

2004 Draft EA Public Issues

In 2004, a Draft Environmental Assessment (Draft EA) was prepared for the project and circulated for public comment. Comments were received, but a Final EA to address those comments was not published. Because of the length of time that has elapsed since the Draft EA was circulated, and because the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) has changed, FTA has directed the preparation of this Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) to replace the previously prepared Draft EA in its entirety.

In recognition that comments were made on the Draft EA, this SEA contains a tables of those comments. Public comments are arranged by topical issue and location within this SEA is provided to direct the reader to where the issue is addressed. As noted in the SEA, a new 30-day public comment period will be announced and initiated by FTA. Specific comments received during this new comment period will be addressed in the Final SEA.

**Table 1.0
2004 Draft EA Public Issues**

Topical Issue of Comments	Reference Section in SEA
Air Quality Issues:	7 Total Comments
Emissions (Diesel, CO, Ozone, PM, Fugitive Dust, Nitrous Oxide)	3.3.1 through 3.3.4
Ozone Analysis	3.3.3
CO Analysis	3.3.3, 3.19.3
Biological Issues:	8 Total Comments
MSHCP Evaluation	3.14.2, 3.14.4
Impacts to Sensitive, Threatened and Endangered Species	3.14.1
Jurisdictional Waters/Wetlands	3.14.1 through 3.14.4
Historical Sites Issues:	1 Total Comment
Aesthetic Impacts	3.6.3
Noise and Vibration Issues:	60 Total Comments
Train Noise (Horns, Engine, Etc.)	3.4.1 through 3.4.6
Additional Noise Mitigation	3.4.4 through 3.4.6
Impacts to Sensitive Receptors (Residences, Schools, Day Care Facilities, Etc.)	3.4.1 through 3.4.3
Quiet Zones	3.4.1, 3.4.2
FTA/FAA Analysis	3.4.2, 3.4.3
Limited Noise Data Collection	3.4.3, 3.11.2
Vibrations from Trains	3.4.3 through 3.4.6
Noise Barrier Aesthetics	3.4.6, 3.6.2 and 3.6.3
Planning Issues:	22 Total Comments
Property Acquisitions (ROW and Residential)	ES 4.3, 1.7.3, 3.7.3
Ridership Analysis	1.7.9, 2.2.2, 2.3, 3.3.3
Property Values	3.2.3 (Ag. Value only)
Grade Crossings (Locations, Closures, Separations, and Improvements)	ES.2.0, 1.7.5, 3.5.3
No UCR Station	1.3
Station Selection (Location and Property Value)	1.3, 1.6
"Riverside Industrial Lead" (RIL)	ES.4.2, 2.2.3

**Table 1.0 (cont'd)
2004 Draft EA Public Issues**

Topical Issue of Comments	Reference Section in SEA
General ROW/Station Construction	3.4.3
Highgrove Station Wanted	1.3
Safety Issues:	44 Total Comments
Proximity to Schools	3.8.3
Derailment	3.8.3, 3.12.1, 3.12.3
Underground Fuel Lines	3.8.2
Faster Train Speeds	3.4.3
Stations (Access, Pedestrian Crossings, Security, Etc.)	3.4.3, 3.4.7, 3.5.2, 3.6.3, 3.8.3
Emergency Access	3.8.3
Education to the Public	3.12.4
Section 4(f) and Parklands Issues:	5 Total Comments
Analysis Provided Insufficient	3.10.3
Recreation/Loss of Trails	3.10.3, 3.10.4
Traffic and Transportation Issues:	26 Total Comments
Traffic Congestion in Residential and Business Areas	3.5.3, 3.5.4
UCR Area Traffic and Parking	3.5.3, 3.5.4
Hydrology and Water Quality Issues:	2 Total Comments
Flooding	3.1.1, 3.14.2, 3.14.4, 3.17.2 through 3.17.4
Existing Culverts	3.16.3
Landscape Irrigation	3.9.3, 3.15.1
Draft EA Analysis	1 Total Comment
Analysis Provided Insufficient	Entire Document, 1.1

FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)

3. Date Of Land Evaluation Request: June 19, 2009 4. Sheet 1 of 1

1. Name of Project: Perris Valley Line 5. Federal Agency Involved: Federal Transit Administration

2. Proposed Land Use: Transportation (Commuter Rail on Existing Freight Line) 6. County and State: City of Perris, City of Riverside, Riverside County, California

PART II (To be completed by NRCS)

1. Date Request Received By NRCS 2. Person Completing Form:

3. Does the corridor contain prime, unique, statewide or local important farmland? (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form)
 YES NO 4. Acres Irrigated: — Average Farm Size: 180 ac

5. Major Crop(s): CITRUS, ROW CROPS, POTATOS 6. Farmable Land In Government Jurisdiction: Acres: N/A % 7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA: Acres: N/A %

8. Name of Land Evaluation System Used: Calif Storie Index 9. Name of State or Local Site Assessment System: N/A 10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS: 7-30-09 RSA

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)

Alternative Corridor For Segment:

	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly	93.63	88.94	89.06	
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly	27.27	16.42	16.42	
C. Total Acres In Site	483.44	467.90	468.02	

PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information

A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	24.8	9.26	9.38	
B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland	96.1	96.1	96.1	
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted				
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value				

PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Criterion
Relative Value of Farmland To Be Converted (Scale of 0 to 100 Points)

	60.1	60.1	60.1	
--	------	------	------	--

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corridor Assessment Criteria
(Criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5 b & c. For Non-Corridor project use form AD-1006)

	Maximum Points	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
1. Area In Non-urban Use	(15)				
2. Perimeter In Non-urban Use	(10)				
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed	(20)				
4. Protection Provided By State and Local Government	(20)				
5. Size Of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	(10)				
6. Creation Of Non-farmable Farmland	(25)				
7. Availability Of Farm Support Services	(5)				
8. On-Farm Investments	(20)				
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	(25)				
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	(10)				
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS	160				

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)

Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	100				
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or local site assessment)	160				
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)	260				

1. Corridor Selected: 2. Total Acres of Farmlands to be Converted by Project: 3. Date Of Selection: 4. Was A Local Site Assessment Used? YES NO

5. Reason For Selection:

Signature of Federal agency representative completing this form: Steven H. Keel Date: 6/25/09

NOTE: Complete one form for each segment with more than one Alternate Corridor

Table 1.0

[U.S. Census Data used for the Environmental Justice Analysis](#) **Environmental Justice Data**

	Households	Persons	Minority Persons*	Percent Minority*	Median Income	Percent In Poverty
Riverside County	506,781	1,545,387	758,069	49.05%	42,887	14.17%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 420.10	556	2,156	1,564	72.54%	32,574	23.92%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 420.10	572	2,111	1,385	65.61%	28,750	20.51%
Block Group 9, Census Tract 421	462	938	188	20.04%	66,161	2.24%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 422.14	315	1,078	515	47.77%	72,446	5.57%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 422.14	1,444	4,744	2,512	52.95%	65,714	5.60%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 423	621	2,124	1,359	63.98%	34,963	20.82%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 423	639	2,117	1,690	79.83%	22,616	40.29%
Block Group 3, Census Tract 423	593	1,810	783	43.26%	50,592	9.10%
Block Group 9, Census Tract 423	0	0	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Study Area BGs outside Cities	5,202	17,078	9,996	58.53%	46,727	16.12%
City of Riverside	82,128	255,093	138,944	54.47%	41,646	15.75%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 301	226	873	566	64.83%	42,667	26.91%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 301	351	1,211	811	66.97%	39,196	12.88%
Block Group 3, Census Tract 301	211	564	414	73.40%	26,607	21.63%
Block Group 4, Census Tract 301	216	913	703	77.00%	32,833	24.55%
Block Group 5, Census Tract 301	843	3,017	2,104	69.74%	37,218	19.26%
Block Group 9, Census Tract 301	402	1,329	721	54.25%	56,061	14.75%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 303	480	1,226	662	54.00%	24,219	27.23%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 303	171	1,234	672	54.46%	21,285	48.62%
Block Group 3, Census Tract 303	162	766	433	56.53%	27,308	16.48%
Block Group 4, Census Tract 303	495	892	494	55.38%	13,389	50.34%
Block Group 5, Census Tract 303	232	727	454	62.45%	23,594	32.50%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 304	279	1,097	989	90.15%	26,173	34.28%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 304	465	1,480	1,304	88.11%	28,625	16.28%
Block Group 3, Census Tract 304	247	1,056	885	83.81%	31,806	29.30%
Block Group 4, Census Tract 304	226	801	688	85.89%	24,583	24.34%
Block Group 5, Census Tract 304	365	1,532	1,508	98.43%	19,861	41.06%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 305.01	285	1,255	1,058	84.30%	33,194	37.26%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 305.01	410	1,405	1,344	95.66%	21,350	34.95%
Block Group 3, Census Tract 305.01	304	1,104	923	83.61%	25,568	40.28%
Block Group 4, Census Tract 305.01	204	833	727	87.27%	51,875	26.71%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 305.02	266	1,061	929	87.56%	20,238	41.56%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 305.02	239	974	901	92.51%	33,491	24.74%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 305.03	217	934	929	99.46%	28,542	33.83%

