interchange with shuttle service to and from the Indio polo grounds music festivals along with service to the new Palm Desert arena project. It also provides remote employees, like myself, easier access to large scale airports and venues in the Los Angeles area and family transportation to the Coachella valley from the inland empire for my older relatives.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Indio Area which encompasses the community of Indio. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies. Please also refer to Master Response 10 which provides a discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-63 (Kyle Canova)		
I-63-1	This project would be a spectacular addition to the Coachella valley. My suggestion for a station is at the Jefferson street interchange with shuttle service to and from the Indio polo grounds music festivals along with service to the new Palm Desert arena project. It also provides remote employees, like myself, easier access to large scale airports and venues in the Los Angeles area and family transportation to the Coachella valley from the inland empire for my older relatives.	This comment appears to have been submitted in duplicate. Please refer to Response I-62-1.
Comment I-64 (Anonymous)		
I-64-1	I think having a train from Indio to LA is a brilliant idea. Not only will the locals (myself included) would take advantage but people coming into town would also benefit from it. For me it's simple, I have a fear of driving so I'm used to taking public transportation. It can be time consuming so having access to a train would be amazing. I've lived in LA and would always take advantage of the train. Less road congestion and faster to get to and from.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-65 (Anonymous)		
I-65-1	Please bring to the Coachella Valley! Put a stop in Indio!	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Indio Station Area which encompasses the community of Indio. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
Comment I-66 (David T. Casares)		
I-66-1	This is way overdue. The traffic from OC to our home in Indio is getting worse. There are weekends we don't come out due to traffic. A relaxing, stress free train ride would be awesome! We need this ASAP. Thanks, Dave Casares	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-67 (Sally Hill)		
I-67-1	I think it would greatly support the communities involved as well as have a positive impact om the envionment.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-68 (Cathy O'Connell)		
I-68-1	I love the idea of rail transportation to LA and would use it frequently! We do the drive into Los Angeles weekly and having a easy option to not drive would be incredible!	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-69 (Amir Sakr)		
I-69-1	It is truly a great idea and very important to offer more transportation options to those who don't have cars and to reduce the pressure from the freeways. GO FOR IT	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-70 (Deborah Kennedy-Comouche)		
I-70-1	Please have a rail corridor Service in the Coachella Valley San Gorgonio Pass. We need it for all of us to be able to enjoy this lovely valley.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-71 (Anonymous)		
I-71-1	I want the Coachella Valley San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service! The Coachella Valley needs this CV San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service!	Thank you for your comments. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-72 (Revae Reynolds)		
I-72-1	Rail service from Los Angeles to the Coachella Valley would be a great asset for residents at both ends of the line. It can't happen soon enough!	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-73 (Anonymous)		
I-73-1	I would love a direct train link from the Coachella valley to Los Angeles.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-74 (Jackc Neff)		
I-74-1	THERE HAVE BEEN 2 "TURNS FOR THE WORST" THAT NEED CORRECTING A.S.A.P.: 1A. WHY WAS OPTION 3 VIA UP'S "ALHAMBRA SUB" VIA POMONA-ONTARIO, KEEPING THE TRAIN ON THE MOST-DIRECT, TIME-SAVING ROUTING NO CHOSEN?; The deviation south to Fullerton, then back up north (via Riverside) might gain a few additional passengers, but it requires the trains be handed off to a different freight railroad dispatchers at Division Point boundaries = a time-waster. (see also #1B. below)	Thank you for your comments. Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives) provides a summary of the alternative analysis, which documented the decision process of route alignments within the Program Corridor, including why Route Alternative 3 was removed from consideration. Route Alternative 3 is a high-density freight line, with substantial sections of single track that would require costly expansion projects to create the additional capacity needed to reliably operate the proposed passenger rail service and mitigate impacts on freight rail capacity and reliability. Route Alternative 3 could require construction of up to 39 miles of additional second main line track, would experience freight-train congestion, and serve freight terminals where trains enter and exit at low speeds, which has the potential to affect passenger-train travel reliability. Given the extensive sections of single main line track and presence of heavy unscheduled freight train traffic, the potential for introducing travel unreliability, slow projected running time, high technical complexity, and high cost for expanding capacity, Route Alternative 3 was eliminated from further study. Please refer to Master Response 7 which provides a discussion on train trip durations and Master Response 10 which provides a discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
I-74-2	1B. A SWITCH TO THE UNION PACIFIC ROUTE TO LA WOULD MEAN MATCHING THE ROUTE OF AMTRAK'S SUNSET LIMITED, NEW PROJECT FORCED TO COMPETE WITH EXISTING RAIL SERVICE…	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.6.1 (Limited and Constrained Travel Options), the Amtrak Sunset Limited long-distance train stops in Los Angeles. Pomona, Ontario, and Palm Springs, with three trips per week in the middle of the night. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.3 (Transportation), westbound and eastbound trains are anticipated to operate between 9:25 AM to 6:40 PM daily, which does not compete with the Amtrak Sunset Limited's current schedule.
I-74-3	foolishly, Amtrak's Sunset Limited train only runs 3 days/wk.! And doesnt reach Miami or anywhere west of New Orleans since Hurrican Katrina! www.amtrak.com/content/dam/projects/doctcom/english/public/documents/temporary-timetables/Sunset-Limited-Schedule/100520.pdf For multiple reasons, ALL Amtrak trains must run Daily! The Coachella Valley Train this can patch Amtraks' less-than-daily coverage gap in the schedule, at least in CA (see also #2 below).	Please refer to Master Response 6, which provides a discussion about train trip frequency.
I-74-4	2. EXTENDING THE COACHELLA VALLEY TRAIN TO ARIZONA WOULD GUARANTEE RIDERSHIP SUCCESS, & PATCH A SCHEDULE GAP: Membership-lobbying group RailPAC's former V.P. Bob Manning said the Coachella train was going to dovetail into talks to extend it all the way to Phoenix, Arizona; the largest city -4 Million people- ignored by Amtrak! (Maricopa (a puny station) doesn't count, & it's an hour & a half bus ride away! Phoenix' station still stands, but it's wasted = boarded up). This must be the 2nd Phase, begin Studying it in this Phase! To guarantee ridership success.	In general, the routing of this proposed service analyzed in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR was designed to encourage connections for travelers between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley. Extending the Program Corridor further east to Arizona is not part of the Program's Purpose and Need. Please refer to Master Response 10, which provide a discussion of future potential transportation connections within and outside of the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
I-74-5	THIS IS THE PLACE FOR A GREEN TECH. UPGRADE! TELL THE LOS ANGELES DEAL MANAGERS OF THIS PROJECT TO: 3A. CALL METROLINK, & OFFER TO BUY THEIR EMD F-125 DIESEL LOCOMOTIVES... TO POWER THE COACHELLA VALLEY SERVICE, AS F-125'S PERFORMANCE IS BETTER-SUITED FOR THIS (FEW STOPS + "HIGHER-SPEED" -RAIL CAPABILITY (125mph)) IS MORE APPROPRIATE THAN START-&-STOP TYPICAL METROLINK COMMUTER TRAINS. (see also 3B.) 3B. CALL ON RAIL PROPULSION SYSTEMS (RPS) OF FULLERTON = railpropulsion.com & info@railpropulsion.com TO IMPLEMENT CLEAN(ER)-AIR ALTERNATIVES: i. SWITCHING FUEL TO BURN GAS (saves money + no loss in horsepower), ii. CAPTURING REGENERATIVE BRAKING ENERGY, TO STORE IT (by Battery or Fuel Cell in a rebuilt locomotive) FOR ACCELERATION LEAVING STATIONS. 3C. CALL ON US RAILCAR (f.k.a. Colorado Railcar before 2009 reorganization in Columbus, Ohio) = www.usrailcar TO STUDY i. IF A SELF-PROPELLED FULLY F.R.A.-LOCOMOTIVE-CRASH-STANDARDS COMPLIANT PASSENGER RAILCAR (multiple designs available) WOULD WORK MORE ECONOMICALLY IF RIDERSHIP DEMAND IS LOW ON SOME RUNS? (WE ALREADY KNOW THE ANSWER IS "YES, MUCH MORE ECONOMICALLY!") & ii. IF A SELF-PROPELLED RAILCAR (with as much horsepower as a switch engine) MIGHT BE USED AS A HELPER TO CONTINUE THE TRAIN EAST OF INDIO... TO PHOENIX?	The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR conservatively assumes the addition of two daily diesel locomotive round trips for purposes of Tier 1/Program environmental evaluation. Implementation of the Program would not preclude the conversion to clean-engine locomotives at a future date. Please refer to Master Response 11 for a discussion associated with green train technology.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	4. WE CALL FOR OVERHEAD ELECTRIFICATION, SUSTAINABLY-POWERED (FROM WINDMILLS TRACKSIDE, AS SHOWN IN THE LOGO), (OVERHEAD ELECTRIC'S THE ABSOLUTE BEST FOR HIGH-SPEED RUNNING, & FOR PULLING POWER FOR A HELPER DISTRICT)	
I-74-6	CONNECTING TRANSIT IS ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL! 5A. AN EXTENSION OF SUNLINE ROUTE #1 OR RAPID ROUTE #1X TO AMTRAK'S TRAIN STATION IS ESSENTIAL! (making the walk from Palm Springs' Amtrak Station to downtown from there this time of year could kill you!) https://sunline.org/sites/default/files/SunlineSystemMap-012021.pdf 5B. AN EXTENSION OF SUNLINE ROUTES TO THE EASTERN END OF CIVIC CENTER WAY IN TO THE INDIO TRANSIT STATION IS ESSENTIAL. THIS STATION BLISTERING PARKING LOT COULD BE COMPLETELY SHADED WITH SOLAR PANELS FOR BUILDING POWER + SUNLINE'S ELECTRIC BUS RECHARGING. TRANSIT PARKING LOT PAVING SHOULD BE RECONFIGURED TO PUT BUSES, (NOT CARS!) RIGHT NEXT TO THE TRACKS TO FACILITATE CROSS-PLATFORM TRANSFERS! By reaching the same endpoints as 2 stations on the rail line, the bus becomes a "rail emulator" any time they run that trains are not. With buses reaching intermediary points the train doesn't, and the train reaching much further destinations outside the buses' service area, they extend each other's range, & feed each other passengers.	Please refer to Master Response 10, which provides a discussion of transportation connections within the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
I-74-7	THIS ENTIRE PROJECT NEEDS TO BE FAST-TRACKED & DONE! 6. MULTIPLE OTHER RAIL ROUTES NEED IMPLEMENTATION & GREENING YESTERDAY! 2030's (DeCarbonize-By) hot breath is on our necks!	The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-75 (Niraj Raj)		
I-75-1	It would be good for the valley	Thank you for your comment. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-76 (Carla Barajas)		
I-76-1	A train to the Coachella Valley is a fantastic idea & would be a great addition to our desert. As a student with no car who went to school in Orange County, it was so difficult to find a ride back home on weekends & holidays. A train like this would have been so helpful when I was in school, and I know it will be to plenty of other students & individuals who don't have the luxury of owning a car.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-77 (Anonymous)		
I-77-1	I am very excited about this rail service to/from Los Angeles to the Coachella Valley. There will be so many benefits to this alternative transportation! In addition to contributing to less traffic and cleaner air, rail service from Los Angeles to Indio/Coachella is essential for equitable access to and from the Coachella Valley communities to the rest of Southern California. It would allow more visitors, locals and workers at all income levels to travel for leisure, employment	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	opportunities, and business throughout Southern California, thus improving the local economy and quality of life for our residents. This rail service is also key to sustainable growth in the Coachella Valley, as the addition of regular, reliable rail service would increase the ease of rail travel from other, more populated areas of Riverside County increasing our employee pool. I am a former resident of the East Coast, where I took the train regularly from New York City to Philadelphia - and sometimes Washington, D.C. - rather than drive. Being able to travel between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley - with stops along the way for those who don't want to go that far - without driving will help transform Southern California for the better and help us grow sustainably.	
Comment I-78 (Sally and John Robertson)		
I-78-1	We live on the edge of San Timoteo canyon in Redlands, CA. No data was offered on the environmental impact of this plan to increase passenger rail transit in the area that includes adding track in narrow corridors like this canyon.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section ES.1 (Executive Summary), this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR represents the first step within a tiered approach to NEPA analyses in accordance with the CEQ's Regulations for Implementing NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508), FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (64 Federal Register 28545, May 26, 1999), and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15170. Tiering under NEPA and CEQA involves the evaluation of broad level programs and issues in an initial Tier 1/Program level evaluation followed by more detailed evaluation of specific improvements in subsequent Tier 2/Project-level analyses. This Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts of the No Build Alternative and the three Build Alternative Options broadly within the Program Corridor. The Program Corridor provides a flexible regional context for the best location of an enhanced passenger rail

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		system while providing opportunities for the Build Alternative Options within the Program Corridor to account for engineering and environmental constraints, as well as public input. As identified throughout the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, programmatic mitigation strategies were identified for further consideration as part of subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental analysis when site-specific details and localized impacts would be identified and analyzed. As described in the Executive Summary of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, environmental evaluation being conducted for the Program is being made available to the public for review and comment and distributed to agencies and stakeholders with jurisdiction, expertise, or interest in the issues involved in the Tier 1/Program Draft EIS/EIR document. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, which contains existing setting, environmental evaluation, and programmatic mitigation strategies, was made available at various locations throughout the Program Corridor as well as online. This information was also disclosed at the public outreach meetings that were held during the public review period of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program level evaluation and Tier 2/Project level analysis and refer to Final Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Appendix B (Outreach Summary Report) for additional details related to public outreach for this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR environmental process.
I-78-2	The city of Redlands has already had difficulty getting Union Pacific RR to commit to quiet zones in this sensitive, narrow canyon. The response to my question in this hearing re. Noise pollution and this plan was “TBD”. The train horns and rumble of an increasing number of freight trains is already worsening for the residents that	The Program is currently at Tier 1/Program-level evaluation. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis. Chapter 3.6 (Noise and Vibration) of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR provided evaluation on potential rail, station, and traffic noise that could

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	live along this corridor. This plan would compound this problem and adversely affect hundreds of residents in this canyon as well as other communities that suffer from this constant noise pollution. What we need is thoughtful analysis of the impact of additional rail traffic in places like San Timoteo canyon as well as planned mitigation efforts for these unintended consequences for our region. Noise mitigation is essential especially if there is an inevitable increase in freight traffic occurring on these existing train tracks and perhaps even worse by adding new additional tracks that could worsen this pre-existing problem. After all Amtrack trains may be quiet and less polluting but they are NOT silent and any additional train traffic will add to an existing bad problem.	occur during construction and operation of the Program along with mitigation strategies that would be implemented during subsequent Tier 2/Project-level analysis. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.6 (Noise and Vibration), Mitigation Strategy NOI-1 through NOI-2 call for additional site-specific noise and vibration assessments to analyze and identify impacts to noise sensitive land uses and how those impacts would be addressed (e.g. siting of equipment, provision of noise-attenuating features) in coordination with the local jurisdiction in which the infrastructure improvements would be constructed. These site-specific impacts and mitigation measures would be further identified as part of the Tier 2/Project-level environmental review process. Please refer to Master Response 4 for a detailed discussion on noise quiet zones.
I-78-3	We already know but don't have published data that the volume of freight traffic is growing each year.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the California State Rail Plan anticipates rail intermodal traffic in California will increase at a compound annual growth rate of 2.9 percent through 2040, and rail carload traffic will increase at a compound annual growth rate of 1.7 percent through 2040. This could add approximately 40 additional freight trains to BNSF's San Bernardino Subdivision west of Riverside, approximately 60 additional freight trains between Riverside and Colton, and approximately 50 additional freight trains to UPRR's Yuma Subdivision east of Colton. Please refer to Master Response 3 for a discussion on freight rail growth assumptions.
I-78-4	Other critical issues include pollution impact (freight engines are not tightly regulated pollution producers) in a region with some of the dirtiest air in the US.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.5 (Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases), the evaluation identified sensitive receptors within the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area and evaluated the potential air quality, health risk, GHGs, and global change-related impacts that could occur from implementation of the Program.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		As identified throughout the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, programmatic mitigation strategies were identified for further consideration as part of subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental analysis when site-specific details and localized impacts would be identified and analyzed. Specifically, Mitigation Strategy AQ-1 requires that site-specific air quality analyses are performed at the Tier 2/Project level. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis.
I-78-5	Actual impact on freeway truck traffic (it is mythology that more trains = less trucks on the road) more likely it means enabling an even greater growth of the largest employer in the region: logistics.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.6 (Program Need, the Program is needed to address the absence of effective transportation alternatives to personal automobile travel between coastal regions of Southern California, cities in the Inland Empire, and the Coachella Valley; the projected increase in travel demand in the Program Corridor resulting from population and employment growth; and the increasing unreliability of existing transportation systems (e.g. highway and freeway systems) within the Program Corridor.
I-78-6	Thoughtful consideration needs to be given to the wildlife corridors for critical habitat in these isolated canyons.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.8 (Biological Resources), potential impacts associated with wildlife movement and wildlife movement corridors depend on the location of infrastructure improvements, which are currently unknown. The Eastern Section under Build Alternative Options 1, 2, and 3 crosses multiple drainages, roadways, and culverts, however, the Tier 2/Project-level analysis would identify and evaluate impacts related to site specific impacts associated with wildlife movement and wildlife movement corridors. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR includes programmatic mitigation strategies (Mitigation Strategies BIO-1 through BIO-5) that require additional analysis for biological resources during Tier 2/Project-level

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		environmental review. These induce subsequent Tier 2/Project-level biological resource assessments, design alterations; and/or consultations with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and other local, state, and federal agencies for biological resources, particularly on protected and sensitive species and their associated habitats, and wildlife movement corridors and linkages. Further analysis associated with wildlife movement corridors throughout the Program Corridor will be considered by the applicable lead agency or agencies during Tier 2/Project-level environmental review.
I-78-7	Further, we live in two huge counties (in aggregate area bigger than half the states) with a rapidly increasing population (5 million) with the fastest growing city in the state, Banning. We can all guess the reason of affordability as the driver for this population outmigration from coastal counties but despite recent infrastructure investments in freeways, we are way behind in all metrics (doctors, housing, manufacturing, etc…). We understand everyone wants easier, affordable transportation, but there are many issues that should be carefully considered and managed to enhance quality of life, not make an existing problem worse.	The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-79 (Nate Fakes)		
I-79-1	I believe this would be a very popular, well-used, and successful rail corridor. Currently, the Beaumont/Banning area is growing like crazy. My family travels to Riverside to take the Metrolink to the beach quite often. If there were a local stop, we'd be sure to use it. Plus, I often have to commute to L.A. for work and would take this train instead of driving.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Pass

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	With what it can do to help ease vehicles congestion on the road, eliminate air pollution, and make for a great alternative to driving, I see this as nothing but a win-win for California, the connections, and the local community. My only wish would it could be done sooner than five years.	Area which encompasses the communities of Beaumont, Banning, and Cabazon. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
Comment I-80 (Sage Vandenheuvel)		
I-80-1	I strongly support extending rail service and stations to the Inland Empire from Union Station in Los Angeles.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
I-80-2	Please include a station in the city of Banning near the historical downtown area or near 22nd Street. I grew up in Desert Hot Springs and Banning, and believe that additional rail service from the desert and pass area to Los Angeles is badly needed. Please also ensure the stations are as close as possible to housing and businesses as possible, as opposed to the middle of nowhere.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Pass Area which encompasses the communities of Beaumont, Banning, and Cabazon. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-81 (Cate Andrew)		
I-81-1	I am completely in agreement with the plan to implement twice daily Amtrak service from L.A. to the Coachella Valley. I-10 is completely unsafe, over crowded and not friendly for driving between the areas for vacationers, the elderly traveler, or just someone who HAS to make a deadline. The revenue that could be generated for the valley alone would be outstanding, but L.A would also stand to benefit greatly. I alone would be taking that train at least twice a month to visit friends, dine and shop. PLEASE take advantage of the opportunity President Biden and Secretary Buttigiegis offering. This is the best chance ever to make it happen.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-82 (Michael Benitez)		
I-82-1	Please make it happen. We desperately need connectivity to Los Angeles from the Coachella Valley. Please connect it all the way to City of Coachella to Los Angeles. It would ease congestion in the freeway. And it get us out of cars for traveling between here and the big city.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-83 (Kelly Taylor)		
I-83-1	Please bring the railroad to Indio. The traffic driving to LA and Orange County gets more congested every year.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Indio Station Area which encompasses the community of Indio. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
Comment I-84 (Nancy Ross)		
I-84-1	As a City Councilmember I am honored to see, visit and meet with people from all walks of life. Cathedral City is largely a retirement community and I hear time and again I moved here because it was not very far from Los Angeles but I can't go anymore because of the traffic. During the pandemic our houses went up in price, like everywhere else but I heard people from LA say I would love to live here for all the benefits of the valley but even if I only have to go into the office once a week it can become a 14 hour day with the communte sometimes taking up to 5 hours in traffic to get to my office. We want to enjoy the museums, art, culture and shopping and though 100 miles doesn't seem like much, in order for it to be reasonable you have to stay overnight which sometimes make it financially stretching, or for our older community, they just want to be back in their own home for medicines and safety. Now for me. I have the time, the energy and the wherewithall to make the trip but when I see the thousands of other cars making that same trip I cringe at the selfishness of me using these scarce resources and polluting my environment. I have solar on my home and car about our air. When my EV car arrives will it be able to make such a trip?	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	For these few, and many more reasons I request that we have rail service to the Coachella Valley and open up our world.	
Comment I-85 (Doug Watson)		
I-85-1	Having lived in the valley since 2004 and also lead several major hotels along the way, I can only be one of the largest supporters of your efforts. Not only for all of the obvious reasons that will allow the riderships easier accesses to all the great cities on the route, but to also answer the call of evolution. The impact on clean air, the impact on saftey, the impact on staying competitive in a hiper competitive landscape all certainly justify this expansion plan. I wish you continued success on this long journey!	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-86 (Dan Wentzel)		
I-86-1	I fully support this project from Los Angeles to Coachella. I believe it will be very popular. I also recommend that this project be built in such a manner that allows increasing the frequency, which likely means one of the third track options. There should be a same day turnaround option that allows the rider more than three hours before having to return, perhaps a later evening run. I support future extensions of this line to Phoenix/Tucson and Calexico/Mexicali.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 6 for a discussion on the Program's proposed trip frequency and Master Response 10 for a discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
Comment I-87 (Heather Hurley)		
I-87-1	Rail service is really needed here in the Coachella Valley. As the I-10 becomes increasingly congested we are getting desperate for transit. I only wish it was here 20 years ago.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-88 (Reggie Lee)		
I-88-1	The Coachella Valley San Gorgonio pass project is a complete waste of $$. You politicians need to stop wasting taxpayer $$ on libtard projects!	Thank you for your comments. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-89 (Fernando Fregoso)		
I-89-1	Yes!!!	Thank you for your comment. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-90 (Fernando Fregoso)		
I-90-1	Yes!!!	This comment appears to have been submitted in duplicate. Please refer to Response I-89-1.
Comment I-91 (Anonymous)		
I-91-1	I am in support of the CV San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program, as a senior adult I know it will benefit a lot of people of all ages and it is long overdue. Please secure a boarding site in the city of Indio.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Indio Station Area which encompasses the community of Indio. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-92 (Anthony Bianco)		
I-92-1	We need the trian	Thank you for your comment. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-93 (Patricia Brockman)		
I-93-1	This is a great idea and will be used by many. I just wish it would be completed sooner. A great and convenient way for me to get to the Desert.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation and Master Response 9 for a discussion of the Program's timing.
Comment I-94 (Alecia Walstrum)		
I-94-1	Please bring the passenger rail service to the valley! Would be a huge opportunity to drive in more tourism and reduce our carbon footprint!	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-95 (Joanna Ohanesian)		
I-95-1	Having AMTRAK service the Coachella Valey would be Fantastic !	Thank you for your comments. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-96 (Sabina Greco)		
I-96-1	I'm writing to communicate my approval of the rail line connecting The Coachella valley with LA and the OC. This so so needed for the area. By way of background I rode the train to work in LA from Orange County —for 20 Years. I could not have done this without rail service. Rail service allows individuals and families to have alternate options to get to work, appointments, entertainment etc. thus it is economic reality that touches all levels of people lives. The rail is already in place and exists—— it makes sense to utilize the existing track and find a way to fund the project by grants, tax measures, or private funding. Not everyone enjoys driving- and the traffic on the 10 FWY can be grueling. It would get cars off the highways thus helping the environment— ! The rail would bring commerce and business opportunities to the communities. I strongly support a rail line (Amtrak and Metrolink or other) to begin regular service to the Coachella Valley. It would help seniors (retired) individuals to get to their destinations— The Coachella valley has many retired individuals— another great reason to implement service. I just hope rail service is funded and completed soon. I hope we do not have to wait years before the service is implemented. Please keep us updated on the projected start/completion dates. Again, rail is so needed in the valley. Please approve the project.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation, Master Response 8 for a discussion on Program funding and Master Response 9 for a discussion on Program timing. Contact information provided by the commenter will be added to a stakeholder database for subsequent Tier 2/Project-level outreach.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-97 (Jana Baumann)		
I-97-1	I am a full time Coachella Valley resident who strongly supports the Coachella Valley San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service. I would personally use the train several times a year as I visit friends and relatives in my native Los Angeles. I have experience riding trains in New York, Massachusetts, and Georgia. We southern Californians need similar added public transportation options here. This particular route would be especially beneficial during the Coachella Valley's festival season (January – May). Each year thousands of visitors from Los Angeles, Orange, and San Bernardino Counties travel to the Coachella Valley to attend major music, sports, and arts festivals. Please move forward with the plans to realize this much needed, long dreamed of plan.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-98 (Tandy Hill)		
I-98-1	I'm astonished by the absence of any mitigation regarding noise pollution, especial train horns. And there is a simple solution called, Quiet Zone, where the train does not blow the horn if the intersection has basic safety measures in place that can be done in concert with the changing of the rail crossings to accommodate a third track. Just the mention of a needed third track has my entire neighborhood of approximately 280 upscale homes very upset. We have been working trying to install a Quiet Zone on the rail crossing at Alessandro Rd in Redlands, CA 92373 for years without any cooperation from Union Pacific and now they are getting a free third track without addressing residences complaints going back to 2005. The neighboring City of Loma Linda, CA, luckily put in two Quiet	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section ES.1 (Executive Summary), this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR represents the first step within a tiered approach to NEPA analyses in accordance with the CEQ's Regulations for Implementing NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508), FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (64 *Federal Register* 28545, May 26, 1999), and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15170. Tiering under NEPA and CEQA involves the evaluation of broad level programs and issues in an initial Tier 1/Program level evaluation followed by more detailed evaluation of specific improvements in subsequent Tier 2/Project-level analyses. This Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts of the No Build Alternative and the three Build Alternative Options broadly within the Program Corridor. The Program Corridor provides a flexible