**Table 1.0
Environmental Justice Data (continued)**

	Households	Persons	Minority Persons*	Percent Minority*	Median Income	Percent In Poverty
Block Group 2, Census Tract 305.03	441	1,816	1,676	92.29%	26,588	33.48%
Block Group 3, Census Tract 305.03	444	1,575	1,340	85.08%	16,818	53.08%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 422.02	264	662	438	66.16%	19,565	30.32%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 422.02	0	868	665	76.61%	0*	0*
Block Group 1, Census Tract 422.05	1,517	3,432	1,358	39.57%	60,931	5.69%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 422.05	1,465	4,557	1,750	38.40%	87,109	2.52%
Block Group 3, Census Tract 422.05	100	175	100	57.14%	31,389	37.14%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 422.06	1,013	2,337	1,122	48.01%	40,195	25.71%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 422.06	515	1,259	489	38.84%	60,150	12.39%
Block Group 3, Census Tract 422.06	782	1,618	781	48.27%	35,855	19.70%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 422.09	509	1,375	963	70.04%	26,510	37.48%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 422.09	729	1,656	937	56.58%	21,728	27.09%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 422.10	983	2,444	1,696	69.39%	17,861	38.45%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 422.10	792	1,644	1,169	71.11%	23,103	29.47%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 422.11	922	2,043	1,582	77.44%	8,798	59.52%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 422.11	780	1,528	1,252	81.94%	5,563	77.49%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 422.13	509	1,623	819	50.46%	50,150	17.25%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 422.13	471	2,031	1,077	53.03%	43,125	15.19%
Block Group 3, Census Tract 422.13	583	1,379	381	27.63%	56,094	9.69%
Study Area BGs in the City of Riverside	20,115	60,306	39,814	66.02%	32,225	27.25%
City of Moreno Valley	39,341	142,548	96,420	67.64%	47,387	14.23%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 422.12	1,277	4,122	2,468	59.87%	56,947	8.19%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 422.12	636	2,189	1,276	58.29%	47,500	5.49%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 425.04	430	1,476	1,244	84.28%	17,788	52.72%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 425.05	503	1,569	1,194	76.10%	23,250	34.53%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 425.05	461	1,643	1,408	85.70%	23,101	33.96%
Study Area BGs in the City of Moreno Valley	3,307	10,999	7,590	69.01%	33,717	21.21%
City of Perris	9,665	36,203	28,371	78.37%	35,522	20.38%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 426.02	119	500	289	57.80%	30,114	44.07%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 426.02	14	28	0	0.00%	44,250	0.00%
Block Group 3, Census Tract 426.02	786	2,931	1,932	65.92%	47,857	13.04%
Block Group 4, Census Tract 426.02	211	761	432	56.77%	40,040	15.95%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 426.03	1,044	3,892	2,978	76.52%	36,133	19.82%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 426.03	2,764	10,642	8,636	81.15%	37,479	17.18%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 427.06	126	571	456	79.86%	59,286	7.18%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 427.06	1,355	5,461	4,486	82.15%	41,616	14.08%

**Table 1.0
Environmental Justice Data (continued)**

	Households	Persons	Minority Persons*	Percent Minority*	Median Income	Percent In Poverty
Block Group 1, Census Tract 427.18	919	2,351	1,176	50.02%	28,368	25.10%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 427.18	848	2,646	946	35.75%	43,429	11.07%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 427.19	478	1,685	599	35.55%	47,024	13.41%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 427.19	799	1,956	1,013	51.79%	36,164	17.62%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 428	659	2,288	1,676	73.25%	30,881	29.02%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 428	598	2,374	2,028	85.43%	21,522	35.81%
Block Group 3, Census Tract 428	452	1,789	1,654	92.45%	18,694	43.37%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 429.01	719	2,395	1,526	63.72%	41,060	14.81%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 429.01	816	2,894	2,073	71.63%	29,196	22.68%
Block Group 1, Census Tract 429.04	584	2,260	1,803	79.78%	25,214	30.88%
Block Group 2, Census Tract 429.04	791	2,909	1,880	64.63%	31,484	28.47%
Block Group 3, Census Tract 429.04	445	1,708	1,479	86.59%	30,275	40.58%
Study Area BGs in the City of Perris	14,527	52,041	37,062	71.22%	Study Area BGs in the City of Perris 36,004	14,527 21.33%
Totals for Study Area BGs	43,151	140,424	85,853 94,462	67.27%	37,168	23.15%

*The U.S. Census (2000) reports that the entire population of this tract is housed in Group Quarters; Census Data describing median income and poverty are not available.

[Source: Census 2000 Summary File 3 \(SF 3\) - Sample Data](#)