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	Zones in 2007 just before Union Pacific basically started fighting the approval of any more Quiet Zones even though there has been no major safety incidents reported. The City of Redlands is just about finished adding a new Metrolink line named Arrow from San Bernardino to Redlands having 22 rail crossing and ALL of them were required to put in Quiet Zones by CTA (San Bernardino County Transportation Authority). I'm requestion the same be performed with this new Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Project. We are in a canyon that acts like a big amphitheater amplifying sound and the train horn bounces all over the place making the noise pollution much worst. Just as they do on a freeway when they add a lane near houses, they install sound walls to abate the noise, this would be similar. About 600 acres has been designated as open space and trails for the city residents can come to a peaceful place and this is all destroyed by trail horns. My request is simple, please require Quiet Zones on City of Redlands rail crossing intersections, as did the other public transportation agency did on the new Metrolink Arrow rail line.	regional context for the best location of an enhanced passenger rail system while providing opportunities for the Build Alternative Options within the Program Corridor to account for engineering and environmental constraints, as well as public input. As identified throughout the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, programmatic mitigation strategies were identified for further consideration as part of subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental analysis when site-specific details and localized impacts would be identified and analyzed. For the Redlands Passenger Rail Project, the tiered (Tier 1/Program to Tier 2/Project) environmental process did not apply as site-specific locations of rail infrastructure improvements were available and allowed for a Project-level environmental document. Unlike the Redlands Passenger Rail Project, the Program is currently at the Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and has not started Tier 2/Project-level analysis. The identification of rail crossings within the Program Corridor and site-specific noise mitigation for the Program would be determined during Tier 2/Project-level environmental review after Tier 1/Program-level evaluations are finished. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.6 (Noise and Vibration), Mitigation Strategy NOI-1 through NOI-2 call for additional site-specific noise and vibration assessments to analyze and identify impacts to noise sensitive land uses and how those impacts would be addressed (e.g. siting of equipment, provision of noise-attenuating features) in coordination with the local jurisdiction in which the infrastructure improvements would be constructed. These site-specific impacts and mitigation measures would

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		be further identified as part of the Tier 2/Project-level environmental review process. Please refer to Master Response 4 for a detailed discussion on noise quiet zones.
Comment I-99 (Susie and Larry Talbot)		
I-99-1	We wink out s great idea and we need something like that, especially between traffic and our environment it's great for the seniors especially out in this area as alternate transportation to the inland empires	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-100 (Anonymous)		
I-100-1	Whenever I drive out of the desert to LA or San Diego, I try to use the local rail system as much as possible once I'm there. It saves me from having to drive in unfamiliar areas, finding and paying for parking, and I can also relax and enjoy the view. I would love to be able to take a train all the way from Indio and not have to drive at all. My friends and family would definitely utilize this rail service and I believe a large number of Coachella Valley residents would as well. Think of all the congestion on I-10 that could be alleviated if people had the option of riding the rail. We would undoubtedly reduce traffic and pollution, which is good for everyone. It's really a no brainer in my opinion because we really don't have any other options.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-101 (G. Jason)		
I-101-1	Yes. Bring the trains. This is a great option for a different mode of transportation. We can expand on this concept even more in the future. The option to take a train into anahiem area and LA would be	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	awesome for our areas. Now with the Rams nfl team and our hometown dodgers this train can help provide direct modes special rides into these games for all fans. Let alone the endless possibilities for the festivals. Do it!!!	and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-102 (Mike Zamudio)		
I-102-1	Looking forward to finally see our train station finally expanding and built, instead of that trailer.	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 1 for a discussion on proposed station locations.
Comment I-103 (Morgen Bentsen)		
I-103-1	I would like to comment on the proposed Coachella Valley - San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service. In a word - approve! There was once rail service between the Coachella Valley and LA. In fact there was multiple trips per day between the two. There is no doubt that at the time, this service contributed a great deal to the development and expansion of all the desert cities. We would not have the bedrock that we build upon today, if it was not for the expansion of our communities that resulted from more visitors to our area via rail service at this time. But with the explosion of car travel, that rail service became unsustainable. We are long past the moment of determining the future of the sustainability of car travel, that moment was in the 1990's when the proposal of a commuter rail line to the CV was first re-imagined. If the powers that be, at the time, had the forethought and determination we would have long ago experienced another surge of development and expansion of our cities. That being said, the current powers that be can take the reins and do what needs to be	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	done to move the CV into the 21st century, ironically with a new commuter rail service. The benefits of a commuter train service between LA/OC and the CV are: more visitors with less vehicle traffic; more opportunity for hospitality jobs related to the increase of visitors (ie. Hotels, restaurants, bars, events, golf, tennis, etc.); increased 'work from home' opportunities for those who want it; increased full-time residents that can go into LA/OC for work but live in the desert; possible expansion of post-secondary institutions - creating jobs, student spending, and business incubation opportunities; and a lessoning of traffic along the I-10 corridor, alleviating noise, pollution and accidents. Our communities in the CV are in a unique position: we are far enough away from LA & OC to not be burdened by the many issues those areas face; and we are close enough to benefit from easy access between those areas and ours. But we must look forward and beyond what we have done and how the future will unfold and where we can position the CV to be better and stronger. A commuter rail line is a step in the forward direction. It can open up so many possibilities for all the CV cities. More visitors means more revenue for local businesses. More long-term residents means more tax dollars generated for local and county governments, meaning more services offered to its citizens. More relocating businesses & corporations means more jobs for locals, more tax revenue and more state, national and international exposure showing how great our area is. The CV is currently at a precipice, does it continue on doing business as usual, enjoying snowbirds and weekend visitors, or	

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	does it move to expand, creating a better CV by increasing innovation, entrepreneurship, and sustainability? A commuter rail service between LA/OC and the CV will be a step towards a brighter future for everyone in the CV.	
Comment I-104 (Amanda Hoffman)		
I-104-1	I am very much in favor of this rail service. It will help with traffic congestion, it will allow people who live farther away to have hospitality jobs, and it will bring further tourism to our valley.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-105 (Anonymous)		
I-105-1	I would love a direct train link from the Coachella valley to Los Angeles.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-106 (Gayl Biondo)		
I-106-1	Rail service between the Coachella Valley and parts west makes sense for commuters and leisure travelers alike. California roads are overcrowded and, in some cases, unsafe. Now's the time. Let's make it happen.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-107 (Alexander Cota)		
I-107-1	Yes! The train would be great for loads of people from LA. It would also help people in the valley travel outside without having to worry about their vehicles.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-108 (Anonymous)		
I-108-1	Make an Indio station please	Thank you for your comment. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Indio Station Area which encompasses the community of Indio. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please see Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
Comment I-109 (Rubyd Olvera)		
I-109-1	would love to see this in my city so I dont have to take the greyhound!	Thank you for your comment. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-110 (Steve Richards)		
I-110-1	I support adding rail from Indio to the metro link system. It would be beneficial to visitors to the Coachella Valley and also allow us residents a chance to travel without driving.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion on future potential transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
Comment I-111 (Bill Wolfer)		
I-111-1	This is something that's been needed for ages. Our rail service and public transportation in general is way behind other developed countries. Let's get this done.	Thank you for your comments. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-112 (Christine Peters)		
I-112-1	As an Indio resident who drives to LA for work, this proposed rail service would be welcomed and is needed.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley, including Indio.
Comment I-113 (Tracy Beckman)		
I-113-1	Hello. I am a resident of the Coachella Valley and I strongly support the Coachella Valley San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-114 (Anonymous)		
I-114-1	Rail Service to the valley would be a fantastic addition to the Palm Springs communities. Cannot wait to utilize the service	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley, including Palm Springs.
Comment I-115 (Kelly Groves)		
I-115-1	As a year round Palm Springs resident, it would be so valuable to have a rail option for travel to LA and surrounding areas. This is especially important on busy weekends where traffic almost stops on I-10.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley, including Palm Springs.
I-115-2	One key would be to have express trains so that it would be reasonable to travel to LA for the day or vice versa, instead of our current situation where the travel time is so long that day trips are unrealistic.	Please refer to Master Response 6, which provides a discussion on train trip frequency and Master Response 7, which provides a discussion on train trip durations.
Comment I-116 (Janet Malachowsky)		
I-116-1	Extending rail service from LA to the Coachella Valley would be a game changer for people and businesses. We could have an alternative, free-flowing schedule of trains. This would increase transportation opportunities and reduce carbon simultaneously. Plus, riders could either work or relax rather than concentrate on driving. We need this. It's 2021 and we need more public transportation offerings to connect the Coachella Valley to LA.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 6 for a discussion on train trip frequency

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-117 (Keith Coleman)		
I-117-1	Rail service to the Coachella Valley is long overdue!	Thank you for your comment. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-118 (Barbara Matis)		
I-118-1	It would be absolutely wonderful to have train service between the Coachella Valley and Los Angeles. The roads have become impossibly crowded and dangerous and we need to get cars off the roads. Every civilized country has excellent train service and we lag far behind.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-119 (Gary Smith)		
I-119-1	I wholeheartedly support the development of regularly scheduled, dependable rail service between LA and the Coachella Valley. The congestion on the roads now is dense and the driving dangerous. My preference is for alternative build option 1, with the line extending to Coachella.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-120 (Dex Graham)		
I-120-1	PLEASE add rail service between LA Union Station and the Coachella Valley (Palm Springs and Indio). This weekend I have to drive all the way to LA for an upcoming medical test. I greatly wish I could take the train, and I'm sure many of the visitors who come to Palm Springs would avail themselves of the service too. M	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-121 (Barbara Shore)		
I-121-1	Great idea to have a commuter train from LA to Coachella Valley! It would make a huge difference. Getting to LAX or having guests visit the CV would be so much easier! Perhaps it could even connect to Los Angeles/Coachella Valley/Las Vegas. It would be an economic bonus to all.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 10, which provides a discussion on transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.
Comment I-122 (Anonymous)		
I-122-1	Having a reliable mode of transportation other than individuals driving on our crowded freeways and interstates would be beneficial to the environment as well as reducing the air pollution each one of us generates on a daily basis while driving. Putting to use the rail system and expanding it into the Coachella Valley from Los Angeles would make travel to and from much more accessible to everyone. The option of a Greyhound bus isn't for everyone, but being able to take the train would allow more visitors and generate revenue. Even those coming for the festivals would cut down on the traffic congestion generated.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-123 (Lise Webb)		
I-123-1	Rail service between the Coachella Valley and Los Angeles would have a huge environmental and societal impact on California. Trains are amazing, quiet, clean, and convenient. Please put in rail service!	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-124 (Donna Salazar)		
I-124-1	I have reviewed the proposal for Amtrak passenger service between Coachella and Los Angeles and am in support. It would be a safer and more convenient way for us to travel to LA and would be better for the environment.	Thank you for your comments. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-125 (Keith R. Bevan)		
I-125-1	I support implementing rail arrive between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley. Implementation of such service will diminish traffic between LA and The Valley and reduce the number of increased vehicles from tourism in the valley. The valley is a small community and does not have the funds to support the infrastructure needed to support the throngs of LA tourists who visit the Valley on weekends, and then leave. Reducing traffic reduces the harm to the environment and the strain on the Valleys fragile infrastructure.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-126 (Sean Treguboff)		
I-126-1	I completely support having Amtrak come to the Coachella Valley. I think it would be great for the businesses tourism and better travel back to Los Angeles	Thank you for your comments. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-127 (Steve Arendt)		
I-127-1	Rail service will be a game changer for the Coachella Valley -both local residents and visitors.	Thank you for your comment. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-128 (Jo Lage)		
I-128-1	As a senior citizen, I support the Amtrak to Coachella Valley Amtrak line. There are very few options for seniors to reach the coast besides driving which is difficult after a certain age. Please bring the Amtrak to the valley.	Thank you for your comments. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-129 (Anonymous)		
I-129-1	I am for bringing Amtrak to the Coachella Valley. Our several trips to Los Angeles every year would save energy and climate change by taking cars off the road.	Thank you for your comments. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-130 (Charles Willis)		
I-130-1	Please bring Amtrak service to the Coachella Valley! It would take many cars off the road and it’s a more enjoyable way to travel, a boon to citizens throughout the SoCal region.	Thank you for your comment. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-131 (Carlos Vidal)		
I-131-1	Coachella valley needs an alternative mode of transportation. Bring the Amtrak	Thank you for your comment. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-132 (Anonymous)		
I-132-1	I believe that a very large number of my fellow Coachella residents, and I, would welcome a proper Amtrak service to our Valley. There are many times I have decided not to go to Los Angeles because of the hideous traffic both ways. As the Valley grows the need for an efficient rail service also grows. We rake enough havoc with the environment as it is with our current life styles, let's make an effort to better that environment while we still have the opportunity. Amtrak service for Coachella Valley would be more of a service to the environment than a multi billion fast track train between Fresno and wherever.	Thank you for your comments. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-133 (Doug Greenman)		
I-133-1	We need Amtrak in the Coachella valley. I strongly support adding a stop in Palm Springs or Palm Desert. A route from Orange County would be ideal.	Thank you for your comments. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), the alternatives analysis included an evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives for implementation of daily intercity passenger rail service in the Program Corridor. FRA, Caltrans, and RCTC used this process to identify a reasonable range of preliminary alternatives that could be evaluated in the SDP and this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR. Four screening criteria were relied on during the process of evaluating and selecting reasonable and feasible route alternatives to carry forward in the SDP and Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, which includes achieving the Program's Purpose and Need, as well as consideration of environmental constraints, technical feasibility, and economic feasibility. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identifies Build Alternative Options that cross Orange County and assumes that the proposed passenger rail service would utilize the existing Fullerton station.
Comment I-134 (Lyle Brennan)		
I-134-1	It's highly needed to have other travel options into Los Angeles	Thank you for your comment. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-135 (Anonymous)		
I-135-1	Open to Amtrak in Coachella Valley	Thank you for your comment. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-136 (Jeffrey Bagley)		
I-136-1	I would like regular Amtrak service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley. Certainly weekend service is a must. Thank you.	Thank you for your comment. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-137 (Anonymous)		
I-137-1	Looking very forward to the Amtrak coming to Coachella Valley. I support the efforts in bringing this to fruition.	Thank you for your comment. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-138 (Arlene Gotshalk)		
I-138-1	I support Coachella Valley San Gorgonio Pass Rail Project	Thank you for your comment. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-139 (Angie Gerber)		
I-139-1	An Amtrak from the Los Angeles area to the Coachella Valley would be a great benefit. It would reduce highway congestion, pollution and a convenience for residents and visitors.	Thank you for your comments. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-140 (Jason Goff)		
I-140-1	Bring Amtrak back to Coachella Valley.	Thank you for your comment. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-141 (Anita Diaz)		
I-141-1	It would be greatly appreciated if there was train service from Los Angeles to the Coachella Valley area of California. With less congestion on the highway, travel to Coachella Valley would be	Thank you for your comment. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	faster and help with energy conservation. Thank you for your attention.	
Comment I-142 (Anonymous)		
I-142-1	We need Amtrak to the Coachella Valley. It could alleviate a lot of traffic and give me another way to get into LA without driving.	Thank you for your comments. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-143 (Earle Wolfe)		
I-143-1	We need this service	Thank you for your comment. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-144 (Cinthia Klinger)		
I-144-1	We need this service for many reasons. The environment is at a critical stage and emissions must be reduced. Bumper to bumper traffic on 10 is not a sustainable option.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
Comment I-145 (Sandra Sternberg)		
I-145-1	I totally support bringing more rail service to S CA, particularly between the LA area & the Coachella Valley.	Thank you for your comment. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-146 (Trish Webb)		
I-146-1	In support of Amtrak to the Coachella Valley	Thank you for your comment. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-147 (Richard Lunstedt)		
I-147-1	I support more Amtrak train's in the Coachella Valley. We need more transportation options in this area.	Thank you for your comments. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-148 (Linda Lechlitner)		
I-148-1	Please bring AMTRAK to the Coachella Valley	Thank you for your comment. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-149 (Anonymous)		
I-149-1	Please bring Amtrak service to the Coachella valley and connect us to the outside world.	Thank you for your comments. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-150 (Megan Goehring)		
I-150-1	As a 26 year resident of the Coachella Valley, the proposal to provide regular rail service from our area to the coast is a thrill on many levels. I personally would use it regularly for recreation, especially to escape the beastly hot summer weather in the desert. The fear of being stuck in automobile traffic and contributing selfishly and needlessly to climate change are two reasons we don't currently travel there very often. Daily rail service would put these concerns to rest for me, and I would image for those on the coast seeking respite from a stubborn seasonal marine layer. As an organizer for a local event (Certified Farmers' Market) a more regular influx of tourist travelers would bolster many different industries. As to the route, extending the terminal station to Coachella makes the most sense. Why leave the Eastern side of the Valley out of rail services' benefits I'd it could be included?	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley, including the City of Coachella. Please refer to Master Response 10 for discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-151 (Robert Schneider)		
I-151-1	Amtrak service to the coachella Valley is essential to the tourism industry and great for families with relatives in the greater LA area.	Thank you for your comment. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-152 (John Ryan)		
I-152-1	Extend Amtrak service to the Coachella valley	Thank you for your comment. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-153 (Paul Ross)		
I-153-1	Bring Amtrak to the Coachella valley	Thank you for your comment. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-154 (Richard Allegra)		
I-154-1	Thank you for allowing Public Comment on the San Gorgonio Rail project. I am in support of Build Option 1 that extends to the City of Coachella. That city, with a significant Hispanic/Latino population, has invested in infrastructure to draw increasing economic development and civic engagement. A train from Coachella to Los Angeles will help connect citizens with increased economic, educational and cultural opportunities. As outlined in the proposed plans for rail, it will take some time to realize rail to Coachella Valley. I encourage Riverside County to consider offering express bus service from Riverside to Coachella Valley destinations in the meantime. RTA has a number of routes in Western Riverside County, but nothing coming to the Eastern part of the County. Sunline offers one limited line with very few stops that is helpful for some riders but doesn't serve Palm Springs and other cities here. An RTA route with several trips that serves Palm Springs downtown or PSP, Cathedral City and perhaps Rancho Mirage to Riverside Metrolink will augment the Sunline bus from Palm Desert. Thank you for taking these comments and considering this idea.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), non-rail alternatives were analyzed in the alternative analysis that included analysis of potential intercity bus service options. However, the analysis concluded that the bus service options would not be able to achieve the identified Purpose and Need and were removed from further consideration. Please refer to Master Response 10, which provides a discussion on transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.
Comment I-155 (James Wilkinson)		
I-155-1	Bring AMTRAK to the Coachella valley	Thank you for your comment. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-156 (Suze Datz)		
I-156-1	I have been wanting this for the 12 years I've lived out here. I don't drive anymore and there's no way to get to LA in a reasonable amount of time unless you have a car. Having a train service between Palm Springs and Los Angeles would be a lifesaver for me and many other people. And an extra added bonus is that it helps the environment not to have so many cars on the road. Thank you	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-157 (Rick Fearns)		
I-157-1	This is America? Why in this great country do I have to sit in traffic jams on I-10 to get to Los Angeles? Many other countries offer their citizens high speed rail between every major city while America offers literally no mass transportation alternative. Low speed rail is a rather poor alternative but it's better than none. Let's get with it and not delay this plan with wasteful studies and delays. Just build a high speed railway from Phoenix to Los Angeles over the I-10 freeway with a stop in Indio. A horse and buggy is faster than Amtrak but if that's the best you can do, so be it.	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies, Master Response 7 which provides a discussion on train trip duration, and Master Response 10, which provides a discussion on transit connections within the Program Corridor. Please also refer to Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives) of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, which provides a detailed explanation of the Program Corridor alternatives analyses and route selection process.
Comment I-158 (Anonymous)		
I-158-1	Rail Service from LA to PS would be ideal- there also needs to be planning for how to get folks from station to locales / end destination in the Coachella Valley,Ubers/Lyfts are not always ideal and parking structures and other services need to be implemented to make this a fully functional concept- also an express train 2x a day in each direction with stops in Union Station, Riverside & PS needs to be	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 1 for discussion on the Program's station location selection screening processes at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies, Master Response 6 for a discussion on train trip frequency, Master Response 7 for a discussion on train trip duration, and Master Response

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	planned -if its going to take longer than a car ride people will not ride	10 for discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
Comment I-159 (Anonymous)		
I-159-1	Can someone explain why so much time has to be spent on environmental impact issues when the plan is to use the existing rail line? If station stops are potentially added why do they require so much time to study? For Coachella valley residents having this sooner rather than later would be helpful. Also is there anyway to have this project expedited? It seems this is so far in the future that with probable delays it will end up another train to nowhere!	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section ES.1 (Executive Summary), this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR represents the first step within a tiered approach to NEPA analyses in accordance with the CEQ's Regulations for Implementing NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508), FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (64 *Federal Register* 28545, May 26, 1999), and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15170. Tiering under NEPA and CEQA involves the evaluation of broad level programs and issues in an initial Tier 1/Program level evaluation followed by more detailed evaluation of specific improvements in subsequent Tier 2/Project-level analyses. This Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR evaluates potential environmental impacts of the No Build Alternative and the three Build Alternative Options broadly within the Program Corridor. The Program Corridor provides a flexible regional context for the best location of an enhanced passenger rail system while providing opportunities for the Build Alternative Options within the Program Corridor to account for engineering and environmental constraints, as well as public input. The benefits in using a tiered approach for the Program Corridor is that t[illegible]