**Table 1.0
Grade Crossing Enhancements
PVL – San Jacinto Branch Line**

No.	LOCATION	MILEPOST CPUC No. DOT No.	EXISTING DEVICE TYPE	Crossing Design	ADDITIONAL NOTES and ACTION
1	Citrus Avenue, Riverside County	MP 0.57 002X-0.6 027301Y	2-1R	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Install two standard No. 9 gates and flashing signal devices. 2. A second track will be added to the crossing by the project. Install approximately 72 track feet (T.F) of concrete grade crossing for the new track. 3. Extend crossing panels on existing track as required. 4. Fencing along RR ROW from crossing to 100' from intersection. 5. Install Access Control Gates. 6. Install raised medians with R8-8 (Do not stop on track), length to be coordinated with existing adjacent driveways. 7. New sidewalk on south west side therefore add SW across tracks only. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No sidewalk on N side. Panels are long enough if sidewalk is added later. Add SW on with side to join existing SW on west. Add active pedestrian gates due to limited visibility of trains around Citrus curve. 2. Determine R/W at NW corner and design to keep private property vehicles at NW corner from circumventing the proposed CPUC gate/flashers by use of K-rail. Propose relocated dwy to be outside rail ROW. 3. Design a 6" high AC dike/berm at NW corner and position the CPUC #9 6' back of dike face. Place K-rail to prevent pvt. property vehicles. 4. Locate ends of raised medians based on turning radius for the Caltrans STAA design vehicle- applicable to all grade crossings . 5. CPUC gates and flashers located per existing conditions. 6. FEMA has no flood map info.
2	Palmyrita Ave., City of Riverside	MP 1.00 002X-1.0 027302F	2- No. 9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A second track will be added to the crossing by the project. Install approximately 72 T.F. concrete grade crossing for the new track. 2. Extend crossing panels on existing track as required. 3. Fencing along RR ROW from crossing to 100' from intersection 4. Install Access Control Gates. 5. Install two standard No. 9-A gates with cantilever flashing signals devices. 6. Install raised medians. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Put in raise median east of crossing for about 80' so as not to block driveway. (LJM 2/2/09) Raised median design should be verified with the City of Riverside. 2. Add sidewalk on south side due to Palmyrita Station. SCRRRA decision tree indicates active pedestrian gates due to adjacency to Palmyrita Station. 3. Need plans from Riverside for construction in NW quadrant.
3	Columbia Avenue, City of Riverside	MP 1.24 002X-1.3 027303M	2-No. 1R	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Crossing is to be improved outside of the project with 2 (two) standard No. 9 gates and flashing signal devices. 2. EB gates to be relocated by project for Palmyrita Station track 3. A second track will be added to the crossing by the project. Install approximately 72 T.F. concrete grade crossing for the new track. 4. Street construction at on Columbia will result in improvements to these crossings by others separate from this project. The plans show the City's project as "existing" being built prior to the PVL project. 5. Fencing along RR ROW from crossing to 100' from intersection. 6. Access Control Gates conflict with Ped treatments therefore not provided. 7. Install raised medians at least 100 feet in length. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BNSF is moving gates out to match city widening to 4 lanes for a one track crossing. 2. Review profile and see coordinate with City/AECOM on profile and gate locations. 3. SCRRRA decision tree indicates active pedestrian gates on north side due to adjacency to Palmyrita Station. 4. SCRRRA decision tree indicates swing gates on south side due limited pedestrian activity.
4	Marlborough Ave., City of Riverside	MP 1.50 002X-1.5 027304U	2-No. 1R	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Crossing is to be improved outside of the project with 2 (two) standard No. 9 gates and flashing signal devices. 2. Fencing along RR ROW from crossing to 100' from intersection. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sidewalk modifications to meet current SCRRRA standards. 2. SCRRRA decisions tree indicates no pedestrian gates. 3. Bike lane on Marlborough could indicated pedestrian gates but is not addressed in decision tree.
5	Spruce St., City of Riverside	MP 2.02 002X-2.02 027305B	2-No. 8	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Install 2 (two) standard No. 9 gates and flashing signal devices. 2. Install 72 T.F. concrete grade crossing panel. 3. Fencing along RR ROW from crossing to 100' from intersection. 4. Install Access Control Gates. 5. Install pedestrian gates and channelization. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revising street to allow for raised medians as feasible. Cannot have 100' median on west. 2. Per Diagnostic Mtg, we are to replace the existing triangular open top drainage inlets-outlets adjacent to the curb on both sides of this grade crossing. To keep the crossing dry, a hydrology study is needed to determine the "Q" coming from the north to design adequate drain inlets. There are existing CBs on Spruce. Need to evaluate capacity. 3. Full ped treatments with ped gates on south side since this is a school route. Prohibit peds on north side of street as no continuous sidewalk.

**Table 1.0
Grade Crossing Enhancements (continued)
PVL – San Jacinto Branch Line**

No.	LOCATION	MILEPOST CPUC No. DOT No.	EXISTING DEVICE TYPE	Crossing Design	ADDITIONAL NOTES and ACTION
6	West Blaine/ Watkins Dr, City of Riverside.	MP 2.66 002X-2.7 027307P	5-No. 9A	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Install approximately 128 T.F. concrete grade crossing panels. 2. Modify existing medians to SCRRA standard length, width, and height, which will include relocation of existing gate arms in medians. 3. Install signs/paint on curb 'No Parking' on east side of crossing. 4. Maintain existing signal. 5. Fencing along RR ROW from crossing to 100' from intersection. 6. Install Access Control Gates. 7. Extend west median further east.. 8. Install pedestrian channelization and pedestrian gates according to SCRRA standards. Full pedestrian treatments on both sidewalks with ped gates due to school route. 	
7	Mt. Vernon Ave., City of Riverside	MP 3.41 002X-3.4 027308W	2-No. 9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Install 64 T.F. concrete grade crossing panels. 2. Existing No. 9 gates to remain. 3. Fencing along RR ROW from crossing to 100' from intersection 4. Install Access Control Gates. 5. Install raised medians at least 100 feet in length (residential driveway permitting). 6. Install pedestrian gates (pathway, railings, ped gates) on north side due to school route. 7. No sidewalk on south side. 	
8 - C	Poarch Rd, Riverside County	MP 5.02 002X-5.0 027311E	1-R	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recommend closure to regular vehicular traffic. 2. Provide locked entry gates for emergency vehicles only. 3. Fencing along RR ROW for 400'+ both sides of current crossing. 	
8 – O	Poarch Rd, Riverside County	"		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opening Poarch Road to vehicular access would require significant lowering of the finished surface of Watkins Road and the Freeway on ramp and significant construction of Poarch Road. Since alternate access is available, this is included in this project. Refer to project memorandum for further discussion. 	
9	Box Springs- River Crest Dr., City of Riverside	MP 7.00 002X-7.0 909090S	4-No. 9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Install 72 T.F. concrete crossing panels. 2. Bring medians to standard height and width. Extend medians to the intersections of River Crest Drive with Box Springs Boulevard and Fischer Road. 3. Existing No. 9 gates to remain. 4. Fencing along RR ROW from crossing to 100' from intersection. 5. Install Access Control Gates. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coordinate with MOW proposed along Fischer Road.

**Table 1.0
Grade Crossing Enhancements (continued)
PVL – San Jacinto Branch Line**

No.	LOCATION	MILEPOST CPUC No. DOT No.	EXISTING DEVICE TYPE	Crossing Design	ADDITIONAL NOTES and ACTION
10	San Jacinto Ave., City of Perris	MP 18.05 002X-18.0 027338N	1-R	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Install two standard No. 9 gates and flashing signal devices. 2. Install 80 T.F. concrete grade crossing panels on new track and remove existing track and panels. 3. Install raised medians 4. Modify sidewalk to accommodate warning devices and pedestrian channelization with full pedestrian treatment since adjacent to station and senior center. 5. Interconnect with traffic signal at D Street intersection for railroad preemption of traffic signal (planned project). 6. Fencing along RR ROW from crossing to 100' from intersection 7. Install Access Control Gates 8. Revised profile as necessary to smooth "hump" crossing. AECOM lowered profile and is coordinating with JLP 2/2/09 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City long range plan shows San Jacinto as E/W through route and significantly widen. City's plans for D and San Jacinto are not clear. West of crossing, San Jacinto ends at C Street. 2. Widening is not proposed by this project. 3. Meet and Coordinate with City of Perris regarding other private engineer traffic signal at D St. and railroad active warning devices.
11	W. 2 nd . St., City of Perris	MP 18.20 002X-18.2 027339V	1-R	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Crossing closed by City of Perris prior to project. 	NOTE: Road closure is required; street bisects the proposed station platform.
12	W. 4 th St. (SR 74) City of Perris	MP 18.34 002X-18.3 027340P	2-No. 9A	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extend medians and reconstruct to SCRRA standard height and width. 2. Traffic Study needed to confirm signalization and interconnect design at South C and 4th Streets. 3. Relocate crossing gates 4. Install approximately 80 T.F. concrete grade crossing for new track and remove existing track and crossing panels. 5. Modify sidewalk to accommodate pedestrians and devices. 6. Fencing along RR ROW from crossing to 100' from intersection on south side of crossing. 7. Install Access Control Gates on south side of crossing 8. Pedestrian crossing signals, gates and swing gates since near Station. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No additional lanes required. Some shift of lanes to create space for medians. 2. Future OERM track is to be located west of new mainline. Moving median gates west of PVL tracks will reduce the length of the left turn pocket from westbound 4th, south to C Street to an in effective and essentially unusable length. When the OERM track is installed, this movement should be prohibited as a pocket cannot be provided. Because the terrain is generally level, the street profile would not be changed.
13	W. 5 th St., City of Perris	MP 18.42 002X-18.4 027341W	1-R	<p>This crossing was closed by the City. The abandoned 5th St. will be incorporated into the future station parking lot/facility.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fencing along RR ROW both sides of current crossing. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Street closed - no crossing. Official street closure process is necessary.
14	W. 6 th St., City of Perris	MP19.03 002X-19.0 027342D	1-R	<p>Revised per Meeting with City 6/25/08: 6Th St. is to be closed according the City's Downtown General Plan. The abandoned street would be incorporated into the Downtown Perris Station facilities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fencing along RR ROW both sides of current crossing. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construct cul-de-sac on east side since access to back of adjacent buildings is still required. 2. On west side, block off the road near C Street but must allow access to one driveway.