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		irzmw2rq2irxep$vizmi{2s Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation.
Comment I-160 (Tamar Cohen)		
I-160-1	We would love to see a rail service connecting the Coachella Valley to the LA area. We have a home in Cathedral city and would greatly benefit if we did not have to drive to Los Angeles by car.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-161 (Tamar Cohen)		
I-161-1	We would love to see a rail service connecting the Coachella Valley to the LA area. We have a home in Cathedral city and would greatly benefit if we did not have to drive to Los Angeles by car.	This comment appears to have been submitted in duplicate. Please refer to Response I-160-1.
Comment I-162 (Taya Gray)		
I-162-1	Rail service by Amtrak to the Coachella valley would be a step in the right direction to help reduce carbon emissions by making mass transit an alternative option to gas powered vehicles. Rail travel also helps elevate traffic gridlock that is sure to increase as the valley continues to grow.	Thank you for your comments. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-163 (Gene Brake)		
I-163-1	Please build this rail connection from the Coachella Valley and Los Angeles. The 10 through this area is a choke point to progress and we must come up with an alternative, rail makes sense.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-164 (Ann Arnold)		
I-164-1	If environmental impact, wildlife safety and other keep points are addressed and resolved, I am all for the railway project. It's long over due and will be a welcomed addition to the corridor!	Thank you for your comments. As stated throughout the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, the Tier 2/Project-level analysis would evaluate site specific impacts, including impacts on biological resources. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.8 (Biological Resources), Mitigation Strategy BIO-1 calls for additional biological screening and assessments to identify potential impacts to biological resources and how those impacts would be addressed and/or mitigated for. These site-specific analysis would include analysis and mitigation to be implemented for special status species and habitat, wildlife movement, jurisdictional waters, and other biological resources identified as sensitive by local, state and/or federal agencies and would be further identified as part of the Tier 2/Project-level environmental review process. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the difference between Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Tier 2/Project-level analysis.
Comment I-165 (Colin Sowa)		
I-165-1	This rail service will be a wonderful addition to our transportation choices in and out of Palm Springs. Currently, all we have is I-10. I, and many others, would relish a rail service to the Los Angeles area. With growing congestion on I-10, and tourism on the rise, I think this will be very popular.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-166 (Elle Greene)		
I-166-1	Support Amtrak corridor service from LA to Indio	Thank you for your comments. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley (which includes the City of Indio).
Comment I-167 (Patty Lasky)		
I-167-1	Yes, bring the train from LA to the desert.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-168 (Eric Reese)		
I-168-1	I want to first thank RCTC, FRA, and other stakeholders for completing the first step in a project that will not only benefit the Coachella Valley but also transform it. I am excited to see that the third track proposal has not only been analyzed but has been deemed feasible. Regardless of whether the train ends in Coachella or Indio, I strongly believe that a complete third track with sidings from Colton to the end boundary of the project is crucial not only for the success of the train service but for also future service growth.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would include a new third mainline track from Colton to the Coachella Valley along UPRR's existing Yuma subdivision.
I-168-2	As is mentioned in the document, the agreements needed from the freight railroads (BNSF/Union Pacific) to start design studies and to ultimately start train service will continue to be the number one issue that must be tackled to unlock the full potential of the train corridor. Without a complete third track and sidings, Coachella Valley train service would still be subject to potential freight train interreference, would still require Union Pacific negotiations to	Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion of next steps associated with Program implementation.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	expand service in the future, and would limit the number of Coachella Valley train slots, similar to the Metrolink Riverside Line.	
I-168-3	In terms of the third track proposal I would highly recommend that RCTC partner with the state and federal government in studying the possibility of the acquiring the undeveloped southern portion of the Union Pacific Yuma Subdivision from Colton Crossing/BNSF Junction to the end project boundary. This acquisition would make it possible to build the third track with sidings within the existing right of way that RCTC would be able to control and maintain. This would mean that RCTC not Union Pacific would have the control to design the track and signal equipment to its own specifications, as well as the ability to maintain and dispatch the third track. The benefits of this acquisition include the following: ability to construct the third track in a straighter alignment with faster train speeds and reduced travel times, complete dispatch control of the third track allows RCTC the ability to guarantee on time train performance without the impediment of Union Pacific freight traffic, allows the project to be built on a cheaper and more efficient time scale as RCTC has greater control of design and construction costs, allows RCTC the ability to obtain more favorable insurance coverage through lower assumption of risks (if RCTC didn't own the third track they would have to negotiate insurance coverage that would be more favorable to Union Pacific but result in more insurance risk to RCTC, LOSSAN, and Amtrak), and most importantly would allow RCTC the ability to increase future train service levels without having to negotiate with Union Pacific.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), the purchase/acquisition and ownership of a separate set of tracks for the entire route was not identified as a reasonable preliminary alternative due to environmental constraints, technical feasibility, and economic feasibility. Transit agencies value on-time performance and reliability because these factors influence ridership levels. At the same time, freight railroads are increasingly facing demands for faster and more reliable schedules. Dispatching becomes more complicated when passenger and freight trains share ROW and track in a rail corridor spanning various geographic regions with multiple host railroads and rail operators. The Program Corridor involves host railroads BNSF and UP as well as multiple rail operators (BNSF, UP, SCRRA, and Amtrak) operating anywhere from 32 to 54 freight trains, 2 to 26 intercity passenger trains, and 8 to 28 commuter trains on any given day. RCTC does not have control over other rail operators and scheduling slots in the Western Section of the Program Corridor. Any savings in time or speed gained would likely be lost once trains reach the Western Section of the Program Corridor and would potentially result in idling and bottlenecking.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
I-168-4	As a commenter mentioned in their testimony, if you are willing to invest the money to build a third track, please don't let yourself be limited to just two roundtrip train slots and please don't put yourself in a situation where any future service increase rests in Union Pacific's hands.	Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation and Master Response 6 for a discussion on the Program's proposed trip frequency.
I-168-5	Because Amtrak would be providing the train service, RCTC has the golden opportunity to utilize Amtrak's eminent domain right to acquire the undeveloped southern portion of the right of way at fair market value, as determined by the STB. This would fit in with the eminent domain principles that the proposed project is in the public's best interest (serves as a backup to the I-10 and thus is a lifeline corridor, fits in with Amtrak's Connect Us Program/future expansion to Phoenix, and reduces freeway traffic and reduces greenhouse gases by shifting commuters from cars to trains), provides fair and just compensation (fair market value given to Union Pacific as well as the opportunity to sell some freight slots to Union Pacific), and results in the least private injury to the owner of the property (Union Pacific would still control and own its two main tracks. Acquisition doesn't affect current or future freight service).	Please see Response I-168-3. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation and Master Response 10 for further discussions on transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.
I-168-6	Regarding the corridor between Colton and Riverside Downtown, I would highly suggest that RCTC investigate constructing a third track on the BNSF San Bernardino Subdivision from Riverside Downtown to the Colton Crossing as well as construct a flyover track at the Colton Crossing (see attached picture). The construction of a third track from Riverside to Colton Crossing would allow RCTC the ability to control dispatching of trains on the third track from Riverside to Colton. This is crucial because the existing	RCTC does not have control over other rail operators and scheduling slots in the Western Section of the Program Corridor. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2(Program Alternatives), in the Western Section of the Program Corridor, RCTC has an existing shared use agreement with BNSF that pairs staged infrastructure improvement projects to available passenger train slots on the route. In addition, a memorandum of understanding between SBCTA, UP, and BNSF associated with the Colton Crossing Railroad Grade Separation Project

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	corridor from Riverside-Highgrove to Colton contains two tracks which limits train movements between these two points. With these existing two main tracks, capacity is further reduced when Union Pacific freight trains use this section when traveling from the Yuma Subdivision to the Los Angeles Subdivision/Riverside Line. When Union Pacific trains travel from one subdivision to the other they conduct a crossover movement from the eastern track/main track 2 to the western track/main track 1 near the Colton Crossing as well as occupy main track 1, thus resulting in a single-track operation.	provides for the conversion of four non-revenue passenger train movements to revenue train movements in the segment of the San Bernardino Subdivision between Riverside and San Bernardino. Under these existing agreements, RCTC has the ability to commit four available train slots between LAUS and Colton for the proposed passenger rail service without constructing additional rail capacity improvement projects in the Western Section. Please refer to Master Response 2, which provides a discussion on the conceptual nature of the Build Alternative Option components at the Tier 1/Program-level of evaluation, which a third track is identified.
I-168-7	The remaining track must be shared with BNSF and Metrolink trains, thus limiting train slots. Constructing a third track and a Colton Crossing flyover would allow RCTC to increase future train slots from the current 2 slots mentioned in the document to infinite slots, subject to the track capacity and infrastructure. While the document assumes no infrastructure improvements would be needed for this segment, I would encourage RCTC to investigate the third track and flyover as these would alleviate any concerns BNSF and Union Pacific might have of the project while allowing RCTC the ability to expand future train service as demand warrants. With the third track and flyover having benefits not only to RCTC but to BNSF, Union Pacific, and Metrolink I would encourage RCTC to pursue a cost sharing agreement with these three railroads for the flyover track as the flyover track eliminates the need for Union Pacific crossover movements, frees up space on the “Yuma Connector Track” that RCTC can use for Coachella Valley trains	Please refer to Response I-168-6 above for a discussion on existing train slots. Please also refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion on the conceptual nature of the Build Alternative Option components at the Tier 1/-Program level of evaluation, of which a third track is identified, Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program Implementation, and Master Response 6, which provides a discussion on train trip frequency.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	(see attachment), and increases train capacity and train slots that BNSF, Union Pacific, and Metrolink could use in the future.	
I-168-8	I would also encourage RCTC to partner with Metrolink in a cost sharing agreement for the third track as the third track would allow for the ability to increase Metrolink service on the IE-OC Line to San Bernardino and increase Metrolink service on the 91-Perris Valley Line to South Perris.	Please refer to Master Response 5, which provides a discussion on Program implementation.
I-168-9	Because RCTC is a member agency of Metrolink, RCTC would be able to take advantage Metrolink's design and operation standards for track, signal, and PTC equipment, as well as take advantage of Metrolink's dispatching and maintenance services. Adding the third track would allow for increased Metrolink service, increased Coachella Valley train service, and guaranteed on time train performance for passenger and commuter trains by eliminating freight train interference between Riverside and Colton.	Please refer to Master Response 2, which provides a discussion on the conceptual nature of the Build Alternative Option components at the Tier 1/-Program level of evaluation and Master Response 5, which provides a discussion on Program implementation.
I-168-10	Overall, the two main suggestions would not only help increase on time train performance and increase train slots for future service growth but would also help alleviate some of the concerns that other commenters and stakeholders have mentioned in their testimonies. In one testimony a commenter mentioned the concern that adding the third track would allow Union Pacific to increase freight service resulting in train delays at grade crossings. If RCTC were to own its own dedicated passenger track, the concern of increased freight traffic would be alleviated. If RCTC owned its own dedicated track, it would be able to control the level and type of traffic that uses the dedicated track. Because the dedicated track would be built and is	Please refer to Response I-168-3. Please also refer to Master Response 2 which provides a discussion on the conceptual nature of the Build Alternative Option components at the Tier 1/-Program level of evaluation, Master Response 3 which provides a discussion on freight rail volumes, and Master Response 6, which provides a discussion on train trip frequency.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	not an existing track Union Pacific uses, Union Pacific would not have any existing rights to use this track and would not have any existing freight train slots on this track, other than what RCTC and Union Pacific would mutually agree to. This would allow RCTC greater control of who has access to the track as any non RCTC service would need to be negotiated with RCTC.	
I-168-11	In a RCTC Commission Meeting, a commissioner expressed the concern that a third track could result in increased train traffic and could result in traffic delays at Cabazon's grade crossings with potential risks to first responder response times. If RCTC were to own its own dedicated passenger track, this concern would be alleviated as having a dedicated track allows RCTC the ability to control the design and construction process. In the design process RCTC would have the greater control and input to study grade separated crossings for crossings with high traffic levels and/or crossings were first responder movement must not be delayed. This would ensure that any Coachella Valley train impacts to grade crossing traffic and first responder response times would be mitigated to the fullest extent possible.	Please refer to Master Response 2, which provides a discussion on the conceptual nature of the Build Alternative Option components at the Tier 1/-Program level of evaluation.
I-168-12	In a third testimony, a commenter mentioned the concern that a third track could cause increased train noise and vibration levels. If RCTC owned its own track, these concerns would be alleviated. If RCTC owned its own track, RCTC would have greater control and input in the design and construction of treatments (sound walls, modified grade crossing warning equipment, etc.) that would help reduce any train noise and vibration. Another benefit of owning its own track is that RCTC can coordinate with Union Pacific to	Please refer to Response I-168-3. Please also refer to Master Response 2, which provides a discussion on the conceptual nature of the Build Alternative Option components at the Tier 1/-Program level of evaluation, as well as Master Response 4 for a discussion of noise quiet zones.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	construct quiet zones where trains are not required to sound their horns at grade crossings. RCTC would have greater control and input in the design, construction, and maintenance of the grade crossing equipment and treatments needed to make a grade crossing eligible for a quiet zone designation. If RCTC were to construct and own its own track, RCTC would be able to coordinate with Union Pacific in becoming the "primary railroad" in charge of posting Emergency Notification Signs (ENS) at all RCTC/Union Pacific shared crossings. This designation, under FRA rules, allows motorists and pedestrians the ability to call a dedicated crossing hotline that RCTC would have control of, instead of calling a Union Pacific number and having to go through several steps to report a crossing issue. This would allow for faster dispatching of RCTC, and Union Pacific provided technicians to grade crossings to allow for faster remediation of any grade crossing malfunctions or hazards. This would decrease any traffic delays caused by malfunctioning crossing equipment, would reduce train horn noise, and would reduce traffic delays caused by trains having to stop and flag the crossing.	
I-168-13	Owning and constructing a dedicated track would also allow RCTC the ability to police the track and the ability to clean up any trash or debris on or near the track, thereby reducing trespasser-train strikes and alleviating any community concerns over blighted conditions. If RCTC didn't own its own track, it would be reliant on Union Pacific to police the right of way and to remove any trash or debris on the third track right of way. This would lead to prolonged delays in cleaning up and addressing right of way issues, as seen, and heard	Please refer to Response I-168-3 and Master Response 2, which provides a discussion on the conceptual nature of the Build Alternative Option components at the Tier 1/-Program level of evaluation. In addition, as described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.15 (Safety and Security), operation of the any of the Program would implement similar safety and security principles and guidelines currently used by rail operators in the Program Corridor. In addition, rail operators and transit system providers along the Program Corridor currently coordinate with

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	in the City of Los Angeles and the City of San Jose's responses to Union Pacific's right of ways.	local police departments for safety and security presence onboard trains and at stations.
I-168-14	In conclusion, I would highly encourage RCTC to partner with the state and federal governments in acquiring the undeveloped portion of the Union Pacific right of way for use in constructing the third track, as well as partner with Metrolink and BNSF/Union Pacific for the construction of the Riverside-Colton third track and the Colton Crossing flyover track. As was mentioned earlier in this comment, there are numerous benefits to RCTC for owning its own track. With this EIS/EIR document RCTC has a golden opportunity to not only implement the 2 roundtrip Coachella Valley train slots but the ability to expand those slots to infinite slots right out of the construction gate. As other commenters have mentioned in their testimonies, this service will not only be successful but could also become a regional rail service with multiple slots a day. With all the accolades from residents, stakeholders, and RCTC commissioners please don't let yourself be limited to just only 2 roundtrip slots a day and having to rely on Union Pacific for access. By investing in additional capital and additional funding you can revolutionize the commutes for all Coachella Valley residents and travelers. Thank you for your time and hopeful consideration.	Please refer to Response I-168-3. Please also refer to Master Response 2, which provides a discussion on the conceptual nature of the Build Alternative Option components at the Tier 1/-Program level of evaluation and Master Response 6, which provides a discussion on train trip frequency.
Comment I-169 (Anonymous)		
I-169-1	Sounds like a great idea, the US needs more train travel! I've always thought backpacking through Europe was so great due to	Thank you for your comments. It is anticipated that the passenger rail services, amenities, and ticketing pricing would be similar to those services and amenities offered by similar Amtrak routes within the Southern

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	the availability trains I would live to see that here but it also needs to be affordable.	California region. Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation.
Comment I-170 (Mary Hawkins)		
I-170-1	Oh my gosh! Cut through the bureaucracy and just do it already!! This was needed 20 years ago and would be such a welcome addition to our valley. Plus, it could alleviate some of the congestion on the I-10.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-171 (Anonymous)		
I-171-1	Getting cars off the roads and offering transportation to those who don't have cars just makes good sense. Simple as that	Thank you for your comment. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-172 (M. Ell)		
I-172-1	This would be a wonderful addition. Please continue to move forward!	Thank you for your comment. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-173 (Scott Pryde)		
I-173-1	I support rail service between Los Angeles and The Coachella Valley. As a resident of Palm Springs that has to go into Los Angeles frequently for work it would be an great option to avoid the excessive traffic between both areas.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-174 (Lauren Wolfer)		
I-174-1	Rail service connecting the Coachella Valley to the LA area would bring tremendous benefit to our region for generations to come, and	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	is long overdue. Also, it's critical that the eastern most station be located in the city of Coachella. Coachella is a vital part of the cultural and historical fabric of the Coachella Valley, and failing to provide direct access to rail service there be a deeply regrettable oversight. Coachella has much to offer visitors and having its own station would benefit everyone.	passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-175 (James Fogarty)		
I-175-1	It would be great for the Coachella Valley economy, would reduce traffic between the two areas, and would keep more vacation money within the local economies. Also, reduces SMOG with reduced traffic and accidents.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley and reduce regional air quality and greenhouse gas emissions.
Comment I-176 (Ann Greer)		
I-176-1	I am in strong support of Amtrak service between Los Angeles and The Coachella Valley.	Thank you for your comments. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-177 (Kathaleen Hart)		
I-177-1	Given my review of the information available, I continue to support this program. In addition, I support option 1. (https://www.regulations.gov/document/FRA-2021-0048-0002)	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-178 (Patricia Patterson)		
I-178-1	I support bringing Amtrak to Coachella valley	Thank you for your comment. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-179 (Bill Lehman)		
I-179-1	I support Amtrak to the Coachella valley!	Thank you for your comment. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-180 (Jamie Avalos)		
I-180-1	This would be a great concept. Heard it would only run twice a day but would need to run more times throughout the day for those who commute daily in and out of the desert. Traffic is horrible on the 10 especially during holiday weekends and events in the Coachella Valley.	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 6, which provides discussion on the proposed frequency of rail service.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-181 (Sandra Allen)		
I-181-1	I would love to have rail service from Orange County to Indio. My OC family wouid use this service all the time to come out and visit! Also will help ease traffic for the music festivals	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-182 (Hugh Wakeman)		
I-182-1	I am strongly in favor of the new commuter rail service from LA Union Station to the Coachella Valley. Commuting between Palm Springs and Los Angeles has become completely unsustainable. The trip used to be one to one and a half hours but now it is a minimum of three hours. The impact on the economy is significant in terms of lost time stuck in traffic. The traffic jams are especially a major hindrance to transport trucks servicing the post of Los Angeles and other destinations. Commuter rail would take cars off the road and allow for more efficient movement of the trucks and other commercial vehicles. The impact on air pollution having all those vehicles on the roads is dangerous. People are concerned about the environment and want to see fewer cars on the roads. People want to visit other regions of California as tourists but are deterred by the congested roads and the stress associated with driving. The sooner the commuter rail service can begin, the better for the entire region.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-183 (Mitch Moldenhauer)		
I-183-1	We just got back from the Bay Area where we used Caltrain Extensively. As a Planning Commissioner in Indio, I personally turned down several projects near the rail stop in anticipation of that area becoming a gateway to Indio as it was when the City began. It	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	is long overdue and it is about time for us to get a turn ahead of the Bay Area, Sacramento, or LA Metro. I'm strongly in favor of moving forward.	
Comment I-184 (Oliver Cleary)		
I-184-1	The proposed Amtrack rail service to Coachella Valley/Palm Springs is interesting but, unlike previous estimate of one and a half hours, or, two and half hours, three and half hours makes it totally impracticable but, for the retired folks who have nothing but time on their hands. Maybe they can combine it with a cruise and take off for August. But, for those who dream of a feasible rail link to LAX, this ain't it. I'll continue to drive to San Bernardino's Metrolink as will most people looking for alternate forms of transportation to the 10 freeway. Seems like a high cost for a few people. Never has so mush been planned to be spent for so few by so many.	Thank you for your comments. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Please refer to Master Response 7, which provides a discussion associated with train trip durations and Master Response 10, which provides a discussion of transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
Comment I-185 (D.D.)		
I-185-1	It is a nice idea and it could help a lot of people get to and from places faster. But I think it will also bring a lot more crime to our desert valley.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.15 (Safety and Security), operation of the Program would implement similar safety and security principles and guidelines currently used by rail operators in the Program Corridor. These safety and security principles and guidelines currently include onboard safety and security programs, such as regular safety meetings for front line employees, forward facing camera systems to help aid in accident investigation, and inward facing cameras for onboard security. In addition, rail operators and transit system providers along the Program Corridor currently coordinate with local police departments for safety and security presence onboard trains and at stations.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-186 (Charlotte Duplay)		
I-186-1	A rail service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley is essential. I fully support the project. I am a Palm Springs resident. With this service I will travel to LA much more frequently and easily, allowing me to visit friends and family, visit cultural institutions and events, and visit sites in LA, which I don't often do due to the congested freeways. I am originally from a place that has a very robust rail network. It greatly improves the quality of life of the area. Villages and towns along the rail lines enjoy increased property values due to the popularity of this vital infrastructure.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
I-186-2	One aspect of the proposal that should be reviewed is the travel time between Coachella and Los Angeles. Three and a quarter hours is a long journey. The train should allow Coachella Valley residents to take day trips to LA (and vise vera). This could be achieved by having a faster train, express services that don't stop at every station, or changing the route so instead of detouring down to Orange County, continuing the line along the 10 freeway and taking a more direct route to Central Station.	Please refer to Master Response 6 for a discussion related to train trip frequency and Master Response 7 for a discussion related to train trip duration. Please refer to Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), which provides a detailed explanation of the Program Corridor alternatives analyses and route selection process.
I-186-3	The timetable should also be adjusted to leave earlier in the morning. This would have the passenger arriving at the ultimate destination earlier int eh day to allow for a full day. For example, a westbound train could depart Coachella at 8AM to arrive in LA at 11:15AM (instead of (9:25, arriving at 12:40PM). Other than the speed of the train and the proposed schedule, I fully support the project and anticipate being a frequent traveler.	The ridership forecasting conducted during the development of the alternatives analysis indicated that a proposed schedule of two daily round trips, with morning and afternoon departures from each terminus, would attract the highest number of riders per train, rather than schedules timed for peak-period commuting from the Coachella Valley to the Los Angeles Basin. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), there are multiple agreements in place within the Western

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		Section of the Program Corridor to accommodate the proposed passenger rail service without having to construct additional rail capacity improvement projects within the Western Section. However, the Western Section of the Program Corridor is also heavily used by other rail (SCRRA) and freight providers (BNSF, UPRR), each with their own established timetable and service schedules. Therefore, the ability to shift proposed passenger trains to an earlier or later time slot is constrained by the availability of existing time slots to use the tracks within the Western Section of the Program Corridor. Additionally, the Program's passenger trains were assumed to operate within the Program Corridor at the same speeds as present-day passenger and commuter trains, enabling the Coachella Valley trains to be slotted into existing commuter-train schedules and to avoid the necessity for construction of additional main tracks.
Comment I-187 (Daniel Stiel)		
I-187-1	I support the Coachella Valley San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor. It's a project that will provide significant economic benefits to the communities impacted while providing sustainable alternatives to increasingly congested roadways. The sooner the better!	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-188 (Shawn Pasqualini)		
I-188-1	This would be a terrible waste of money, just like the billions of dollars wasted on the state's "super train." Taxpayers' should really be directed towards the improvement of municipal water.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 1 (Program Purpose and Need), the Program is needed to address the absence of effective transportation alternatives to personal automobile travel between coastal regions of Southern California (e.g., Los Angeles and Orange Counties) and cities in the Inland Empire (e.g., City of

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		Riverside) and the Coachella Valley (e.g., Cities of Coachella, Indio, Palm Springs), as well as the projected increase in travel demand in the Program Corridor resulting from population and employment growth, and the increasing unreliability of existing transportation systems within the Program Corridor. Please refer to Master Response 8 for a discussion on Program funding.
Comment I-189 (Anonymous)		
I-189-1	Great idea!! Let's get it done!	Thank you for your comment. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-190 (Anonymous)		
I-190-1	Great idea!! Let's get it done!	This comment appears to have been submitted in duplicate. Please refer to Response I-189-1.
Comment I-191 (Taylor Lee)		
I-191-1	I fully support this project. Maybe even a streetcar following Highway 111 in the future to connect all the valley cities.	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion on future potential transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
Comment I-192 (Cecelia Garcia)		
I-192-1	I think it is a wonderful and needed plan both for the people and the planet. Myself I use public transportation whenever possible and this would benefit myself greatly. I use amtrak often and since moving to the desert the has been the biggest struggle for me not having great public transportation out of the desert. The busses take forever. I know but the time the project is complete I will be older but	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	I will still benefit and so will others and most important the environment. I love this plan and hope it goes forward! Thank you.	
Comment I-193 (Donna Feichtmann)		
I-193-1	I think this is a great idea, it would eleviate so much traffic on the I-10, commuters, families and vacationers primarily during the 3 Big Festivals down here. The main question is how much will it cost and who will be paying for this and when would they propose a start and finish date??	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 8 for a discussion on Program funding and Master Response 9 for a discussion on Program timing.
Comment I-194 (Anonymous)		
I-194-1	There's already a working rail line in Palm Springs. I'm not sure why connecting all of the valley to this existing line is not being proposed. It seems like it would be less expensive to connect to an existing line then building something entirely new. The Amtrak system is already underutilized, so I'm not seeing I need for a duplicate system.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.6.1 (Limited and Constrained Travel Options), the Amtrak Sunset Limited long-distance train stops in Los Angeles. Pomona, Ontario, and Palm Springs, with three trips per week in the middle of the night. The proposed passenger rail service would utilize existing rail infrastructure along the UPRR Yuma Subdivision to the extent feasible. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.6 (Program Need), the Program is needed to address the absence of effective transportation alternatives to personal automobile travel between coastal regions of Southern California, cities in the Inland Empire, and the Coachella Valley; the projected increase in travel demand in the Program Corridor resulting from population and employment growth; and the increasing unreliability of existing transportation systems within the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-195 (Tim Bustad)		
I-195-1	This is something that should have been done 20 years ago. Please move this project forward	Thank you for your comments. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-196 (Patrick McCaffrey)		
I-196-1	This is what passenger rail is in the future. The need is definitely there. It can't come soon enough. The whole world is going this way because it is necessary.	Thank you for your comments. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-197 (Patrick McCaffrey)		
I-197-1	This is what passenger rail is in the future. The need is definitely there. It can't come soon enough. The whole world is going this way because it is necessary.	This comment appears to have been submitted in duplicate. Please refer to Response I-196-1.
Comment I-198 (Robert Hedrick)		
I-198-1	No project is perfect but this one is very well conceived. Please move forward with getting this rail line built and operational.	Thank you for your comments. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-199 (Terri Neuman)		
I-199-1	Is this going to be a high speed train with comfortable seating from LA to Indio? How many stops and where? Trains in dire need of updating. Should be streamlined as in Europe.	Thank you for your comments. The proposed Program is not part of the California HSR Program and is not anticipated to be a high-speed train service within the Program Corridor. The California HSR Program has trains with speeds capable of over 200 miles per hour. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), maximum authorized passenger train speed in the Western Section of the Program Corridor is 79 miles per hour west of Fullerton and 60 miles per hour east

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		of Fullerton. In the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor, passenger trains have maximum authorized speeds ranging between 30 and 70 miles per hour with the average maximum authorized speed identified being at 59 miles per hour. It is anticipated that the passenger rail services and amenities (including train seating) would be similar to those services and amenities offered by similar Amtrak routes within the Southern California region. As identified in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, Build Alternative Option 1 contemplates the use of the existing station in the City of Palm Springs and up to five new potential stations in the Loma Linda/Redlands Area (serving the cities of Loma Linda and Redlands), the Pass Area (serving the communities of Beaumont, Banning, and Cabazon), the Mid-Valley Area (serving the communities of Cathedral City, Thousand Palms, Agua Caliente Casino area, Rancho Mirage, and Palm Desert), the City of Indio, and the City of Coachella. Build Alternative Options 2 and 3 contemplate the same areas without a potential station in the City of Coachella. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
Comment I-200 (Anonymous)		
I-200-1	The Pass Area is growling quickly in new housing developments and new warehouses. So the traffic is getting worse. I appreciate the plans for the new rail system from the desert to Los Angeles. Would it be possible to have the train stop in Beaumont? There are many people that work in Riverside or Los Angeles that will use the	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	train to get to work. Your vision should be for the present and especially the futureI. I appreciate your consideration. Thank you.	The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Pass Area which encompasses the communities of Beaumont, Banning, and Cabazon. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
Comment I-201 (Ivan Duran)		
I-201-1	DO NOT bring a stop to the Coachella Valley or Indio. All this train will lead to is homeless people being shotgun pumped into the valley from LA. Which already happens but now by train, please understand that a train to LA seems nice but it will end up being a homeless camp and unsafe to ride anyways.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.15 (Safety and Security), operation of the Program would implement similar safety and security principles and guidelines currently used by rail operators in the Program Corridor. These safety and security principles and guidelines currently include onboard safety and security programs, such as regular safety meetings for front line employees, forward facing camera systems to help aid in accident investigation, and inward facing cameras for onboard security. In addition, rail operators and transit system providers along the Program Corridor currently coordinate with local police departments for safety and security presence onboard trains and at stations.
Comment I-202 (Jan Kielmann)		
I-202-1	Stations for Citizens	Thank you for your comment. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-203 (Anonymous)		
I-203-1	Awesome and about time something is getting done after years of yearning and twice a day seems inadequate should run at least 4-5 times daily the federal infrastructure budget should allocate the funding	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 6 for discussion on the Program's proposed train frequency and Master Response 8 for a discussion on Program funding.
Comment I-204 (Jan Kielmann)		
I-204-1	While a great project and exciting for the future of transport in the San Grogonio Pass and out to LA and the desert, it makes no sense in my opinion to only plan stations near Cabazon and Coachella. The short-sighted perspective seems to be to relieve traffic to these points of economic importance, but housing development in the Pass estimates over 250,000 residents in the future, with probably more from Yucaipa to Whitewater. It therefore would be a more sustainable and holistic perspective to plan as many stations as possible along the route, meaning at least one additional one as close as possible to Yucaipa (Even though residents of Yucaipa / Calimeasa could make it to Redlands University) and at least one more in the Beaumont / Banning area (It makes no sense for Beaumont Residents to travel to Cabazon in order to catch a train to LA).	Thank you for your comments. As described in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, Build Alternative Option 1 contemplates the use of the existing station in the City of Palm Springs and up to five new potential stations in the Loma Linda/Redlands Area (serving the cities of Loma Linda and Redlands), the Pass Area (serving the communities of Beaumont, Banning, and Cabazon), the Mid-Valley Area (serving the communities of Cathedral City, Thousand Palms, Agua Caliente Casino area, Rancho Mirage, and Palm Desert), the City of Indio, and the City of Coachella. Build Alternative Options 2 and 3 contemplate the same areas without a potential station in the City of Coachella. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.5 (Program Purpose and Objectives), the frequency of the Program's proposed passenger rail service was established as two daily round trips based on a ridership forecast model service optimization analysis, which found that two round trips per day would attract the greatest number of riders per train while providing an opportunity for passengers to make a limited round trip in 1 day. The number of potential station areas along the route was also factored in as the Program has to achieve an endpoint on-time

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		performance of 90 percent and an all-stations on time performance of 90 percent which would be in compliance with on-time performance metrics established by FRA.
I-204-2	I have submitted several comments and am concerned about using taxpayer money to solely support economical purposes if there is not much benefit for the taxpayers other than trains rushing by.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.6 (Program Need), the Program is needed to address the absence of effective transportation alternatives to personal automobile travel between coastal regions of Southern California, cities in the Inland Empire, and the Coachella Valley, the projected increase in travel demand in the Program Corridor resulting from population and employment growth, and the increasing unreliability of existing transportation systems within the Program Corridor. Please refer to Master Response 8 for a discussion on Program funding.
I-204-3	I hope you are able to grasp and implement a more future-oriented version and add another station in the Yucaipa / Beaumont / Banning region. A real commuter train would have a stop in all of those and therefore both serve the residents / citizens and experience higher usage rates / lower costs. With best wishes and looking forward to implementation.	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Response I-204-1 regarding station locations. Although the proposed passenger rail service would serve rail commuters throughout the Program Corridor, the Program would serve other users such as those traveling for local and regional recreational activities and leisure opportunities. Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion on future planning efforts for other transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
Comment I-205 (Matt Korner)		
I-205-1	This service should run to San Bernardino where passengers can make more transfers to the Metrolink, Arrow, and sbX systems, where Metrolink's 60-minute express trains to and from Los Angeles may be reinstated, and where the S.C.R.R.A. right of way could be	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), the alternatives analysis included an evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives for implementation of daily intercity passenger rail service in the Program Corridor (DEIS/EIR Table 2-1 – Route Alternatives Studied in the 2016

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	utilized, allowing for the Amtrak service to avoid freight traffic and find a more direct route to Los Angeles.	Alternatives Analysis Report). FRA, Caltrans, and RCTC used the alternatives analysis to identify a reasonable range of preliminary alternatives that could be evaluated in the SDP and this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR. Four screening criteria were relied on during the process of evaluating and selecting reasonable and feasible route alternatives to carry forward in the SDP and Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, which includes achieving the Program's Purpose and Need, as well as consideration of environmental constraints, technical feasibility, and economic feasibility. Please also refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion of transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
I-205-2	Additionally, both Riverside and San Bernardino Counties should reserve a sliver of the orange groves alongside Alabama Street that might allow for an extension of California High-Speed Rail to Phoenix and Tuscon. www.Facebook.com/PhoenixHigh-SpeedRail	The proposed passenger rail service envisioned as part of the Program is not a part of the efforts currently being undertaken by CHSRA and would not be considered an HSR project. In general, the routing of this proposed service analyzed in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR was designed to encourage connections for travelers between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley. Extending the Program Corridor further east to Phoenix or Tucson is not part of the Program's Purpose and Need. Please refer to Master Response 10 for further discussion of transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
Comment I-206 (David Applegate)		
I-206-1	I strongly support the proposed rail line from the Coachella Valley to Union Station. We live in Palm Springs and would travel to LA much more frequently if it wasn't such an incredible hassle. I read the EIR and I don't have a strong preference for any of the three options and would support any of them. In general, I would be in favor of the option that results in the fastest timeline for completion and beginning of service. It is also important to keep in mind that the	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	traffic is generally not bad between Coachella and Beaumont so it is not necessary to have multiple stations between these two points. Looking forward to this moving ahead!	subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies and Master Response 9, which provides a detailed explanation on Program timing.
Comment I-207 (Wayne Chandler)		
I-207-1	After reviewing the necessary documents I am in favor of this project. I believe it will benefit many people and businesses, as well as cut down on what is already overflow traffic in the affected areas. Let's make this happen.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-208 (Bill Ford)		
I-208-1	We are opposed to this project. There are a number of reasons not the least of which is an increase air, land, and noise pollution. Furthermore the valley can bately handle the current number of visitors. Thanks	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.6 (Program Need), the Program is needed to address the absence of effective transportation alternatives to personal automobile travel between coastal regions of Southern California, cities in the Inland Empire, and the Coachella Valley; the projected increase in travel demand in the Program Corridor resulting from population and employment growth; and the increasing unreliability of existing transportation systems within the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR provides an evaluation on existing and future conditions within the Program Corridor for a variety of environmental topic areas, including air quality (Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.5), land use (Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.2), and noise and vibration (Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.6). Please refer to Draft EIS/EIR Table ES-1 for a summary of impacts associated with the Program and Master Response 2, which provides a discussion of the conceptual nature of Build Alternative Option components and type of environmental impact evaluation conducted at the Tier 1/-Program level.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-209 (Linda Leventhal)		
I-209-1	Waste of money on rail project. Why not use the money to improve our surface roads.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.6 (Program Need), the Program is needed to address the absence of effective transportation alternatives to personal automobile travel between coastal regions of Southern California, cities in the Inland Empire, and the Coachella Valley; the projected increase in travel demand in the Program Corridor resulting from population and employment growth; and the increasing unreliability of existing transportation systems within the Program Corridor. The Program Corridor currently faces substantial mobility challenges that are likely to continue. Based on population and travel forecasts, as well as the amount of available open land within the Program Corridor, population, employment, and tourism activity is expected to continue to grow in the future; however, opportunities to increase the carrying capacity of the region's roadway network are limited.
Comment I-210 (Nikki Reed)		
I-210-1	More and more job growth, tourism and revenue for the Coachella Valley! I would like to see an employment center or a trade school out here in the Coachella Valley created just for this project.	Thank you for your comments. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. The provision of a Program-related employment center or trade school is beyond the scope of the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis which is described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.6.1 (Limited and Constrained Travel Options). The Program Purpose and Need is to provide regular intercity transportation

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		within the Program Corridor between the Coachella Valley, Inland Empire, and coastal regions of Southern California.
Comment I-211 (Nick Parra)		
I-211-1	At this time, there is no exact location as to where to place Metro Link Stops between Cabazon through Beaumont. It will be great if all cities get one but if only one is rewarded a Stop then I think the City of Banning is most qualified to earn the Stop as it connects to the most government agencies (Social Services, Community College, Supreme Court, Airport, and Dysart Part which is the current largest entertainment venue in the area) and Banning is strategically centered to among private businesses between Monongo Casino, Cabazon Mall, Banning's future Movie Production Studio, and Beaumont's San Gorgonio Shopping District. At some point in the future all venues can be connected by smaller scale Lite Rail, EV, Horse trail, and Bicycle lanes). In addition, City of Banning has been planning and investing in both Homelessness Programming and Affordable Housing way before other cities had interest and it is a fact low income residents will heavily rely on public transport to connect to both public and private resources & venues.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor and not Metrolink, therefore it is assumed that potential station stops would be Amtrak and not Metrolink stops. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Pass Area which encompasses the communities of Beaumont, Banning, and Cabazon. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. It is anticipated that the passenger rail services, amenities, and ticketing pricing would be similar to those services and amenities offered by similar Amtrak routes within the Southern California region. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
Comment I-212 (Ronald Roy)		
I-212-1	Thank you for providing public comments to the DEIR for the Coachella Valley San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	(hereafter CVSGPRCS). Also deepest thanks goes to the individuals and organizations who have, I'm sure, have tirelessly and persistently, shown leadership and fought for the creation of this service which will benefit millions of public transit and alternative transit users for generations to come. The CVSGPRCS project, is clearly a very ambitious and extraordinarily complex undertaking, which must address numerous factors such as land use, right-of-way, connectivity, linkage, convenience, speed, long term costs, coordination and cooperation with other Southern California rail infrastructure projects underway by Regional Transit Agencies such as SBCTA, Metrolink, Amtrak, SCAG, SGVTA, WRCOG, SANDAG, and many other entities which requires extraordinary cooperation, coordination and foresight, to achieve a 22nd century rail service. My goal in my comments is to provide as much criticism as possible, in order that RCTC (and other agencies) are given the widest possible vantage point of options, ideas, innovations, transit user perspectives, and in my case, the vantage point of an individual who will use the service from my home in the San Gorgonio Pass Community of Beaumont.	passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley, including the community of Beaumont.
I-212-2	I. LACK OF JURISDICTIONAL REPRESENTATION for residents of the San Bernardino Valley affected by proposed station location in Loma Linda: A key part of the route will service the Redlands/San Bernardino Valley with municipalities within a 10-15 mile radius of a proposed Loma Linda Station including the cities of:	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Executive Summary, this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR represents the first step within a tiered approach to NEPA analyses and CEQA Guidelines. Tiering under NEPA and CEQA involves the evaluation of broad level programs and issues in an initial Tier 1/Program-level evaluation followed by more detailed evaluation of specific improvements in subsequent Tier 2/Project-level analyses.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	Redlands: 71513 San Bernardino: 215784 Loma Linda: 24184 Highland: 55049 Colton: 54824 Rialto: 103045 Bloomington: 21847 Fontana: 210759 representing a combined population of 757,005 (or over ¾ of a million) people who are not represented politically/governmentally in deciding the outcome of the rail route, service characteristics etc. If you expand the radius from the Loma Linda Station only another 5-10 miles to include Ontario, (185010) which includes Ontario International Airport, and Ontario Mills, and Rancho Cucamonga (177603) , which includes Victoria Gardens, you're looking at a San Bernardino Valley Population of 1,119,618 (or over 1.1 million) people without political/governmental representation on this key regional transportation project. This is in comparison with the city of Riverside with a population of: 326414 which is dwarfed by the SBV population. Given this glaring gap in political/governmental representation, it is inappropriate, and undemocratic that RCTC should isolate itself from the rest of the Inland Empire region, particularly the San Bernardino Valley, to apparently carry forward a political agenda	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 8 (Public and Agency Outreach), RCTC began the public engagement process early in 2014 to ensure stakeholder feedback was incorporated into the scope of the environmental document, as well as analysis required to identify potential effects and determine appropriate mitigation strategies. During the outreach process, the lead agencies, which include FRA, Caltrans, and RCTC, engaged the public (i.e., citizens, elected officials, and key stakeholders), as well as local, state, tribal, and federal agencies during the early stages of the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR evaluation. During outreach efforts, a technical advisory committee was formed for the Program, which included SCAG. SCAG is the nation's largest metropolitan planning organization, representing six counties, 191 cities, and more than 19 million residents in Southern California and undertakes a variety of planning and policy initiatives to encourage a more sustainable Southern California. In addition, SBCTA has been involved with the Technical Advisory Committee from Program initiation with multiple updates and presentations provided to SBCTA throughout the preliminary planning and Tier 1/Program environmental process. As part of this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, additional input on the Program from SBCTA, San Bernardino County, City of Redlands, City of Colton, and others from San Bernardino has been received and will be taken into consideration during subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental documentation. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies and Master Response 5, which provides a discussion on Program implementation.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	that harms not only Pass Area, Hemet Valley, and Coachella Valley Residents (all of which in Riverside County), who need to commute daily westbound to San Bernardino/Los Angeles county "foothill" communities and city centers, but also San Bernardino Valley Residents who would benefit from nearby (less than 5 mile to station) service that could transport them westerly to western San Bernardino County communities or LA County, or easterly to the Pass Area and Coachella Valley for employment, commerce, retail, education, recreation etc. and also SBV residents who could benefit from accessing the Coachella Valley Rail, to reach Coachella Valley.	
I-212-3	II. LACK OF CONNECTIVITY/LINKAGE/ACCESS TO SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY, ONTARIO AIRPORT, POMONA VALLEY, SAN GABRIEL VALLEY, "FOOTHILL COMMUNITIES" • This lack of SBV representation, and other factors, have glaringly negative consequences for SBV and Pass Area Residents which include: • SBTC BECOMES THE KEY TRANSIT HUB FOR CVSGPRCS: Passenger Rail service in the Redlands/San Bernardino Area includes, Amtrak (Southwest Chief [San Bernardino Depot] Sunset Ltd/Texas Eagle[Ontario, Pomona Depots]), Metrolink (San Bernardino Line, Inland Empire/Orange County Line: SBTC) and ARROW Route (Redlands Downtown Station/San Bernardino Transit Center (SBTC). A big problem here is that all three services do NOT connect at one transit hub. Thankfully San Bernardino Transit Center (SBTC) was completed in 2017 and directly connects	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), the alternatives analysis included an evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives for implementation of daily intercity passenger rail service in the Program Corridor. FRA, Caltrans, and RCTC used this process to identify a reasonable range of preliminary alternatives that could be evaluated in the SDP and this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR. Four screening criteria were relied on during the process of evaluating and selecting reasonable and feasible route alternatives to carry forward in the SDP and Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, which includes achieving the Program's Purpose and Need, as well as consideration of environmental constraints, technical feasibility, and economic feasibility. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), the alternatives analysis included ridership forecasts prepared by Caltrans that were used during the fine-level screening of route alternatives. Two of the route alternatives carried forward for fine-level screening included service to the SBTC (Routes 4-B and 5).

	Metrolinks San Bernardino/Inland Empire: Orange County Lines and the ARROW line. Unfortunately passengers of Amtrak's Southwest Chief cannot board at SBTC, creating a gap in connectivity/linkage and significantt bottlenecks and time delays. Also Amtrak's Sunset Limited/Texas Eagle does not have station stops at SBTC or San Bernardino Santa Fe Depot. RCTC and SBCTA need to create a consolidated transit connection at SBTC that allows passengers using Amtrak, Metrolink, ARROW AND CVSGPRCS to conveniently transfer from one service to the others at ONE LOCATION, again SBTC seems the likely choice, unless another location is under consideration. • Putting the only Redlands/San Bernardino CVSGPRCS station in Loma Linda, as the ONLY CVSGPRCS station in the Redlands/San Bernardino area, is a poor choice as it creates an transit "island" which causes connectivity/linkage gaps between CVSGPRCS and the other aforementioned Passenger Rail Services which converge at SBTC. The CVSGPRCS station needs to be located at the SBTC. An CVSGPRCS station at SBTC will dramatically improve connectivity /linkage/ accessibility/ ridership to the millions of people in the Redlands/San Bernardino Valleys, who can access CVSGPRCS at SBTC. Also Passengers who board CVSGPRCS in the Coachella Valley and San Gorgonio Pass Communities will be able to transfer to/board Metrolink, Amtrak, ARROW trains at SBTC. This will transform rail connectivity in the Redlands/San Bernardino valleys for generations. RCTC cannot ignore the importance of building the CVSGPRCS station at SBTC, as it coincides with established transit planning principles of connectivity, linkage,	These two alternatives had the lowest ridership forecasts of all routes evaluated during fine-level screening, and also had the highest trip times, owing to the need for Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Corridor Rail passenger trains to reverse direction at the SBTC, necessitating a longer station dwell time than what was estimated at stations where trains continued operating in the same direction. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies, Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation, and Master Response 10 for a discussion on future potential transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.

	accessibility, and increased ridership for regional passenger rail in the Inland Empire and Southern California. Putting the CVSGPRCS station at SBTC, creates tremendous passenger choice, flexibility, and convenience. For example, by putting the CVSGPRCS station at SBTC, CVSGPRCS passengers could disembark at SBTC and take the other passenger rail services to reach other Inland Empire and Los Angeles County Destinations, or even the High Desert/Las Vegas. After stopping at SBTC, the CVSGPRCS could still continue to Riverside and Orange County. But this now becomes a choice among many passenger rail choices at SBTC. Riders/Passengers are given far more options/choices at SBTC to travel over far more route options. The greater the options/choice, creates a force-multiplier which dramatically drives up ridership. As we know in 2021, passenger rail ridership is crashing, due to the slow times, constant interruptions/delays in service, lack of travel options, poor linkage and connectivity. I'm including the following for review and emphasis. Need to build and service adjacent/direct/nonstop/physical connectivity to key SBV transit hubs/nodes such as • Downtown Redlands Arrow Station: ARROW commuter rail, which is over 80% complete and scheduled for service in early 2022. RCTC has not examined direct rail connection to ARROW stations such as the Downtown Redlands Station, or San Bernardino Transit Center • San Bernardino Transit Center (SBTC) which services the ARROW line, Metrolink San Bernardino Line, numerous bus lines, such as Omnitrans, RTA, Beaumont Transit, and MARTA.	

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	The CVSGPRCS rail should connect directly to the SBTC, so that CVSGPRCS commuters can unboard from their train, and take only a few steps to board the Metrolink San Bernardino line, and other transit services at SBTC, rather than being required to unboard onto a transit island in Loma Linda, that might require CVSGPRCS passengers to use up an additional ½ hour or more of time to transfer to other modes, which wastes precious time that could be avoided with a direct connection at the SBTC. Also Metrolink Trains at SBTC have more frequent arrivals/departures at SBTC, creating more passenger choice/options. • San Bernardino Rail Depot servicing Amtrak Sunset Limited/Texas Eagle, via the UP Alhambra Subdivision, and San Bernardino Metrolink via SCRRA owned tracks from San Bernardino to Union Station. • Ontario Airport Terminals and parking lots and existing rail tracks oriented northerly and most conveniently reachable via I-10, the UP Alhambra Subdivision, which is designed for northern access via I-10. • Amtrak Ontario Station Servicing Amtrak Sunset Limited and Texas Eagle using UP Alhambra Subdivision Route. • Recently approved Boring Company Tunnel that will Connect Ontario Airport to Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station. Need to create enhanced connectivity to other modes of transit such as Bus, Alternative Transit.	

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
I-212-4	III. To improve connectivity to millions of people and dramatically increase ridership, need to incorporate (all or portions of) UP Alhambra Subdivision, UP Los Angeles Subdivision, Metrolink San Bernardino Line Right-of-Way, Amtrak Stations, Ontario Airport Tunnel Project, Gold Line, OR completely new right of way (near/over highways freeways, tunnels) to access: • San Bernardino Valley: Over 1.1 million population from Redlands to Montclair • Pomona Valley: incl: Claremont, Pomona, La Verne, San Dimas • San Gabriel Valley: incl: Covina, Baldwin Park, City of Industry, El Monte, Rosemead, San Gabriel, Temple City, Alhambra, Pasadena. • Utilization of the Alameda East Corridor Project, completed San Gabriel Trench (San Gabriel Valley Association of Governments) which can provide access to San Gabriel Valley Communities. • Use design/build expertise and construction experience gained from the San Gabriel Trench and apply it to potential Trench build through portions of San Bernardino Valley, notably Ontario Airport Access. • Use rail right-of-way adjacent to San Gabriel Trench that was abandoned as part of San Gabriel Trench Construction. • Also: scour the landscape for any abandoned right-of-ways, vacant lands, or other features, that could be used along this proposed route.	Please refer to Response I-212-3.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	• Consider developing new right-of-ways including viaducts and tunnels to connect CVSGPRCS to above valleys and communities, perhaps using abandoned or underutilized rail right-of-ways or over/next to freeways or highways such as Interstate 10 Interstate 210, Route 66, Arrow Highway, Holt Ave • Please note UP Alhambra Subdivision tracks and UP Los Angeles Subdivision tracks Converge closely at Amtrak Ontario California Station [Sunset Ltd/Texas Eagle] (only a few hundred feet apart), and notably, Pomona Downtown station, where Amtrak and Metrolink trains are literally running adjacent to each other. RCTC needs to look both these stations along this stretch of converging track to incorporate a CVSGPRCS Station! The integration here of 3 converging passenger rail services, Metrolink, Amtrak, and CVSGPRCS, can dramatically improve connectivity/linkage and therefore, significantly drive up ridership, for all 3 services. Dramatically increased ridership should be a central objective of designing building CVSGPRCS.	
I-212-5	IV. Given that the Coachella Valley Rail Infrastructure, once built will impact the region for decades, if not centuries, it is worth the additional investment, given the extraordinary long-term impact of this project, to build rail tracks and routes in the fastest most passenger convenient manner. Given that any rail project of this magnitude will cost billions of dollars, its important to put the quality and long-term benefits of the project ahead of cost concerns. Regional rail projects are extremely expensive, but every body knows that. In short, don't nickel and dime on this project if it	Please refer to Master Response 8 for a discussion on Program funding.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	creates a defective system that will permanently impair ridership, speed, convenience and public benefit.	
I-212-6	Key Connectivity is needed for: Direct connections, and where possible, incorporate into the existing infrastructure for, to the following: • Downtown Redlands ARROW station • San Bernardino Transit Center • San Bernardino Depot • Ontario Airport • Claremont • Cal Poly Pomona	Please refer to Response I-212-3.
I-212-7	Anticipate HSR stations in Inland Empire and build infrastructure connections accordingly.	The proposed passenger rail service envisioned as part of the Program is not a part of the efforts currently being undertaken by CHSRA and would not be considered an HSR project. Please refer to Master Response 10 for discussion on future potential transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
I-212-8	V. BUILD INTERMODAL TRANSIT CENTER IN SAN GORGONIO PASS (PASS IMTC) • Model after LA Union Station, Anaheim, ARTIC, Santa Ana Regional Transportation Center, San Bernardino Transit Center.	Please refer to Response I-212-3.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	• Center will Service Pass Area Communities of Whitewater, Cabazon, Banning, Cherry Valley, Beaumont, Calimesa, San Timoteo Canyon. • Supports Retail/Commercial Hubs in the Area • Pass IMTC needs to be strategically located to equally serve both Westbound (San Bernardino Valley, Moreno Valley) and East Bound (Coachella Valley) Pass area commuters, and out-of town ridership that wants to patronize the Pass Area retail and recreational centers. • May need more than one transit center/station in the Pass, one for East Bound daily commuters to the Coachella Valley (Near Highland Springs Rd?), the other for commuters commuting daily to San Bernardino, Los Angeles, and Orange Counties.	
I-212-9	VI. NEED FOR A SEGREGATED AND SEPARATELY OWNED RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR THE CVSGPRCS CVSGPRCS needs to have 100% ownership and control of tracks and right-of-way through the entire rail route! CVSGPRCS needs to purchase/acquire its own separate set of (preferably double/triple) tracks for the entire route. A study needs to be conducted that compares building the service on a separate right-of-way vs "sharing" (which almost always means subordinating to) right-of-way with the UP/BNSF owned tracks that presently characterize the proposed route. This study like all studies and proposals for CVSGPRCS, should project 50-100 years into the future, minimum. Public Transit agencies notoriously make the fatal	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), the alternatives analysis included an evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives for implementation of daily intercity passenger rail service in the Program Corridor. FRA, Caltrans, and RCTC used this process to identify a reasonable range of preliminary alternatives that could be evaluated in the SDP and this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR. Four screening criteria were relied on during the process of evaluating and selecting reasonable and feasible route alternatives to carry forward in the SDP and Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, which includes achieving the Program's Purpose and Need, as well as consideration of environmental constraints, technical feasibility, and economic feasibility. The purchase/acquisition and ownership of a separate set of tracks for the entire route was not identified as a reasonable preliminary alternative due to environmental constraints,

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	mistake of fretting over multimillion dollar/billion dollar initial right-of-way/construction and operating costs without looking at how these seemingly high initial costs end up benefiting the 15-20 million southland residents who will have access to this service over centuries. This study should compare 50-100 year projections for: • Initial design/construction/operating costs associated with purchasing separate right-of-way, vs leasing right of way over same period. • Speed of service and safety advantages of purchasing/acquiring separate right-of-way vs "sharing" with freight railroad track owners. For example, a minimum of 45 freight trains travel through San Timoteo Canyon (and likely the rest of the San Gorgonio Pass) DAILY. Most of these trains are now more than 2 miles long. It will likely be impossible for CVSGPRCS passenger trains to operate speedily, safely, and uninterrupted when forced to subordinate/share rail privileges with the freight railroad companies, such as BNSF and UP, that run freight trains on the same tracks. • A goal in acquiring this additional separate right of way should include, not only safety, but also achieving time/speed targets, such as 45-60 minutes max for Indio-Union Station:LA non-stop service, and 75-90 minutes max. for multiple stop service from Indio to Union Station: LA	technical feasibility, and economic feasibility. Dispatching becomes more complicated when passenger and freight trains share ROW and track in a rail corridor spanning various geographic regions with multiple host railroads and rail operators. The Program Corridor involves host railroads BNSF and UP as well as multiple rail operators (BNSF, UP, SCRRA, and Amtrak) operating anywhere from 32 to 54 freight trains, 2 to 26 intercity passenger trains, and 8 to 28 commuter trains on any given day. RCTC does not have control over other rail operators and scheduling slots in the Western Section of the Program Corridor. Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation and Master Response 7 for a discussion on train trip durations.
I-212-10	VII. Need guaranteed reliable, speedy, and convenient, multi-modal connector service from CVSGPRCS to Downtown areas of the	Please refer to Master Response 1 for discussion on the Program's station location selection screening processes at the Tier 1/Program level and

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	Coachella Valley Communities. The existing freight rail tracks through the Coachella valley, except for Indio, are miles away from the city centers of Coachella Valley Communities of Palm Springs, Cathedral City, Rancho Mirage, Palm Desert, Indian Wells, La Quinta. Given that it will likely be found unreasonable to run new rail tracks through the center of these cities (say via SR111), RCTC needs to arrive at reliable, frequent, and speedy multi-modal connectors from the Coachella Valley Rail Stations to these centers. Examples are Bus, light rail or monorail shuttles. Also linking to alternative transportation infrastructure such as the Coachella Valley Link Alternative Transportation Route is a must	subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies, Master Response 2, which provides a discussion on the conceptual nature of the Build Alternative Option components at the Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Master Response 10 for discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
I-212-11	VIII. NEED TO CONSIDER ROUTING THE CORRIDOR THROUGH THE "VALLEY" COMMUNITIES in Redlands, San Bernardino, Pomona, San Gabriel Valleys, via the San Bernardino Line right-of-way, or the up "Alhambra" Subdivision.	Please refer to Response I-212-3.
I-212-12	IX. Need to abandon fossil fuel (diesel/CNG) technologies for rail "propulsion" in favor of renewable technologies (hydrogen, electrified rail). Also consider using new technologies such as SBCTA's Zero-Emission Multiple Unit (ZEMU) rail vehicles (for use in ARROW rail service). X. Need to consider and adopt 22nd century rail technology for CVSGPRCS such as current or future versions of high speed rail, hyperloops etc.	Please refer to Master Response 11 for a discussion on train technology.
I-212-13	XI. CVSGPRCS needs to develop connectivity with Active Transportation in accordance with WRCOG Western Riverside	Please refer to Master Response 10 for discussion on transportation connections within and outside of the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	County Active Transportation Plan (2018), CVLink, Pass Link, Santa Ana River Trail, and other Active Transportation Route Systems. XII. CVSGPRCS connectivity to future California HS Rail and Las Vegas/LA HS Rail stations in the Inland Empire. LINKAGE/CONNECTIVITY The more linkage/connectivity you can create in a system, the more useful and efficient it becomes, and the increased convenience leads to increased ridership throughout the system, which creates a force-multiplier effect	
I-212-14	ANTICIPATORY PLANNING Designing the CVSGPRCS Rail should anticipate future infrastructure that will be built throughout the system in ways that directly or indirectly impact and benefit the CV Rail system. There is a Southern California version of the 1860s transcontinental railroad race going on. Los Angeles county is aggressively adding additional right-of-way, additional tracks (double/triple/quadruple tracks: see SBCTA: Lilac to Ranch double track)) and grade separations (including Metrolink Fullerton Road and San Gabriel Trench: Alameda Corridor East project) to speed up, and add capacity for freight and passenger rail. Meanwhile RCTC is aggressively adding grade separations through Riverside/Jurupa for its Metrolink Riverside Line to speed up passenger service. The convergence of these West-to-East, and East-to-West, multi-billion dollar rail infrastructure improvements, and future rail infrastructure projects, must be taken into consideration in the design and construction of CVSGPRCS. Again this is another reason, why the right of ways for	Please refer to Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), which provides a detailed explanation of the Program Corridor alternatives analyses and route selection process. Please also refer to Master Response 2, which provides a discussion on the conceptual nature of the Build Alternative Option components at the Tier 1/Program-level evaluation and Master Response 5 which provided a discussion on Program implementation.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	the Metrolink Riverside and San Bernadino lines, and the UP Alhambra Subdivisions must be reconsidered as well as any "new" right-of-ways currently not under the control of commercial railroads, Metrolink, or Amtrak (ex: viaducts over freeways).	
I-212-15	MUST BEAT OUT THE CAR AS A TRANSIT OPTION;	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.3 (Transportation), travel time reliability is another beneficial effect of the Program. Trains operate on a scheduled service within a dedicated ROW and are not subject to fluctuations in traffic congestion. Highway travel time reliability varies from location to location, depending on future traffic conditions in the area. In general, the Build Alternative Options provide travel time reliability for train travelers, compared with expected increases in highway drive times. Please refer to Master Response 7 for a discussion on train travel times.
I-212-16	MUST ACHIEVE USER FRIENDLY TARGETS SUCH AS: • SPEED OF SERVICE: Must achieve a 22nd century speed of service. o 2-3 hours each way is Unacceptable. The one-way non-stop trip time from Indio to DTLA should not exceed 45-60 minutes. With stops the one-way trips should not exceed 75-90 minutes. • COMFORT AND CONVENIENCE: Comfort and convenience while on the trains Examples: ARROW	Please refer to Master Response 7 for a discussion on the Program's proposed train trip duration and Master Response 10 for a discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	Ontario Airport Tunnell San Gabriel Trench Grade Separation Project HSR into the Inland Empire Double Track along Metrolink San Bernardino Line Future Pass Transportation Center	
I-212-17	Creating a station in Loma Linda, separates/disconnects CV Rail from nearby transit hubs such as Redlands ARROW station, SB Transit Center. It slows down the system, by requiring unnecessary and time consuming transfers from the Loma Linda Station to the nearby key transit hubs.	Please refer to Master Response 1 for discussion on the Program's station location selection screening processes at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies, Master Response 7 for a discussion on train trip duration, and Master Response 10 for discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
I-212-18	RAIL THROUGH COACHELLA VALLEY Can the rail line run though or within a few blocks of Downtown Palm Springs, PS Internation Airport, Cathedral City, Palm Desert, Indian Wells, La Quinta, and Indio/Coachella, rather the current proposed route which is miles away from the nearest city centers?	Please refer to Master Response 1 for discussion on the Program's station location selection screening processes at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies. Please refer to Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives) of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR and Master Response 10, which provides a detailed explanation of the Program Corridor alternatives analyses and route selection process, including why intermediate station stops were located on each route alternative as close as possible to the largest intermediate cities (to attract and serve the largest possible ridership).
I-212-19	DO NOT NICKEL AND DIME THE PROJECT IN A WAY THE PERMANENTLY HARMS LONG TERM EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SYSTEM:	Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion on transportation connections, including information on why the UPRR Alhambra Subdivision was eliminated from consideration during the alternatives analysis. Please refer to Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	RCTC staff have indicated that there is a cost difference of under 200 million between using the UP Alhambra subdivision vs the "Los Angeles" Subdivision which runs through Riverside, Orange County, then LA county cities like. Norwalk, Commerce etc. Designing the long-term benefits of this type of infrastructure should not be bogged down in small cost differentials considering the scale of the project and the millions of people who will have access to the system. Considering this infrastructure will The San Gabriel Trench Grade Separation cost $294 million, but will impact the regional freight and passenger rail system for a century! This was paid for by the SGVAG, creating a force multiplier for the region, and having a key linkage subregion shoulder the cost for its geographic and ridership share of the route system. Got to think long term benefits. Fullerton Rd. Grade Separation: cumulative benefits are being created by improving the efficiency of the rail system in LA County via Alameda East Corridor project. Also the necessary grade separation projects completed or underway from DT Riverside through Jurupa and Beyond.	Alternatives), which provides a detailed explanation of the Program Corridor alternatives analyses and route selection process.
I-212-20	Need to create direct connections to SB Transit Center and Ontario Airport, to increase ridership by allowing riders to use portions of the CV Rail route to disembark at the aforementioned key hubs which increases ridership on other lines such as Metrolink SB Line, and Gold Line (eventually running to Ontario Airport).	Please refer to Master Response 10 for discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
I-212-21	ONTARIO AMTRAK STATION IS ONLY A FEW YARDS from the Metrolink Riverside Line near Euclid Avenue in Ontario. Why aren't these two lines connected at this station?	The comment is focused on existing Amtrak and transit facilities in Ontario, which are not within the Draft Tier 1/Program-level Study Area that is being considered as part of the environmental analysis of the Program. Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor, including an explanation of why Route Alternative 3 via Ontario International Airport (i.e., immediately east of the referenced Ontario Amtrak Station) was eliminated during the alternatives screening and analysis process.
Comment I-213 (Terri Crooks)		
I-213-1	Hello, My husband and I live Palm Desert, and we enjoy driving to downtown Riverside Metrolink station and taking the Metrolink to San Clemente. We invite and encourage others to ride the Metrolink also. Personal, I would like to see the train travel from Palm Springs to the Orange County and San Diego County beaches, instead of LA.	Thank you for your comments. As described in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Executive Summary, within the Western Section, the Program would utilize existing stations at LAUS, Fullerton and Riverside to support the proposed passenger rail service. Please refer to Master Response 10 for discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
Comment I-214 (David Haugland)		
I-214-1	I support frequent, daily, regularly scheduled rail service to Palm Springs and the Coachella valley from Los Angeles, San Diego, Las Vegas, and Phoenix.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 10 for discussion on transit and transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-215 (Daniel Teutle)		
I-215-1	I have been a Coachella Valley resident and a daily driver of the roads in our state for over 40 years and I love to travel by train (mostly in other states and countries, a few times in California) and, my first impression of this Rail Road Corridor is that this is an utter waste of money as proposed for the following reasons:	Thank you for your comments. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
I-215-2	Sunline transit agency has provided a daily service Coachella Valley to Riverside metrolink stations (and vice versa) for way over a decade, one does not have to be an expert to see that there is just a handful of riders, if any at times, to figure that people need the flexibility that a car provide. Check With Sunline transit on actual yearly ridership and why it has not in service for months.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.6.1 (Limited and Constrained Travel Options), while the Program Corridor is served by a transportation system that includes air, highway, transit, and rail modes, few of these alternatives provide regular intercity transportation within the Program Corridor between the Coachella Valley, Inland Empire, and coastal regions of Southern California. The Program Corridor currently faces substantial mobility challenges that are likely to continue. Based on population and travel forecasts, as well as the amount of available open land within the Program Corridor, population, employment, and tourism activity is expected to continue to grow in the future; however, opportunities to increase the carrying capacity of the region's roadway network are limited. Please refer to Chapter 1 (Program Purpose and Need) of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
I-215-3	Our cities, unlike the East coast, Europe and/or Japan are far apart and access to current train stations are non existent by public transportation with the exception of Indio, to park a private car on this facilities is sketchy at best.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.15 (Safety and Security), operation of any Program elements would implement similar safety and security principles and guidelines currently used by rail operators in the Program Corridor. These safety and security principles and guidelines currently include onboard safety and security programs, such as regular safety meetings for front line employees; forward facing camera systems to help aid in accident investigation; and inward facing

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		cameras for onboard security. In addition, rail operators and transit system providers along the Program Corridor currently coordinate with local police departments for safety and security presence onboard trains and at stations.
I-215-4	Freight railroad rights of way are owned by private, for-profit corporations, and the routes potentially most useful for passenger service are typically the busiest with freight traffic. In many cases, states or commuter rail authorities have reached agreement with freight railroads to share either their track or right of way. However, unlike Amtrak, which has eminent domain power over freight facilities and can appeal to a federal agency to determine the terms of its access to freight track, other would-be passenger rail operators do not have any statutory leverage when negotiating with freight railroads. This likely increases the price public authorities pay for access and leaves them with no apparent recourse when freight railroads reject their offers.	Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation.
I-215-5	The focus should be in ensuring that the proposed Banning to Cabazon I-10 bypass actually extends to where I-10 and Hwy. 111 merge on the East, and Hwy. 60 to the west. This area is the constriction that causes traffic to back up all the way to Indio at times.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 1 (Program Purpose and Need), the Program Corridor currently faces substantial mobility challenges that are likely to continue. Based on population and travel forecasts, as well as the amount of available open land within the Program Corridor, population, employment, and tourism activity is expected to continue to grow in the future; however, opportunities to increase the carrying capacity of the region's roadway network such as the I-10, SR-111, and SR-60 are limited.
I-215-6	Many of us wishes that it would be less traffic in the future but, the reality it that it will continue to increase exponentially, let us focus on	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.6.1 (Limited and Constrained Travel Options), while the Program Corridor is served by a

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	finally fixing existing roads and build alternate ones. Trains, even if they overcome all the legal and environmental hoops, and using other areas in our country and around the world as example, will always be expensive to operate and will always relay on subsidies, will be unreliable and ultimately will never solve our transportation problems. On the environmental side it will just create more pollution by traveling with only a handful of passengers (like the Sunline's 10 commuter Link has done for more than 10 years) and while waiting for the freight trains (they will always have the priority) using the same track.	transportation system that includes air, highway, transit, and rail modes, few of these alternatives provide regular intercity transportation within the Program Corridor between the Coachella Valley, Inland Empire, and coastal regions of Southern California. In addition, the existing transportation system is constrained due to the limited travel alternatives to driving a private vehicle. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 1 (Program Purpose and Need), the Program Corridor currently faces substantial mobility challenges that are likely to continue. Based on population and travel forecasts, as well as the amount of available open land within the Program Corridor, population, employment, and tourism activity is expected to continue to grow in the future; however, opportunities to increase the carrying capacity of the region's roadway network are limited. Pursuant to 49 U.S. Code, Section 24308(c), except in an emergency, intercity and commuter rail passenger transportation provided by or for Amtrak has preference over freight transportation in using a rail line, junction, or crossing unless the Board orders otherwise. Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation.
Comment I-216 (Edward Neal)		
I-216-1	As a Palm Springs resident I am 100% in favor of passenger rail service between the Coachella Valley and Los Angeles - I know many people who would love to be able to jump on a train and spend a day or two in LA and to not have to worry about driving their vehicle and finding and paying for parking. I also think that rail service would be very beneficial for people who wanted to come to the Coachella Valley for events like Stage Coach and Coachella fest and having this option could greatly reduce traffic on local freeways	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	and local roads and in addition would also reduce pollution and help reduce greenhouse gasses	
Comment I-217 (Monica Hayes)		
I-217-1	I think is a great idea to have a Pass Rail Corridor service in the valley because it will be good for the environment plus less traffic, also it is easier for people that do not have a car or drive the freeway. Visitors to Los Angeles to Coachella Valley will benefit during vacation time. I hope this project gets approved it is time to simplify and get practical traveling.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-218 (John Kephart)		
I-218-1	Absolutely. The sooner the better. The added convenience of not having to deal with So Cal auto traffic, plus it could be marketed as including leisure/luxe accommodations and perfect for weekend trips, business trips, etc. With all the events in both L.A. and the Coachella Valley, this is an absolute home run.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-219 (Hubert Hanrahan)		
I-219-1	The rail proposal is terrific and so needed for our residents. I live in Desert Hot Springs and as a senior, this will make traveling to LA County so much easier with the opportunity to leave our car behind. We had excellent service on the Amtrak Capitol Corridor line between Sacramento and the Bay Area. It made getting to San Francisco so easy, as well as riding to 49er games in Santa Clara. Thank you and keep up the good work and effort!	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-220 (Catherine Barber)		
I-220-1	The slogging traffic in 10 and the fact that we have only one primary entrance and exit makes this transportation addition critical for safety egress and avoiding pollution	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley and reduce regional air quality and greenhouse gas emissions.
Comment I-221 (Brian Bower)		
I-221-1	I am very much in favor of immediate construction of rail service from LA to the Coachella valley. Having driven the route several times I would definitely make use of a rail service and I feel it would bring positive economic benefits along the route.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-222 (Ellen Finan)		
I-222-1	Please extend rail service to Coachella Valley. Rail would connect us to Riverside and Los Angeles. Currently the only way to get there is by car. Tesloop, the reasonably priced method, is defunct. If we could get access to metrolink, it would transform the area for tourists. Europeans often travel by rail but there is really no possibility in our case. As for locals, rail would open up possibilities for shopping, entertainment, the arts, and the beach. Rail would lesson pollution; it save lives as the Inland area has had an explosion of warehouses along the 60 and 10 corridors and building more fulfillment centers has already been approved. The recent construction on the 70 will only provide some relief for drivers to the valley for the next 5-10 years. Rail would help mediate the traffic.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	Quality of life, economic viability, environmental concerns and economic justice are all reasons for Coachella Valley to be open for rail transit. I support rail.	
Comment I-223 (Anonymous)		
I-223-1	I'm very much in favor for an alternative way to get to and from the Coachella Valley and Los Angeles Area. All the connections already in service (San Bernardino - Riverside) can offer continued rail as far South as San Diego, North Simi Valley, Santa Barbara and more. Please allow this service low "RED TAPE" to get into service as soon as possible.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion of transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.
Comment I-224 (Dave Grothe)		
I-224-1	This project should be a no brainer. The impact to the environment is clearly on the beneficial side as existing rail lines would be used for the majority of the extension. Plus it would remove countless vehicles from our roadways and onto public transportations and should be expedited	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-225 (Jan Harnik)		
I-225-1	It is well past the time for train service for Coachella Valley and the pass area to be implemented. The sooner this train and a third rail are part of our transportation system the sooner our community members will enjoy the freedom of ridership and others will begin to shift their thinking regarding transit, the sooner we have a positive impact on air quality and health, the sooner we lessen traffic congestion and the need to continually increase lanes on our freeways and highways and waste tax payer funds that could be put	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	to much better use. IT IS PAST TIME FOR THE COACHELLA VALLEY LINE!	
Comment I-226 (Brenda Direen)		
I-226-1	Yes please! I would use this weekly!	Thank you for your comment. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-227 (Brian Eggert)		
I-227-1	I think the Coachella Valley San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor is a great idea. We need a better system to connect to rail systems to allow us to travel to other parts of the state on rail instead of our autos. Especially has most of the population in the Coachella Valley are getting older and less able to drive. The current Amtrak system arriving at the weird hours is not a feasible answer for us especially where the train stop is located in Palm Springs.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-228 (Suzanna Dwight)		
I-228-1	As a Coachella Valley resident, I strongly support rail service ; it's long overdue for sure!	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-229 (Suzanna Dwight)		
I-229-1	As a Coachella Valley resident, I strongly support rail service ; it's long overdue for sure!	This comment appears to have been submitted in duplicate. Please refer to Response I-228-1.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-230 (Adam Behr)		
I-230-1	I am all for rail service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley, where I live in Rancho Mirage. It would be great for residents at both ends, and all along the way, as well as the environment, and probably other people and things I haven't even thought of yet.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-231 (Jim King)		
I-231-1	I support bring the line to the Coachella Valley	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-232 (Phillip Snover)		
I-232-1	As a resident of 29 palms I believe it is great to have another option for traveling from the desert to the other cities. I think it would benefit many adding jobs, both temporary and long term for generations and would help bring in tourism from all southern California areas.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-233 (Thomas Tokheim)		
I-233-1	On behalf of Millennium Master Plan, 152 acres at the NE corner of Portola Street and Gerald Ford Drive, I am writing to you today to consider Portola as a future rail station for the Coachella Valley San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program. The benefits of this project are numerous, but here are the critical issues this project addresses:	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Mid-

	• Genesis Single Family Home development by this fall will have the final 33 homes closings to complete the 166 new home development at the NE corner of Portola and Gerald Ford Drive. • In 2022, we plan to start the construction of the Millennium 330 apartments which includes 66 affordable apartments. • Also within the Millennium Master Plan is a 10-acre parcel owned by the City of Palm Desert for 220 affordable apartments. • The new 11,000 seat arena has been approved by Riverside County and is under construction near Cook Street and Interstate 10 for the new minor league hockey team and other concerts and shows, all of which could total 150 events per year whereby the commuter train would be a valuable mode of transportation. • Close proximity to both the California State University San Bernardino at Palm Desert and the University of California, Riverside at Palm Desert campuses would greatly enhance transportation options. • The University Park area has two new home developments just under way for new homes totaling approximately 500. Another minimum of 600 are planned for University Park for future development. • Neat Portola and Gerald Ford Drive another new home development of 70 homes will start in 2021. Other area new home developments within 1-2 miles could add 300-400 homes.	Valley Area which encompasses the communities of Cathedral City, Thousand Palms, the Agua Caliente Casino area, Rancho Mirage, and Palm Desert. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	It is very exciting what is going on in the center of the Coachella Valley to the south of I-10 with a 4-year University in Cal State San Bernardino (and hopefully Cal State Palm Desert) and UCR and a new arena just north of I-10 for minor league hockey, concerts, and other activities. This I-10/Portola station would open the unincorporated Thousand Palms area between Varner and Ramon Road, providing a more balanced and diversified central part of the Coachella Valley that would better serve all in the entire region. Having served in Administration at Desert Regional and JFK Memorial and Eisenhower Medical Center, I was fully aware that many of our employees were commuting from Desert Hot Springs, Morongo Valley, Yucca Valley, Joshua Tree, Coachella, and further east. This Thousand Palms area provides an excellent opportunity for more affordable housing closer to schools and universities and other amenities this central location offers with public transportation much more feasible. There was an excellent editorial in the Desert Sun on March 19, 2021 by Representative Eduardo Garcia and Chad Mayes about the tremendous need to affordable housing, and it includes a recommendation for developing a valley wide approach to solving the issue with 10,000 new housing units over the next 10 years. Also attached is an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for 5/8/2018 regarding 214 acres north of Varner that would provide for 600 single family homes, 900 apartments, a K-5 elementary school, 5 pocket parks and almost 400,000 of commercial/retail space. These residents would also have great access to the planned City of Palm	

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	Desert 27-acre regional park south of I-10 off Portola Street and Dinah Shore Drive in the Millennium Master Plan.	
I-233-2	This project cannot move ahead without the federal funds available through this process. A high prioritization of this project among the many will benefit the people of the Valley.	Please refer to Master Response 8, which provides a detailed explanation on Program funding.
Comment I-234 (Pamela Carnt)		
I-234-1	This is a fantastic idea	Thank you for your comment. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-235 (Kevin Holliday)		
I-235-1	As a resident of LA and a frequent visitor to the Coachella Valley, I would greatly appreciate rail service between LA and Palm Springs. I would use it a lot and it would he's so much better than sitting in traffic. Please consider having times that would service the leisure market, i.e. the weekends. I'd love to take an afternoon train on Friday and arrive in Palm Springs in time for dinner.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section ES 1.3 (Program Overview), passenger train frequencies proposed as part of the Program would consist of two daily round-trip intercity passenger trains operating the entire length of the Program Corridor between Los Angeles and the Cities of Indio or Coachella, with one morning departure and one afternoon departure from each end of the Program Corridor. Please refer to Master Response 6 for a discussion on train trip frequency and Master Response 7 for a discussion on train trip duration.
Comment I-236 (Anonymous)		
I-236-1	This is a great idea, I know the youth of the Coachella Valley would love this idea due to the fact that it simplifies a trip to Los Angeles. Being 20 years old something like this completely excites me	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	knowing it would be easier to travel avoided tremendous amounts of traffic and gives us more opportunities to explore without the hassle.	and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-237 (Roman Minyaylyuk)		
I-237-1	I am in full support of this project. As a resident of Desert Hot Springs, I would love to be able to get on a train and head into LA versus sitting on the 10 in traffic, which is very unproductive. I also think, we've got a great deal of commuters heading into the LA area for work that would rather not be sitting in a car for hours. I hope as this train project materializes that local public transit agencies tailor their service to serve the new stations in a smart way to make sure everyone is able to get that last mile service once they get off the new train route to their destination.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 10 for discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
Comment I-238 (Judy Myall)		
I-238-1	My partner and I are seniors who have lived in Palm Springs for 11 years. In those years we have visited Los angeles only about 6 times. We would love to be able to visit more often but unfortunately the traffic and congestion on the freeway keeps us away. If there was a train service to the L.A. area we would really enjoy being able to go more often. This service is way overdue.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-239 (Walter Bendick)		
I-239-1	Having moved to Rancho Mirage from LA and having made the drive over the years many many times I would truly welcome a rail service between Indo and LA. The drive on I-10 can be very long and difficult and having the opportunity to sit and relax on that trip	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	would be very positive. I hope this project moves forward and becomes a reality .	
Comment I-240 (Michael Sloan)		
I-240-1	Great Idea. So happy to see the proposal after all these years in the IE. Please keep me updated.	Thank you for your comments. Contact information for the commenter, as identified, will be added to a stakeholder database for subsequent Tier 2/Project-level outreach.
Comment I-241 (Michael Moore)		
I-241-1	We need it!	Thank you for your comment. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
Comment I-242 (Christine Caffrey)		
I-242-1	I hope this project is completed. I drive up to the LA area twice a month and the traffic is horrible. This would really be a great way to travel without having to deal with all the traffic.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-243 (Deborah E. Garbe)		
I-243-1	What type of train service proposed? Will there be restrooms, club cars, food service, etc? Like the trains I road in my youth! When is an estimated date for service to begin if approved? Will there be a discount for seniors?	Thank you for your comments. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Therefore, it is anticipated that passenger rail services, amenities, and ticketing pricing, including discounts for seniors, would be similar to those services and amenities offered by Amtrak routes within the Southern California region. Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation, Master Response 6 for a discussion on train trip

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		frequency, Master Response 7 for a discussion on train speed, and Master Response 9 for a discussion on Program timing.
Comment I-244 (Shawn Stoller)		
I-244-1	Good morning. We are residents of Indio and would support adding rail service to Union Station and hope it would reduce traffic and the gas burned for people to visit the valley and the many events, including major music festivals, held here each year. Hopefully, the reduced emissions from removing those vehicles from the interstate will be seen as a huge benefit of adding this additional rail service and this environmental win will be factored in to the analysis.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-245 (Tyson Atwood)		
I-245-1	Interesting project which would be a great public transportation alternative. This project would tie in nicely to other public transit project in the Coachella Valley region such as CV Link.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion of transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
Comment I-246 (Gordon Edwards)		
I-246-1	Your map is so unreadable, it should be an embarrassment to post on your web page.	Thank you for your comment. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR that was also available on the website contains copies of detailed maps depicting the Build Alternative Options and various environmental mapping efforts associated with the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR's Executive Summary and associated maps can be found web address: https://www.rctc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/00_Executive-Summary.pdf

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-247 (Andrea Josephson)		
I-247-1	Will everyone disembark at Union Station or can u stay on til Chatsworth? Will u allow dogs. Will u have reserved seats and beverage service?	Thank you for your comments. As stated throughout the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, the Program is proposing the implementation of passenger rail service options between Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) in Los Angeles County, California and the City of Coachella in Riverside County, California. The Program does not address service west of LAUS. The intercity passenger rail service proposed to operate in the Program Corridor would be part of California's state-supported passenger rail system. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Therefore, it is anticipated that on-board amenities and other service attributes would be similar to those provided on existing Amtrak passenger services currently operating within Southern California. Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
Comment I-248 (Joseph Farley)		
I-248-1	The CVR Project could generate massive "fixed" revenues, that would reduce the unnecessary waste of conventional debt financing & expose opportunity costs, by offering a cargo "Trunk-Line-Feeder" service, utilizing cargo-only wagons, (combi units can also be used) & take advantage of unused capacity (track & off-track hrs./idle, 24/7). The "Feeder" strategies connect endless lesser "Feeder" vehicles, incl. bus-lanes, & facilities of many functions, for time/place utility; throughput, & "all that comes with that." Required: Legions of standardized, very fast on-off, (RFID/IoT/AI), Roll carts, incl. non-motor cold-chain, for upstream unitization & downstream selectivity, can reduce massive highway bottlenecks &	Thank you for your comments. Discussion and analysis of alternative financial strategies as it relates to Program revenue generation is not considered an environmental issue for purposes of NEPA and CEQA. This comment does not raise significant environmental issues and no further response is required.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	support community planning for cost reduction & progressive designs for communal living. Note the FHWA study reveals that "Bottlenecks cost the US economy more than $42b in 2019...almost 660 million hours of delay on the nation's highways" . Commercial Carriers Journal May 27, 2021, by Jason Cannon, CCJ chief editor. The mobility/functionality of Roll carts is not a big problem.	
Comment I-249 (Kelly Watson)		
I-249-1	I fully support this project; as a resident of Palm Springs with family in LA and OC it would be very valuable to me to have alternative to automobiles to reach LA especially as i get older. Thanks for everything you are doing.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-250 (Nicola Wong)		
I-250-1	I am very interested in taking the train into LA as often as once a week.	Thank you for your comment. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-251 (Alex Croix)		
I-251-1	I am just a bit confused, is this going to be a high speed railway project?? Because if not, it is concerning how fast the train will travel and how long it will shorten the time compared to car travel from Palm Springs to Riverside. I was looking forward to this, thinking it will be a high speed train. I would just like to know how many mph the train plans to travel. Thank you.	Thank you for your comments. The proposed passenger rail service envisioned as part of the Program is not a part of the efforts currently being undertaken by CHSRA and would not be considered an HSR project. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), maximum authorized passenger train speed in the Western Section of the Program Corridor is 79 miles per hour west of Fullerton and 60 miles per hour east of Fullerton. In the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor, passenger trains have maximum authorized speeds ranging between 30 and 70 miles per hour with the average maximum authorized speed identified as being 59 miles per hour. Please refer to Master Response 7 for a discussion on the Program's proposed train trip duration.
Comment I-252 (Sabina Greco)		
I-252-1	I'm very interested in train service being established in the Coachella Valley. I hope the project moves forward and can be completed — this will be so beneficial to the residents living here and to visitors. By my way of background I rode the train to work from Orange County to LA for work for 20 years! I have first hand knowledge of the benefits rail service can provide. Please keep me updated on the status - if you need comments or thoughts relating to the project I'd be happy to participate.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Contact information for the commenter, as identified, will be added to a stakeholder database for subsequent Tier 2/Project-level outreach.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-253 (William Cunnigham)		
I-253-1	I believe the project is of great merit. I have lived for forty years in near proximity to the San Timoteo crossing. The road crosses the tracks at an angle and typically carries heavy daily traffic. Over the years a number of accidents have occurred, several undoubtedly caused by drivers trying to beat the gates, while others were traveling at such speed they could not negotiate the turn, which happened just a few months ago. I believe it is important that every possible element of safety that can be provided should be in place at this intersection. The sounding of the train's horn alerts drivers traveling at high speed along the approaches to be alert and slow down.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.15 (Safety and Security), Mitigation Strategy SS-1 through SS-2 call for the preparation of site-specific collision hazard analysis and safety certification plans in coordination with the local jurisdiction and applicable regulatory agencies in which the infrastructure improvements would be constructed. These site-specific impacts and mitigation measures would be further identified as part of the Tier 2/Project-level environmental review process.
I-253-2	I live twice as close as the "health Facility" (Redlands Community Hospital) is to the crossing, making the horn's sound four times louder where I live. Further, while I often have my windows open at night, the hospital is an enclosed environment. While a patient there lhe sound could barely be heard.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.6 (Noise and Vibration), Mitigation Strategies NOI-1 through NOI-2 call for additional site-specific noise and vibration assessments to analyze and identify impacts to noise sensitive land uses and how those impacts would be addressed (e.g. siting of equipment, provision of noise-attenuating features) in coordination with the local jurisdiction in which the infrastructure improvements would be constructed. These site-specific impacts and mitigation measures would be further identified as part of the Tier 2/Project-level environmental review process. Please refer to Master Response 4 for a discussion on noise impacts and quiet zones.
Comment I-254 (John Ulloth)		
I-254-1	I don’t know why, but seem unable to comment right on the on-line documents provided, anywhere else, or in any other way, There are no instructions how/ where to make the thing work, so I’m mailing.	Thank you for your comments. The usability of the regulations.gov site comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	When I type in various phrases in your Search box, i.e. “how to comment”, “make comment now”, “instructions”… nothing comes back. The documents are bureaucratic (stacks of facts in boxes bringing characteristics together, short on analysis, short on strategic value-judgement or pricing) I find that user-repelling, with dim insight how judgements are made/ or perhaps made up in a smoke filled back room? There is no page describing “How to Comment”/Instructions Page” in the Table of Contents… So I am mailing & commenting in a way that makes sense to me: with facts > (comparisons) > reasons that brings me conclusions which FRA, RCTC, etc. to consider. I’m apologizing now – in advance – for submitting comments “out of (your) order”, but I am making all comments now, with no alternative than to trust you will put them in the appropriate places. Because despite the glacial pace of this process, I find that without notice, decisions (such as routing!) have been suddenly, permanently made without public comment, Unless this is meant to repel Public comments from Enviro. Docs. (and hope that *isn’t* your dept.’s intent), may I recommend in the future a simplified, get-real, user-friendly overhaul of this process putting simple instructions on how to make Comments in the table of Contents?	analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), the alternatives analysis included an evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives for implementation of daily intercity passenger rail service in the Program Corridor. FRA, Caltrans, and RCTC used this process to identify a reasonable range of preliminary alternatives that could be evaluated in the SDP and this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR. Four screening criteria were relied on during the process of evaluating and selecting reasonable and feasible route alternatives to carry forward in the SDP and Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, which includes achieving the Program’s Purpose and Need as well as consideration of environmental constraints, technical feasibility, and economic feasibility. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Table of Contents includes a section on how to provide comments on the Draft Tier 1/Program Draft EIS/EIR (ES.1.7 Public Review of Tier 1/Program Draft EIS/EIR). Within ES.1.7 additional details of how the public can provide comments on the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, including ES.1.7.1 (Document Availability), ES.1.7.2 (Providing Comments on the Tier 1/Program Draft EIS/EIR), and ES.1.7.3 (Public Hearings). In addition, FEIS/EIR Appendix B (Outreach Summary Report), provides additional information to public outreach conducted throughout the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR process.
I-254-2	Since the last public hearing at the lobby of LA County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) THERE HAVE BEEN 2 "TURNS FOR THE WORST" THAT NEED CORRECTING A.S.A.P.:	Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives) provides a summary of the alternative analysis, which documented the decision process of route alignments within the Program Corridor, including why Route Alternative 3 (UPRR Alhambra Subdivision) was removed from consideration. Route Alternative 3 is a high-density freight line, with

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	PUT THE COACHELLA TRAIN (BACK) ON THE UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD'S (U.P.) "ALHAMBRA SUB"... I AM NO LONGER AMBIVALENT ABOUT THIS ROUTING... FOR REASONS OF PHYSICS: 1A. THE SHORTEST DISTANCE= LOWEST ENERGY COSTS TO RUN. Better than your wandering route which zigs southeast (to Fullerton), then zags back upwards northeast (via Riverside) to add a few additional passengers, gaining another County for political braggadocio, but requires the Coachella Trains be handed off to different freight railroad dispatchers at track ownership boundaries... that's all a schedule time waster!. 1B. THE MOST DIRECT LINE WITH FEWEST CURVES= HIGHER END-TO-END SPEEDS. 1C. LIMITING STATION STOPS= HIGHER END-TO-END SPEEDS. Why are we looking for so many new stations to slow the service down? Don't! The best station to add, (and only on the Alhambra Sub) is the Ontario Airport (ONT) terminals! There was once an Alhambra station, which was a great suburban location, but would need complete rebuilding now... (not worth holding up the beginning of project service.)	substantial sections of single track that would require costly expansion projects to create the additional capacity needed to reliably operate the proposed passenger rail service and mitigate impacts on freight rail capacity and reliability. Route Alternative 3 could require construction of up to 39 miles of additional second main line track, would experience freight-train congestion, and serve freight terminals where trains enter and exit at low speeds, which has the potential to affect passenger-train travel reliability. Given the extensive sections of single main line track and presence of heavy unscheduled freight train traffic, the potential for introducing travel unreliability, slow projected running time, high technical complexity, and high cost for expanding capacity, Route Alternative 3 was eliminated from further study. Please refer to Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), which provides a detailed explanation of the Program Corridor alternatives analyses and route selection process. Please refer to Master Response 1 for a discussion on station location selection and Master Response 10 for a discussion of transportation connections within the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
I-254-3	Since it won't be cheaper than a bus, or faster than an airplane, the Coachella Train must at least be cheaper than an airplane & faster than a bus! Therefore THE LAUS-INDIO TRIP MUST BE MADE IN UNDER 3 HOURS, INCLUDING DWELL TIME AT STATIONS, MUST COST FAR LESS THAN $300 AIRFARE, & AS CLOSE TO A $30 LONG DISTANCE BUS FARE AS POSSIBLE TO BE COMPETITIVE/	Please refer to Master Response 7, which provides discussion on train trip duration. For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. Therefore, it is anticipated that passenger rail fares would be similarly priced to other Amtrak services within Southern California.
I-254-4	PUT THE COACHELLA TRAIN ON U.P.'S "ALHAMBRA SUB"... FOR REASONS OF RIDERSHIP: MAKING THE NEW COACHELLA TRAIN MATCH THE ROUTE OF AMTRAK'S SUNSET LIMITED, BRINGS DAILY SERVICE ON THIS LINE FROM LA UNION STATION... In fact, the Coachella train will be the defacto base service on the west end of this line, taking its place in Amtrak's Schedule with the Sunset Limited. But 2 initial runs per day (minimal service proposed for the Coachella train) would make additional deviations fanning out unwise- they'll only water-down convenience & ridership. Though outside of the scope of this project, it will also help the Union Pacific get used to making room for Daily Amtrak Service, which will ease the Sunset Limited's eventual move to Daily operation (see 68 .)	Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion on transportation connections, including information on why the UPRR Alhambra Subdivision was eliminated from consideration during the alternatives analysis. Please refer to Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), which provides a detailed explanation of the Program Corridor alternatives analyses and route selection process.
I-254-5	1C. .. .AT LEAST AS FAR AS INDIO...	Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley (which would include the City of Indio).
I-254-6	Foolishly , Amtrak only ran the Sunset Limited train 3 days/wk. but presently only 2 days per week! a ludicrous false economy that kills network connections to/from other trains! Made even worse since	Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion of transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	the Sunset Limited has a lousy on-time performance record, shamefully doesn't reach Miami, Florida anymore (Amtrak's last true Transcontinental), or anywhere tracks were rebuilt in the Gulf Coast east of New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina (2005) thanks to George W. Bush! For many reasons displayed on the Sunset Limited cascading thru out Amtrak's network, running trains "less than Daily" must come to an end! https://www.amtrak.com/content/dam/projects/dotcom/english/public/documents/temporary-timetables/Sunset Limited-Schedule/100520.pdf Until Amtrak's abuse of the Sunset Limited stops, the Coachella train can patch up Amtrak's less-than-daily coverage gap in the schedule, at least in CA (see also #2 below)... we're not doing this to help pinch-penny Amtrak accountants' with their Funny Numbers, we're doing this for rail passengers! 1D. ...on days the Sunset Limited runs, its presence will boost train choices in the corridor... 2 BUT BEST TO PUT A HUGE 2ND TRAVEL MARKET ON THE OTHER END OF THE LINE. WHERE? EXTENDING THE COACHELLA VALLEY TRAIN TO PHOENIX , ARIZONA VIA YUMA WOULD GUARANTEE RIDERSHIP SUCCESS, PATCH AN INEXCUSEABLE AMTRAK TRAIN GAP TO MEET PENT-UP DEMAND , & SAVE A STATION: Some years ago, membership-lobbying group RailPAC's former VP. Bob Manning said the Palm Spring train (Coachella Train) was already dovetailed into talks to extend it to Phoenix, Arizona; the largest U.S. City; -4 Million people- having NO AMTRAK TRAIN! Without knowing where	

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	that stands today, facts are: Maricopa (a puny station) doesn't count -an insulting hour & a half bus ride away- from Phoenix' real Station ((b. 1923) (401 South 4th Avenue (x Harrison St.)) still stands, (but) wasted (boarded up). Cities should own their own stations (almost always produces the most viable, mutli-use result) and Phoenix should reopen this one, (RailPAC affiliate "All Aboard Arizona" might help persuade Mayor Gallegos, who they've met with before)! It's just 3 blocks south + 3 blocks west of the nearest Valley Metro light rail line turning to the east, which is only 4 more blocks south of Phoenix' Downtown bus plaza (1st Ave.-W. Polk St.-N. Central Ave.-E.Van Buren St.). THIS MUST BE THE 2ND PHASE OF THE COACHELLA TRAIN: START A STUB IN THIS DOCUMENT TO BEGIN STUDYING GOING TO PHOENIX IN THE NEXT PHASE! KEEP IT AS A STUB & LEAVE IT UNFUNDED (NOT 1 MORE EXCUSE TO DELAY IMPLEMENTATION!) BUT YES IT IS APPROPRIATE when you consider this strategy's purpose is to guarantee ridership far beyond survival by PUTTING A BIG CITY AT BOTH ENDS! This is what Amtrak trains can do. Why risk losing everything for lack of the Big Picture here?	
I-254-7	THIS IS THE PLACE FOR INCREMENTAL GREEN TECH. UPGRADING! WITHOUT SLOWING ANY PROGRESS, TELL THE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGERS OF THIS PROJECT WE NEED INCREMENTAL GAME-CHANGING EQUIPMENT & ENERGY FROM THE START: 3A . FIRST, CALL UP METROLINK (SCRRA), & OFFER TO TAKE ENOUGH EMD F125 DIESEL	Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.5 (Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases), Mitigation Strategy GHG-2 requires the development of an operational energy conservation plan, which will be developed in a subsequent Tier2/Project-level analysis. The operational energy conservation plan will identify best management practices (BMP) including, but not limited to the identification of state of the art locomotives to maximize fuel efficiency. Please refer to Master Response 11 for a

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	LOCOMOTIVES OFF THEIR HANDS (I think that = 3; 1 locomotive for each daily train + 30% in rotation/ reserve) TO RUN PUSH/PULL COACHELLA VALLEY SERVICE AS F125'S PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS "HIGHER-SPEED"-RAIL CAPABILITY (to 125MPH) ARE FAR BETTER-SUITED TO THE COACHELLA TRAIN'S CORRIDOR (LONGER RUNS WITH FEW STOPS BETWEEN), THAN THE START-&-STOP TYPICAL OF METROLINK COMMUTER RUNS WITH STATIONS AS LITTLE AS 3 MILES BETWEEN. (ALSO, TO MEET TODAY'S HIGHER TIER-4 DIESEL ADMISSIONS STANDARDS, F125'S DESIGN ROUTES ALL ITS TRAIN'S POWER INCLUDING HEAD END POWER (HEP) THRU THE PRIME MOVER + AFTER-TREATMENT SO THE EXHAUST CAN BE SCRUBBED TO TIER 4 STANDARDS; CHICAGO'S METRA F-40PH'S HAD A SIMILAR PROBLEM EARNING THEM THE NICKNAME "SCREAMERS" FOR WAILING AWAY AT RUN-8 WITH FANS TOILING HARD, ESPECIALLY ANNOYING WHILE IDLING IN STATIONS!) 38. ALTERNATIVELY , CALL UP RAIL PROPULSION SYSTEMS (RPS) OF FULLERTON= railpropulsion .com & info@railpropulsion.com TO BEGIN IMPLEMENTING CLEAN(ER)-AIR ALTERNATIVES : i) FOR REBUILDING LOCOMTIVES TO SWITCH FUEL TO BURN NATURAL GAS (though still a fossil fuel, it's less- worse environmentally , there's no loss of horsepower, & converting to gas saves money), ii) THEN HAVE RPS SELL YOU A COUPLE ZERO EMMISSION BOOSTER LOCOMOTIVES (they call a "ZEBL" = a locomotive MU'ed (maybe on the other end of the train for ideal FRA locomotive	discussion on locomotive technology and Master Response 7 for train trip durations and existing train speed constraints within the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	crash-worthiness?) , with its prime mover gone, replaced by racks of batteries or fuel cells) TO CAPTURE BRAKING ENERGY otherwise lost to heat/ friction/ brake wear FOR ACCELERATING AWAY FROM STATIONS, DISTRIBUTED HELPER POWER ON UPHILL GRADES + DOUBLING THE NUMBER OF TRACTION AXLES. 3C. CALL UP U.S. RAILCAR (f.k.a. Colorado Railcar before 2009 post-bankruptcy reorganization in Columbus, Ohio)= www.usrailcar TO STUDY i) IF A PAIR OF SELF-PROPELLED FULLY FRA LOCOMOTIVE-CRASH-STANDARDS-COMPLIANT PASSENGER DMU's (multiple designs available , but ask about US Railcar's 110 Mph PRIIA compatible concept) WOULD WORK MOST ECONOMICALLY IF RIDERSHIP DEMAND IS LOW ON SOME RUNS? (WE ALREADY KNOW THE ANSWER IS "YES, MUCH MORE ECONOMICALLY! (like 3-miles-per-gallon instead of a locomotive's 3-gallons-per-mile"), & ii) IF A SELF-PROPELLED DIESEL RAILCAR (can be ordered with up to 800 hp- as much horsepower as a small switch engine) MIGHT BE USED AS AN IN-TRAIN HELPER AT THE REAR OF LONGER COACHELLA TRAINS- FOR DISTRIBUTED POWER TO CONTINUE THE TRAIN EAST OF INDIO...? 4. FINALLY, CALL FOR OVERHEAD ELECTRIFICATION ON TRANSCONTINENTAL ROUTES (THE SUNSET LIMITED IS ONE OF THEM), SUSTAINABLY-POWERED (BUILD THOSE TRACKSIDE WINDMILLS IN "THE PASS" AREA, AS SHOWN IN THE LOGO- make it real!); OVERHEAD ELECTRIC IS THE ABSOLUTE BEST FOR HIGH-SPEED RUNNING &	

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	PULLING-POWER ON A HELPER DISTRICT)... & RPS' BATTERY ZEBL's CAN STILL BE USED AS HELPERS!	
I-254-8	58. CONNECTING TRANSIT TO GET PALM SPRINGS' RECREATIONAL MARKET IS ESSENTIAL! FOR THOSE NOT INTO THE DOWNTOWN PALM SPRINGS SCENE, the arrival of Coachella Train passengers will give Sunline Transit the incentive to connect to the Palm Springs Aerial Tram... Sunline buses must go to/from the Train station; Sunline Rte. 4 is closest short line, but needs to extend southwest from Ramon straight across Palm Canyon where it becomes Tram Way, a 3.5 miles driveway to the Tram's base station. The Tram expects you to ONLY come by car (/taxi) as its shuttlebuses to only serve loopy car parking lots at the west end of their driveway. As they go to Indio, Sunline Rte's. 1 (& 1X) serve a larger area. Whatever route it's attached to (in the name of maximizing 1-seat rides) Tram departures are on the half hour, so Sunline should match that! But this service should end within half an hour of the 1st & last Tram, since there's no other destination/ nothing else to do on Tram Way except for taggers, vandals, & thieves.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 1 (Program Purpose and Need), the Program's Purpose is to implement a safe, reliable, and convenient intercity passenger rail service in the Program Corridor with the capability to meet the future mobility needs of residents, businesses, and visitors. Please refer to Master Response 10, which provides a discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
I-254-9	SC. AN EXTENSION OF SUNLINE ROUTES TO THE EASTERN END OF CIVIC CENTER WAY INTO THE INDIO TRANSIT STATION ("INO" in Amtrak-lingo) IS ESSENTIAL.	Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion of transportation connections within the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
I-254-10	THIS STATION'S BLISTERING PARKING LOT SHOULD BE COMPLETELY SHADED WITH SOLAR PANELS FOR SUNLINE'S ELECTRIC BUS RECHARGING , & POWERING A LARGER STAFFED STATION BUILDING .	As stated throughout the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, none of the components evaluated at the Tier 1/Program level include exact design/engineering plans. Upon completion of the SDP and the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR process, the location of specific infrastructure improvements needed (such as site-specific station locations, grade crossing locations, and station design) would be refined through public input received during the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR process, additional engineering analysis, and further coordination with agencies, organizations, and the public as part of subsequent Tier 2/Project- level environmental analyses. Additionally, as described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.5 (Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases), and per Mitigation Strategy GHG-2, during Tier 2/Project-level analysis, an operational energy conservation plan shall be required for the specific rail infrastructure or station facility proposed.
I-254-11	AT ALL STATIONS ON THE LINE- BUT PARTICULARLY THIS ONE- PAVING SHOULD BE RECONFIGURED TO PRIORITIZE BUS EFFICIENCY WITH BUSBAYS PARRALLEL & RIGHT NEXT TO TRACKS TO PRIORITIZE "CROSSPLATFORM TRANSFERS"! ... Bike facilities should be close-by... with car drivers, whose mode is least efficient, sent to park furthest away from train platforms!	Please refer to Master Response 2, which provides discussion on the conceptual nature of the Build Alternative Options components as described in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, and Master Response 10, which provides a discussion on local transportation connection considerations within the Program Corridor at the Tier 1/-Program level.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
I-254-12	By reaching the same endpoints as more than 1 station on the rail line, a bus can become the "rail emulator" anytime buses run that trains don't. Covid-impacted Sunline's Route 10, designed to be a rail emulator complimenting Metrolink, will connect even farther to the west... But Sunline Route 1 and/or 1X (Express) needs to be stretched north of Downtown Palm Springs (Palm Canyon x Taquitz) WORKING TOGETHER with buses reaching intermediary points the train doesn't, & the Coachella train reaching much further destinations beyond the buses' service area, they extend each other's range & feed each other passengers .	Please refer to Master Response 2, which provides discussion on the conceptual nature of the Build Alternative Options components as described in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, and Master Response 10, which provides a discussion on local transit connection considerations within the Program Corridor at the Tier 1/-Program level.
I-254-13	I don't understand any NEED for trains to stop a short distance southeast of Indio station? (there IS straighter track there... still...) Moving the crowds off Metrolink trains to Coachella/ Stagecoach/ other festivals must be organized by a charter bus company (like CoachUSA) to bridge the gap, since the Empire Polo Club (Madison-Ave 49-Monroe-Ave 52) is far off the tracks & a bit south of east-west Sunline routes. Riverside's County Fair/ Date Festival Ground (Arabia-111-Oasis-Dr. Carreon) is already covered/ handled by Sunline routes. But why should it be necessary to stop the Coachella trains somewhere south of the downtown Indio Station ("100" in Amtrak-Thruway lingo)?	Please refer to Master Response 1 for a discussion on proposed station locations and Master Response 10 for a discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
I-254-14	50. THERE IS A TEMPLATE FOR AN OPTIONAL COACHELLA/ STAGECOACH FESTIVAL STATION (WITH INFRASTRUCTURE NOT NEAR THE TRACKS, REQUIRING BUSING); IT'S FOUND AT METROLINK'S LA COUNTY FAIR PLATFORM IN POMONA; IT SITS THERE ALL YEAR , BUT DUE TO THE PROXIMITY OF OTHER STATIONS, ONLY OPERATES LIKE A FLAG STOP WITH	For purposes of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis, it was assumed that Amtrak would operate the proposed passenger rail service within the Program Corridor. The proposed stations within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor would be permanent stops. The provision of temporary “flag stop” stations is not feasible with the proposed

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	STOPS FOR PASSENGERS GOING TO THE COUNTY FAIR.. for some reason, it's seldom used for other large events (drag racing at the Pomona Racetrack, outdoor shows in fairground parking lots) besides the County Fair.	passenger rail service within the Program Corridor as currently envisioned for Tier 1/Program-level analysis.
I-254-15	LET'S GET THIS ENTIRE PROJECT FAST-TRACKED & DONE ASAP! & GET OUT OF THE WAY OF PROGRESS!; THIS IS NOT THE LAST OR ONLY AMTRAK TRAIN NEEDED! WHY CAN'T FRA & RCTC TRY TO FAST-FORWARD AT LEAST 1 YEAR OR 2 OUT OF THIS TURTLE-SLOW PROCESS? 6A. MULTIPLE OTHER RAIL ROUTES NEED IMPLEMENTATION & GREENING-UP BY YESTERDAY! Incremental improvements can come later; the hot breath of Global Warming Control's Expiration Date (DeCarbonize-By-2030) is on our necks! 68. ON A GLOBAL WARMING EMERGENCY BASIS, FRA & RCTC must focus on the goal of beginning service NOW zeroing-out all BUDGET-SUCKING, TIMEWASTING INFRASTRUCTURE CHANGES (NO TO ALL GRADE SEPERATIONS, YES TO BUILDING SIDINGS NOW, LONG ENOUGH FOR THE COACHELLA TRAIN TO PASS BY ONCOMING FREIGHTS AT CHOKE POINTS WITHOUT STOPPING)!	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 1 (Program Purpose and Need), the Program's Purpose is to implement a safe, reliable, and convenient intercity passenger rail service in the Program Corridor with the capability to meet the future mobility needs of residents, businesses, and visitors. Environmental review is required for this Program pursuant to federal and state laws to adequately evaluate and disclose the potential environmental consequences of the Program and ensure that a proposed passenger rail service can be implemented safely and reliably Please refer to Master Response 11 for a discussion on the utilization of green technology within the Program Corridor as it relates to the Tier 1/Program-level evaluation.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-255 (Bruce Campbell)		
I-255-1	1.I strongly favor the Downtown L.A. Union Station to Indio route, and urge that this L.A. to Indio route be a "fast-track" priority- both literally and figuratively. I prefer that speeds be limited to 110 to 120 MPH;	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), maximum authorized passenger train speed in the Western Section of the Program Corridor is 79 miles per hour west of Fullerton and 60 miles per hour east of Fullerton. In the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor, passenger trains have maximum authorized speeds ranging between 30 and 70 miles per hour with the average maximum authorized speed identified as being 59 miles per hour.
I-255-2	2.Please study the (very obvious to me) viability of a Downtown L.A. Union Station to Indio to Phoenix, Arizona, route which would clearly have financial viability since Phoenix is not only the 5th largest city in the USA, but is an hour and a half from an Amtrak station.	Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion on transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.
I-255-3	3.One excellent reason to choose that L.A. to Indio route is that it would be a lot more timely and less complicated because the proposed route through Fullerton and Riverside would involve DIFFERENT FREIGHT RAILROAD OISPATCHERS at DIVISION POINT BOUNDARIES - if one goes to the trouble to have this route and to have the train run at fairly high speeds, why would one choose the route which faces major delays because, as you are likely well aware, FREIGHT TRAINS HAVE PRIORITY OVER PASSENGER TRAINS in the USA?!? (Addition of July 5th: I have just been informed that actually passenger trains are supposed to have priority over freight trains but Congress has never enforced it	Please refer to Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives) of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, which provides a detailed explanation of the Program Corridor alternatives analyses and route selection process and Master Response 5 for a discussion of Program implementation. Pursuant to 49 U.S. Code, Section 24308(c), except in an emergency, intercity and commuter rail passenger transportation provided by or for Amtrak has preference over freight transportation in using a rail line, junction, or crossing unless the Board orders otherwise.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	so the freight operators instead favor freight trains. SO INSIST THAT THE RULES BE ENFORCED - Passengers First!)	
I-255-4	4.Given the reasonably steady proposed route, rather than having numerous starts and stops, it may well be wise to acquire EMD F-125 diesel locomotives for the project, so please study this option; 5.Please seek to convince Rail Propulsion Systems of Fullerton to switch to cleaner fuel while also seeking to store (in battery or fuel cell) "regenerative braking energy" to help power the trains; 6.Please also evaluate the possibility of overhead electrification on each of the routes proposed; and	Please refer to Master Response 11 for a discussion on locomotive technology.
I-255-5	7. It would make sense to extend SUNSHINE RT. 1 or RAPID RT. 1X to Amtrak's train station in Palm Springs (unless you want walking passengers perishing from hear while walking between stations).	Please refer to Master Response 10, which provides discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.

Table 1-7. Response to Verbal Comments on the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Received During the Public Hearings

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-256 (Brian Yanity)		
I-256-1	Hi, my name is Brian Yanity, and I am Vice President South of the Railroad Passenger Association of California and Nevada or RailPAC, and thank you again for this opportunity to give comments this evening on the Coachella Valley Tier 1 program EIS/EIR, Coachella Valley Rail, I should say. RailPAC is a 501C3 volunteer group of railroad professionals and advocates that have campaigned for improved personal mobility in California and the west since 1978. RailPAC applauds the efforts to advance additional intercity rail services in the Los Angeles Union Station and Coachella Valley, and it has long been a goal of our organization, the California State Rail Plan and many in Riverside County, and we recognize this is a Tier 1 program EIS/EIR, which is one step of a multi-phase-iterative process, and details such as passenger station locations and so forth will be evaluated the next phase; however, RailPAC wants to emphasize how this project can open the door for future projects and goals much greater than the proposed or evaluated Tier 1 passenger rail service option of two daily rounds trips between Los Angeles Union Station and Coachella Valley.	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 6 for a discussion on the Program proposed trip frequency.
I-256-2	RailPAC fully supports the main feature of the preferred bill alternative option 1, which is construction of a new third mainline track 76 miles long along Union Pacific Railroad along the existing Yuma subdivision between Colton and Coachella.·	Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would include a new third mainline track from Colton to the Coachella Valley along UPRR's existing Yuma subdivision.
I-256-3	Given the capital costs of the third mainline track proposed from Colton to the Coachella Valley, RailPAC wants to emphasize a variety	Please refer to Master Response 3 for a discussion of freight rail volumes, Master Response 6 for a discussion on the Program's proposed

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	of benefits to passenger and freight rails that are possible with this investment additional track capacity. Any proposed service in the Coachella Valley Rail Corridor and capital improvements associated with it must be a building block for future expansion, and I am just going to briefly list a few initiatives that would also benefit from this investment and add significant public value to any capital grant request for a Colton Coachella third mainline track and perhaps we should evaluate them in the Tier 2 of EIR, that's greater frequency than proposed – greater frequency, like much more than two round trips a day, maybe 6 or 12 preferably with higher speeds, a daily Amtrak sunset limited, which has long been a of our organization, and also many in Riverside County benefit the Union Pacific Freight rail. With the new third track, UP can run a lot or conventional freight trains, along with short-haul and medium-haul trains to get trucks off I-10. The new California-Arizona passenger service that Amtrack has proposed, extension to the Imperial Valley as proposed by RCTC's 1991 study that's down to Coachella – or sorry, to El Centro, Calexico, and I guess that's the end of my three minutes. Thank you very much."	service frequency, and Master Response 10 for a discussion on transportation connections within and outside of the Program Corridor.
Comment I-257 (Reed Alvarado)		
I-257-1	My name is Reed Alvarado. I am a resident of Palm Springs, and actually a car-free resident of Palm Springs. I am a frequent user of Amtrak's current three-way bus service to Fullerton, and I understand the that the interest -- which makes a lot of sense for RCTC -- to want to serve Riverside. That being said, I think it is incredibly important that in the next EIR, there is a specific plan outlined that expands on the dedicated shuttle comment, and hopefully improved access either through BRT or what have you to the SB line or the Arrow Rail for	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 10 for discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	faster and more convenient access to Metrolink and the Inland Empire.	
I-257-2	I also wanted to support Margo's comment about a mid-valley station. As we know in Palm Springs, the current station is located in a very desolate area, and Agua Caliente, SunLine Transit Agency, CSUSBPD are all areas that are served in the Mid-Valley area. I just wanted to echo that support for a Mid-Valley Station option, and, you know, coordinate with the local transit agency in the future for added connections for people once they get off that line, and finally I wanted to just support the previous comment for a full corridor third track for increased frequency.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Mid-Valley Area which encompasses the communities of Cathedral City, Thousand Palms, the Agua Caliente Casino area, Rancho Mirage, and Palm Desert. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies and Master Response 10, which provides a discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
I-257-3	As we all know, two daily round trips won't suffice the desire to be able to live in this region car-fee and access the second largest city in the country, but it is a great starting point, and I fully support this project, and I just wanted to see more car-free transit options and accessibility for the Coachella Valley. Thank you very much.	Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley. Please refer to Master Response 6 for a discussion on the Program's proposed service frequency.
Comment I-258 (Anthony Tristan)		
I-258-1	I am a long term resident of the Coachella Valley, but I have also lived in Orange County, LA, and the San Francisco Bay Area, and I have	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	had the opportunity of taking the BART, which is very convenient from Berkeley to San Francisco state. I am an educator from Palm Springs Unified School District, and I am very excited to know this is finally being talked about. I mean, considering Walt Disney had the first monorail in the western hemisphere back in the 60s. I did commute recently a couple years ago to USC three or four times a day -- I mean three or four time as week for my Master's in public administration, and prior to that in the early 2000s, I had to commute to Cal State Long Beach, so I am very excited that a rail system is going to be implemented hopefully soon. It is much needed, especially since Palm Springs has been a destination since the 20s, and I worked at a place in Desert Hot Springs where supposedly Al Capone was visiting in the 20s, so this place has been well known for people coming from LA, and I think it is long overdue. Japan has been building monorails since the 1960s.· I am grateful that you guys are working on this. I appreciate it. Thank you for allowing me to comment.	passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-259 (Peter Green)		
I-259-1	I am Peter Green. I am a resident of Palm Desert. I support the proposal.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-259-2	I would like to reiterate that besides having a station at Bob Hope, I would hope they would consider a station in University Park where the proposed Cal State campus is going. Across from that, there is a 100 -- or a 10,000-seat arena being built as we speak, and the Seattle Kraken Minor League team will be based there.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Mid-Valley Area which encompasses the communities of Cathedral City, Thousand Palms, the Agua Caliente Casino area, Rancho Mirage, and Palm Desert. Preparation of Tier

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
I-259-3	Also, I would like to see in the final report if additional trains could be provided for special events like Coachella or athletic events or other things.	Please refer to Master Response 6 for a discussion on the Program's proposed service frequency.
I-259-4	My other concern, which I also put in writing is I believe that the North Palm Desert residents will want either a sound wall or some other mitigation like landscaping for additional rail noise. They are already upset about the rail noise as it is. But, again, I support the project and thank you for your time.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.6 (Noise and Vibration), Mitigation Strategies NOI-1 through NOI-2 call for additional site-specific noise and vibration assessments to analyze and identify impacts to noise sensitive land uses and how those impacts would be addressed (e.g. siting of equipment, provision of noise-attenuating features) in coordination with the local jurisdiction in which the infrastructure improvements would be constructed. These site-specific impacts and mitigation measures would be further identified as part of the Tier 2/Project-level environmental review process.
Comment I-260 (Timothy Papandreou)		
I-260-1	Thank you. My name is Timothy Papandreou. I am a resident of Palm Springs, and I am a transportation planner. As well, so I really applaud the efforts to try to get this corridor under way. Let's figure out how to get this expedited to get this service from LA to this area as quickly as possible. I do want to highlight two things.	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies. Please also refer to Master Response 2, which provides a discussion on the conceptual nature of the Build Alternative Option components, and Master Response 10, which provides a discussion on transit connections within and outside of the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	One is that we want to make sure that the access to and from stations really look at the surrounding street designs focusing on making sure there are prioritized areas for bicycles and transit bus access. We also want to mention that in Palm Springs their recent climate action work has basically identified that regional trips are growing much faster than they can handle, which is increasing their carbon footprint impact. So this is a regional corridor with regional trips reduction prospects, but only if they are really connected to the areas that they serve, so I really want to see much stronger connections with the street design from the tourism stations, the transit access, the bicycle access with parking, and more interoperability designed for how it links in with the Metrolink system, but, overall, I think this is fantastic, and I am so glad you guys are moving forward in this. Thank you.	
Comment I-261 (Barbara DoCouto)		
I-261-1	Hi, my name is Barbara DoCouto, and I am so excited about this transaction that is being done. I have lived here in Sun Lakes for 21 years, and the last 16 years, like I said, I take the train every weekend in the summer because I am originally from Rhode Island, and I miss the ocean, and I drive down to the Riverside downtown station and do that every weekend.	Thank you for your comments. The comment does not contain questions associated with the environmental analyses or conclusions contained within the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR.
I-261-2	Unfortunately we have had a lot of mishaps, like a lot of trains having to be stopped because of people trying to commit suicide and all, and I don't know if there is anything that can be done about that. That is very discouraging, which I have sometimes had to come home late at night, but I am so happy that this is being done. I have been talking	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.15 (Safety and Security), rail operators and transit system providers along the Program Corridor currently coordinate with local police departments for safety and security presence onboard trains and at stations; consider safety improvement projects such as track and signal upgrades, gate and

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	about it to the conductors every time I go on the train. I am going to be 80 years old in August, and I don't know how long I can be driving down to the Riverside station.	warning systems, and grade separations that eliminate hazards at at-grade crossing; and engage in public awareness campaigns designed to educate the public about the risks of trespassing on railroad property. It is anticipated that operation of the two daily round trips on passenger trains within the Eastern Section would require the additional passenger trains to operate in accordance with standard operating procedures, operator rules, and rail emergency plans.
I-261-3	Me living in Banning, it would be so convenient for me to get my beach bag on that train and hop on and get off really quickly, and I appreciate all of the work that you folks are doing, and we really, really need it in this area because Banning and Beaumont area is really growing and there is a lot of senior communities here, and this would be so convenient for the elderly to get on a train to go to LA to concerts or go to a ball game, and we so appreciate what you guys are doing, and good luck in your endeavor. Thank you for listening to me.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Pass Area which encompasses the communities of Beaumont, Banning, and Cabazon. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
Comment I-262 (Margo Bell)		
I-262-1	Well, I just commented on the Palm Springs station as is, which is terrible, and a lot of people don't even know it is there, but another gentleman also commented on that, so I think we have looked at that issue that we certainly need something better than what is there that most people don't know about. And I do like that place at Bob Hope Drive at the corner, near Agua Caliente, but the other place near the	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	college, I think that is on Cook Street, that's an excellent spot too, but I think they were keeping that for further expansion and for parking places for the college, which is going to grow and grow.	selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
I-262-2	I have nothing more to say except that I am excited about this wonderful train. I think you are doing a great job, and I am so glad that Donna Reed a representative for Indian Wells is spearheading it here and getting us all excited about it in Indian Wells. Thank you, Donna. Good bye.	Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
Comment I-263 (Lisa Middleton)		
I-263-1	Thank you. I am Lisa Middleton, member of Palm Springs City Council, as well as member of the Riverside County Transportation Commission. All of us in Palm Springs are very well aware of the need for improvement of the Palm Springs train station. I can tell you that council will look very enthusiastically at making those improvements as we progress toward achieving the kind of train service that is being envisioned here this evening. Thank you.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would result in station improvements at the existing Palm Springs station.
Comment I-264 (Gary Levin)		
I-264-1	Good afternoon, this is Gary Levin. I live in Riverside. I have spent quite a bit of time living in the desert for about 10 years, and I think this is a great idea. It is quite ambitious. I am sure there are a lot of hurdles to get over. Living in the Coachella Valley sort of is a different experience. It is a different environment, a different community. You do feel cut off from the rest of Southern California at times, but I think this is a great idea because I think it will help with the people that feel	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	isolated out there. It will certainly help senior citizens to get back and forth.	
I-264-2	I agree with the comment about where the train stations are located. That has to be a critical thing. One thing I think we have to consider is how much growth there will be for the next 25 to 100 years. Palm Springs used to be isolated. Now there is a lot of commercial educational going up along the I-10 railroad corridor. There were a couple other things I wanted to comment on. Oh, I wonder how much support you are getting from our elected state representatives in this endeavor, and that's about it.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies. During the outreach process, the lead agencies, which include FRA, Caltrans, and RCTC, engaged the public (i.e., citizens, elected officials, and key stakeholders), as well as local, state, tribal, and federal agencies during the early stages of the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR evaluation. During outreach efforts, a technical advisory committee was formed for the Program, which included SCAG. SCAG is the nation's largest metropolitan planning organization, representing six counties, 191 cities, and more than 19 million residents in Southern California and undertakes a variety of planning and policy initiatives to encourage a more sustainable Southern California. As part of this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, additional input on the Program from San Bernardino County Transportation Agency, San Bernardino County, City of Redlands, City of Colton, and others from San Bernardino has been received and will be taken into consideration during subsequent Tier 2/Project-level environmental documentation. Please refer to Master Response 5, which provides a discussion associated with Program implementation.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-265 (Brian Yanity)		
I-265-1	I won't take too much time on the second comment, but an additional thing we wanted to comment on, we being RailPAC, the Rail Passenger Association of California and Nevada. When it comes to noise and vibration of the passenger rail operations, at least one speaker brought that up earlier and in relation to section 3.6, that is mitigation strategy LU3, Land Use Consistency in the draft EIR documents, RailPAC recommends that sound walls and sound dampening ballast in the rail beds should be implemented where the track passes close to residential area. I think someone mentioned north Palm Springs.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.6 (Noise and Vibration), Mitigation Strategies NOI-1 through NOI-2 call for additional site-specific noise and vibration assessments to analyze and identify impacts to noise sensitive land uses and how those impacts would be addressed (e.g. siting of equipment, provision of noise-attenuating features) in coordination with the local jurisdiction in which the infrastructure improvements would be constructed. These site-specific impacts and mitigation measures would be further identified as part of the Tier 2/Project-level environmental review process.
I-265-2	We were also thinking the Loma Linda area. And then on the station location, one comment we had about the Cabazon station, so far in the Tier 1 EIS/EIR, it was identified Beaumont/ Banning/ Cabazon as a single station opportunity, or at least a single, kind of, a long, you know, corridor along the map; however, we believe there is enough reasons to explore two stations, one for Beaumont and Banning and the other specifically for Cabazon. There are several attractions located specifically at Cabazon, which merit a stop. I think we all know what those are. However, it is somewhat disconnected from Beaumont and Banning, so I would likely see more commuter traffic in Beaumont and Banning versus tourist to Cabazon, and we are trying to force either group to use one or the other station for an entire area will depress ridership from both, so I think we should have two stations in that area. Thank you.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-266(Genevieve Judge)		
I-266-1	Oh, okay. I just have a question. I just want to send this information to other people in other counties that might be impacted, Orange County specifically. Is there a place where I can get a copy of this presentation that you gave, the one we just saw and the one we went through previously? I am very excited about this. I have often wondered why we don't have rail service between here and LA. I live in Palm Desert. So is it possible to get this to send to somebody and prep them for the next meeting?	Thank you for your comments. All Program materials, including public hearing presentations, are available on the RCTC Program webpage: https://www.rctc.org/projects/coachella-valley-san-gorgonio-pass-corridor-rail-corridor-service-project/.
Comment I-267 (Dan Wentzel)		
I-267-1	Good morning. I wanted to thank you for this great presentation. I understand the project a lot better now, and I fully support it. I -- if I could make one recommendation, it is that it would have a longer same-day turn-around time in Los Angeles, if that is possible, instead of three hours, maybe four or five hours.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), there are existing shared use agreements for available passenger train slots within the Western Section on the Program Corridor. Under these existing agreements, RCTC has the ability to commit four available train slots between LAUS and Colton for the proposed passenger rail service without constructing additional rail capacity improvement projects in the Western Section. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative and is an important step towards building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the foundation of an improved passenger rail system within the Program Corridor.
I-267-2	Other than that, I think the project should be built in such a way that it allows for further extensions to, as was stated, to Yuma, Phoenix or to Imperial County, El Centro, Calexico, Mexicali, and should allow for more frequency. I think this is going to be a very, very popular service, and I am excited about it, and I look forward to riding it.	Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation and Master Response 10 for a discussion of transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
I-267-3	So thank you very much for your time, and it -- I would like to be able to -- that discussion of why it is Amtrak rather than Metrolink, if someone could provide a link to that, I would love to be able to get to that. I get asked that question a lot when I get asked about this project, and it has to do with funding. I would love to have a link to read that and understand that more fully. Thank you."	The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR and other Program materials can be found on RCTC's website: https://www.rctc.org/projects/coachella-valley-san-gorgonio-pass-corridor-rail-corridor-service-project/. Please refer to Master Response 5 for a discussion on Program implementation.
Comment I-268 (Tom Liebman)		
I-268-1	Yes. Good morning, everybody. Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment. My name is Todd Liebman, and I am the president of All Aboard Arizona. We are a non-profit group here in Arizona that advocates for improved passenger rail in Arizona and throughout the southwest. I just wanted to express our whole-hearted support, of course, for your program and your looking at this. It was an excellent presentation, and I appreciate it.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley.
I-268-2	We would like to advocate, though, that you not forget about one of our top priorities, which is the Daily Sunset Limited. Some of the question – comments and questions have centered on the fact that obviously getting the same-day return from LA would be nice. Well, the Sunset Limited on its current schedule leaves late in the evening, so that would help to accommodate that at least with -- perhaps, you know, two stops at least, maybe three stops along the route.· Obviously, Amtrak's working towards service improvement. Going beyond the Daily Sunset, which is really a major priority, and I would urge you not to lose sight of that because that would really increase your mobility in the corridor without the additional operating expense, …but, also, we feel it is very important to keep extensions to	Please refer to Master Response 6 for a discussion on train trip frequency and Master Response 10 for discussion on transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	Yuma, Phoenix and Tucson in the mix. And one of the reasons we are so supportive of your project is because that would allow that to really come to fruition. Again, it was mentioned in the frequency. I think your two roundtrips add to a -- several – couple of roundtrips, perhaps to Tucson, Phoenix, Yuma, would really increase service in the corridor, and we feel there are a lot of Arizona travelers that would be traveling to the Coachella Valley, and this would be a tremendous opportunity to link one of the country's largest metropolitan areas and a large metropolitan in the form of Tucson and Phoenix to LA and also the Coachella Valley region. Again, we are wholeheartedly supportive. We would like to see the schedule moved up faster to get the service going as quickly as possible, and extensions. Thank you for the opportunity to comment this morning, and I wish you all the success with your project. Thank you.	
Comment I-269 (Brian Yanity)		
I-269-1	"Hello. Good morning, everyone. Thank you again for this presentation, and, of course, the opportunity for us to speak. My name is Brian Yanity. I am vice president south of the Rail Passenger Association of California and Nevada or RailPAC. RailPAC is a 501(c)(3) volunteer group of railroad professionals and advocates that has campaigned for improved mobility and improved passenger rail in particular in California and Nevada since 1978. I will -- wanted to follow up on what my colleague at All Aboard Arizona, Todd Liebman, just said about keeping the Sunset Limited on the radar for this project, even though we do recognize that, you know, Amtrak	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 10 for discussion on transportation connections within and outside the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	negotiations with UP are technically separate from RCTC and FRA's negotiations on the Coachella Valley Rail Service, but the reality is they would be using the same infrastructure, and the same Daily Sunset Limited as Todd mentioned could compliment the Regional East Coachella Valley Rail Service very well. Around the country one of the markets that are served by a long distance train, like the Sunset Limited, are shorter distanced trips within that corridor.· For example, the Sunset Limited could add extra schedules off peak for someone with a roundtrip ticket going through the Coachella Valley during the day, and then they can go back to LA late at night or vice versa on the Sunset Limited, because people complain about the Sunset Limited stopping in Palm Springs between 12:30 and 2:00 in the morning or 5:00 in the morning if it is late. But that could actually be an advantage if you are complimenting service during more quote/unquote bankers hours that the Coachella Valley rail could be doing.	
I-269-2	But back to really the focus of this EIR, RailPAC fully supports the main feature of the preferred option, build alternative option 1, and that is construction of a new third mainline track from 76 miles – with 76 miles in length from Colton to Coachella Valley along the Union Pacific Railroad's existing Yuma subdivision.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would include a new third mainline track from Colton to the Coachella Valley along UPRR's existing Yuma subdivision.
I-269-3	You know, we would like it to be more, of course – more passenger track everywhere, that's our organization's position, but we do think this is a good start, and we want this record and decision to happen soon, that way we can get building and to doing extensions to it, like the greater frequency and speed people are desiring, more than two partnerships a day and faster service, which we hope will be planned for. Along with that, back to Arizona service, yes, RailPAC also fully	Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion on transportation connections within and outside of the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	supports regional trains, and Amtrak has recently proposed between Tucson, Phoenix, Yuma, Coachella Valley, and LA on top of this Coachella Valley Rail Service and on top of the Daily Sunset and we fully support an Imperial Valley extension to Calexico. Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment."	
Comment I-270 (Mariela Loera)		
I-270-1	Hello, I am Mariela. I am a public advocate with Leadership Council, which is a state-wide community based organization. I am based in the Coachella Valley, and most of our work focuses on the unincorporated communities in the Coachella Valley, like Thermal and Mecca.· I am very excited to see a project like this. It is very exciting to see transportation being expanded to those unincorporated communities who have a very hard time reaching those areas. So that's very exciting. And like the previous comment, I also think the Option 1 is the best option.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley and offer an alternative mode of transportation to communities in the Coachella Valley.
I-270-2	So in regard to the service, fully supportive of this project, very excited to see it being planned. I am aware the comment is only for the service, but I do want to mention the importance of considering green and zero-emission technology, at least at the station in Coachella Valley, because as your EIR mentioned, these communities are very vulnerable and already have a lot of pollution in the area, especially from the Salton Sea. That would be a very important feature to keep in mind. But fully supportive and excited for this project. Thank you.	Please refer to Master Response 11, which provides discussion on locomotive technology, and Master Response 12, which provides a discussion on environmental justice communities.
Comment I-271 (Tom Tokeim)		
I-271-1	I am Tom Tokeim. I live in Rancho Mirage, middle of the Coachella Valley, and I think it is important to have a mid valley station and be	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	very convenient. The Amtrak station in Palm Springs is somewhat removed. It is three or four miles from downtown. It is got some safety issues depending upon time of day and weather issues. I really think that a mid valley location in Palm Desert would be most functional. There is a new 11,000-seat arena approved and started in development off Cook Street, and it will host a Minor League Hockey team, and there will be concerts and other events, you know, totaling about 150 a year from what they have said. And so, you know, being able to get on and off the train and get to them, it would be more convenient. There is also hotels, two or three hotels off of Cook Street, and it is near the university, the Cal State San Bernardino Palm Desert campus and the UC Riverside campus. So I think that it is a safe area and there is adequate parking. I think it would be very functional. I think a lot of people would utilize it there, so hopefully that will be taken into consideration when sites are looked at. Thank you for having this presentation, it has been very helpful for me.	Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Mid-Valley Area which encompasses the communities of Cathedral City, Thousand Palms, the Agua Caliente Casino area, Rancho Mirage, and Palm Desert. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
Comment I-272 (Heather Ross)		
I-272-1	Hi, my name is Heather Ross. I want to follow-up regarding the other two questions I have posed that have not been answered. The first is with regard to the I-10 having originally been designed to have a train corridor included, and has this not been investigated as an option.	Thank you for your comments. As illustrated in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Figures ES-2 and ES-3, the majority of the Build Alternative Option alignment within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor follows the I-10 corridor. In addition, as described in the Executive Summary of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, the proposed third main line track would be constructed primarily within the existing UPRR ROW, which also generally follows the I-10 corridor. Please refer to Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), which provides a detailed explanation of the Program Corridor alternatives analyses and route selection process.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
I-272-2	And the other question is with regard to the Ontario Airport Hyperloop development. Has this also been considered as a transportation link to Palm Springs and Los Angeles?	Please refer to Master Response 10 for discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor, including an explanation of why a station at Ontario International Airport (and hyperloop development) did not meet the Program's Purpose and Need, and, as such, was eliminated from further consideration as part of this Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR analysis.
Comment I-273 (Ian Stewart)		
I-273-1	My name is Ian Stewart. I am president of Rail Propulsion Systems. I want to make sure I stay on the scope of this meeting and give our support as the Option 1 that has been supported by some of the other speakers, and I want to show our support for the expansion of passenger rail on all forms, be it our focus, which is commuter rail and improving metropolitan areas, and its interface with the larger projects and interstate projects such as this one.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley.
I-273-2	Thank you all for your efforts, and if there is anything we can do to support zero-emissions locomotives in any of these projects, we are more than happy to do so and speak with you about it. Thank you for your time.	Please refer to Master Response 11 for a discussion on locomotive technology.

Table 1-8. Response to Written Comments on the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Received After the Public Review Period

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Individual		
Comment I-274 (Warren Palmer)		
I-274-1	I AM A RETIRED SANTA FE RAILWAY EMPLOYEE LIVING IN LA QUINTA CA AND FULLY SUPPORT THE IDEA OF RAIL SERVICE BETWEEN THE COACHELLA VALLEY AND LOS ANGELES. AS IT WOULD ENORMOUSLY INCREASE PASSENGER TRAVEL AND COMMERCE FROM INDIO TO LOS ANGELES FOR YEARS TO COME.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-275 (John Harris)		
I-275-1	I am just a bit confused, is this going to be a high speed railway project?? Because if not, it is concerning how fast the train will travel and how long it will shorten the time compared to car travel from Palm Springs to Riverside. I was looking forward to this, thinking it will be a high speed train. I would just like to know how many mph the train plans to travel. Thank you.	Thank you for your comments. The proposed passenger rail service envisioned as part of the Program is not a part of the efforts currently being undertaken by CHSRA and would not be considered an HSR project. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives), maximum authorized passenger train speed in the Western Section of the Program Corridor is 79 miles per hour west of Fullerton and 60 miles per hour east of Fullerton. In the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor, passenger trains have maximum authorized speeds ranging between 30 and 70 miles per hour with the average maximum authorized speed identified as being 59 miles per hour. Please refer to Master Response 7 for a discussion on the Program's proposed train trip duration.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-276 (Howard Hoffenberg)		
I-276-1	To bring in tourist, the money is better spent expanding the Palm Springs airport. The rail line is not consistent with character of the Coachella Valley tourists.	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 1.6.1 (Limited and Constrained Travel Options), while the Program Corridor is served by a transportation system that includes air, highway, transit, and rail modes, few of these alternatives provide regular intercity transportation within the Program Corridor between the Coachella Valley, Inland Empire, and coastal regions of Southern California. In addition, the existing transportation system is constrained due to limited travel alternatives to driving a private vehicle. The Program Corridor currently faces substantial mobility challenges that are likely to continue. Based on population and travel forecasts, as well as the amount of available open land within the Program Corridor, population, employment, and tourism activity is expected to continue to grow in the future; however, opportunities to increase the carrying capacity of the region's roadway and airport network are limited.
Comment I-277 (Richard McCurdy)		
I-277-1	This rail system would greatly benefit all of California as cars will come off the roads and more people will ride trains. We all hate traffic. Bringing in the rail will HELP students get to classes and concert goers to hopefully a Cook street stop where the new 10,000 seat stadium is currently under construction not to mention UC-Riverside located off Cook Street. As well as desert folk who are mostly retirees who would love to get a train and take it to the beaches. This rail line will also relieve congestion for the BPN tennis tourney, Coachella Music fest and well as Stagecoach festival. Please help get this train through. We ALL NEED IT DESPERATELY!!!!	Thank you for your comments. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Mid-Valley Area which encompasses the communities of Cathedral City, Thousand Palms, the Agua Caliente Casino area, Rancho Mirage, and Palm Desert. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
		Please refer to Master Response 1, which provides a detailed explanation of the station location selection process at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies.
Comment I-278 (Jerry Rutledge)		
I-278-1	A train to Palm Springs from Los Angeles is decades overdue. Do it now.	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for daily passenger train service between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-279 (Ross Wittman)		
I-279-1	Good morning. At last night's City Council meeting (7/6/2021), the Redlands City Council approved the submittal of a public comment on behalf of the City for the CVR Project. Upon this approval, which occurred late last night, staff attempted to upload the comment to the site and was unable to do so as the link had been removed prior to midnight. City has submitted a hard copy of the public comment to: Federal Railroad Administration Amanda Ciampolillo, Environmental Protection Specialist 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE Washington, DC 20590 However, we would like to ensure our comment is received. Can you please provide me with a method to submit this letter to ensure it is received and included within public comment?	The comment letter from the City of Redlands has been received and is included as Comment Letter A-09.
Comment I-280 (Esmeralda Sanchez)		
I-280-1	This project would bring a lot of great things for our cities in the Valley, and would bring a lot more entertainment culture. It would also	Thank you for your comments. Build Alternative Option 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, which would provide for an

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	benefit anyone that wants to just explore more cities in a safe and convenient way.	alternative mode of transportation between Los Angeles and the Coachella Valley.
Comment I-281 (Friedrich Bellerman)		
I-281-1	After reading about this project today in the Press Enterprise, I visited your web page. It's nice to see that you posted public hearing dates and times. Too bad you forgot to indicate WHERE they were being held! Please be sure to get that right the next time and request media, such as the PE to publish them.	Thank you for your comments. As described in the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Executive Summary, the noticing provided to the public included notices in various English and Spanish newspapers from the Greater Los Angeles Area to the Inland Empire and Coachella Valley, including the Press Enterprise. In addition, the Notice of Completion/Notice of Availability of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR was published in print and online publications and announced the availability and completion of the Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR, provided the locations where the public could find physical copies of the documents, encouraged public participation, and provided information on the virtual public hearings. The information on the RCTC and FRA websites for the Program contained the same information on the date, time, and location (virtual) for the public hearings. In addition, video recordings from the June 22 and June 26 hearings were posted and are available to the public on RCTC's website: https://www.rctc.org/projects/coachella-valley-san-gorgonio-pass-corridor-rail-corridor-service-project/.
I-281-2	I see that Redlands / Loma Linda may get a station and that's nice because the impending Redlands line will require a non-sensical transfer in San Bernardino for most trips to Union Station. I further note, to my dismay, that your proposal also fails to serve Ontario airport, even though a rail corridor is adjacent. I strongly urge you to consider this.	Please refer to Master Response 1 for discussion on the Program's station location selection screening processes at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies and Master Response 10 for discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-282 (Ken Alan)		
I-282-1	I applaud the effort to bring much needed rail service to the Coachella Valley. However, let's not make the same mistake we usually make with rail transit — putting stations out in the middle of nowhere that require a transfer. When the Bay Area Rapid Transit System (BART) was built in the 1970s, to save costs many of the stations were built in the middle of the freeways (non-destinations) and required some kind of transfer to get to a final destination. Any airline traveler will tell you they prefer non-stop flights because connections dramatically increase the uncertainty and problems with travel. Airline delays can make you miss a flight, luggage gets transferred to the wrong plane or misses the flight, etc. Currently the Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service calls for using the existing AMTRAK station off Indian Canyon Road near I-10. This station is literally out in the middle of nowhere in a high wind, blowing sand area. Indian Canyon is regularly closed due to flooding and the alternative route via Gene Autry adds a good half hour to travel into Palm Springs. There is no overnight parking at this location so riders would have to take some kind of expensive taxi or UBER service to the station. The last time I was out there there were no public phones and no live transit workers. There is no water or food service. It's basically a bus stop in an extremely hostile environment.	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Master Response 1 for discussion on the Program's station location selection screening processes at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies and Master Response 10 for discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.
I-282-2	Safety is going to be a major concern. It will only take one group of thugs coming in a van to hold up a trainload of riders at gunpoint to kill	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 3.15 (Safety and Security), operation of the Program would implement similar safety and security principles and guidelines currently used by rail operators in the

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
	the service. Even so, there's no positive word-of-mouth that will come of using this station as the stopping point for Palm Springs.	Program Corridor. These safety and security principles and guidelines currently include onboard safety and security programs, such as regular safety meetings for front line employees; forward facing camera systems to help aid in accident investigation; and inward facing cameras for onboard security. In addition, rail operators and transit system providers along the Program Corridor currently coordinate with local police departments for safety and security presence onboard trains and at stations.
I-282-3	Indio is not a destination and Coachella is only a destination for the 3 weekends of the music festivals. No doubt those cities are eyeing rail service as a way to attract tourists but the simple fact is there is no tourist draw beyond the seasonal festivals to attract riders.	While the proposed Program would help facilitate increased tourism in the Coachella Valley, it is not the only factor that is being considered. The proposed Program also takes into consideration residents and commuters within the Program Corridor. As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 1 (Program Purpose and Need), the Program is needed to address the absence of effective transportation alternatives to personal automobile travel between coastal regions of Southern California (e.g., Los Angeles and Orange Counties) and cities in the Inland Empire (e.g., City of Riverside) and the Coachella Valley (e.g., Cities of Coachella, Indio, Palm Springs), as well as the projected increase in travel demand in the Program Corridor resulting from population and employment growth and the increasing unreliability of existing transportation systems within the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
I-282-4	For the CVSGPRCS to be successful you must have a destination train staton in the valley. “Destination” meaning the place you get off the train and stay, without having to make any kind of connection. For the reverse travel, desert residents traveling to Union Station in Los Angeles, you must have safe & secure overnight parking. It’s too long a trip for a day trip. So, there’s a rather obvious solution to these problems at hand — build a train station that connects to the Agua Caliente Casino in Rancho Mirage. There is ample secured parking for train raiders and many LA visitors need go no further than the resort to vacation in the valley. Those wishing to venture beyond the resort can find reliable transportation down Bob Hope which, unlike Indian Canyon, has never been closed for flooding or blowing sand. The resort offers food, beverage, shelter and security for train riders. Other amenities, like shopping centers, could be built inside of a train station. To the best of my knowledge all of the area Indian Tribes routinely bus in tourists from Los Angeles to shop at their outlet stores (Cabazon) and play at their casinos. In particular, they target groups that do no drive/don’t have cars. So I would infer the tribes (I’m including Morongo Casino as another destination stop) would see the value of investing in station construction to help realize the train service. I have covered business in the Coachella Valley for over 20 years, so I know what I’m talking about. Please feel free to contact me if you need additional information.	As described in Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Section 2.3 (Alternatives Definition), the Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Study Area for potential station areas allows for a Tier 1/Program-level evaluation that can be used for future station siting purposes within the Eastern Section of the Program Corridor. The Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR identified the development of a potential station within the Mid-Valley Area which encompasses the communities of Cathedral City, Thousand Palms, the Agua Caliente Casino area, Rancho Mirage, and Palm Desert. Preparation of Tier 2/Project-level environmental documents would be required prior to implementation of site-specific infrastructure improvements, including the identification of site-specific station locations. Please refer to Master Response 1 for discussion on the Program’s station location selection screening processes at the Tier 1/Program level and subsequent Tier 2/Project-level studies. Please refer to Response I-282-2 for a discussion on rail station safety, Master Response 7 for a discussion of train trip durations, and Master Response 10 for discussion on transportation connections within the Program Corridor.

Comment Number	Comment	Response to Comment
Comment I-283 (Jeffrey Mihalik)		
I-283-1	Why are only two round trips a day being considered? Shouldn't the alternatives analysis include 4, 8, 16, even 20 trips a day? More people will ride if they have more times to choose from and will still have an option if they miss the first train or it doesn't leave at quite the right time. In places where trains are popular, intercity trains commonly leave once an hour. As it is, I'm afraid you will spend a lot of money on a project no one will use because it is too inconvenient.	Please refer to Master Response 6, which provides a discussion on the Program's proposed service frequency.
I-283-2	I also question the decision to avoid the San Bernardino Metrolink line in favor of routing via Fullerton. The San Bernardino Metrolink link route would produce much faster trip times. Higher speeds are important and will produce much larger ridership.	Draft Tier 1/Program EIS/EIR Chapter 2 (Program Alternatives) provides a summary of the alternative analysis, which documented the decision process of route alignments within the Program Corridor. Please refer to Master Response 7 for train trip durations and existing train speed constraints within the Program Corridor.