**Table 1.0
Grade Crossing Enhancements (continued)
PVL – San Jacinto Branch Line**

No.	LOCATION	MILEPOST CPUC No. DOT No.	EXISTING DEVICE TYPE	Crossing Design	ADDITIONAL NOTES and ACTION
15	W. 7 th St., City of Perris	MP 19.10 002X-19.1 027343K	1-R	<p>The crossing at 7th St. to be upgraded in conjunction with the closures of 5th and 6th streets. If 7th Street remains one lane in each direction, crossing improvements will be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Install 2 (two) standard No. 9 gates and flashing signal devices. 2. Install raised medians at least 100 feet in length. 3. Install 56 T.F. concrete grade crossing panels for new track and extend existing panels as needed. 4. Reprofile 7th Street to match track profile including super elevation at crossing. 5. Fencing along RR ROW from crossing to all the way from 7th Street to 4th Street on both sides of track. 6. Install Access Control Gates. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No street widening. 2. Provide sidewalk on north side 3. Pedestrian swing gates per SCRRRA decision tree. There is not a point in the decision tree which requires pedestrian gates. It would be consist with other crossing in downtown Perris, which all have pedestrian gates in addition to swing gates. To be conservative, PRE has included pedestrian gates in their costs. 4. Future OERM track is to be located west of new mainline. Moving median gates west of PVL can be accomplished at the time the track is installed. Because the terrain is generally level, the street profile would not be changed.
16	South D St., City of Perris	MP 19.17 002X-19.2 027347M	1-R	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Install two standard No. 9 gates and flashing signal devices. 2. Install raised medians at least 100 feet in length. 3. Install 64 T.F. concrete grade crossing panels for new track. 4. Reprofile South D Street to match track profile including superelevation at crossing (7 degree curve). 5. Fencing along RR ROW from crossing all the way from D Street to 7th Street on both sides of track. 6. Install Access Control Gates. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Install sidewalk on south side with pedestrian crossing. 2. Pedestrian gates per SCRRRA decision tree since a medical facility is located at Commercial Street and D street and a wheel chair was observed in the site visit. 3.
17	S. Perris St, City of Perris	MP 19.37 002X-19.4 027348U	1-R	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Install two standard No. 9 gates and flashing signal devices. 2. Install 80 T.F. concrete grade crossing panel 3. Raise power line (RR East). 4. State Street - Original recommendation was to close State Street and construct cul-de-sac. In lieu of this, it is proposed to construct directional raised median in conjunction with center raised median such that southbound traffic would be limited to right turns in and out. This would eliminate conflicts and queuing at the approach to the crossing without terminating State Street in a cul-de-sac. 5. Fencing along RR ROW from crossing to 100' from intersection south and all the way from S. Perris to D Street on both sides of track. 6. Install Access Control Gates. 7. Install raised medians at least 100 feet in length. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintain existing street widths except where required for crossing design and turning movements. 2. Construct additional sidewalk for pedestrian crossing on north side. Pedestrian gates per SCRRRA decision tree as this is on an indentified school route. 3. Widen right turn area from Case Road to NB South Perris Street. Raised median restricts turn radius so must compensate with widening.

**Table 1.0
Grade Crossing Enhancements (continued)
PVL – San Jacinto Branch Line**

No.	LOCATION	MILEPOST CPUC No. DOT No.	EXISTING DEVICE TYPE	Crossing Design	ADDITIONAL NOTES and ACTION
18	G St., City of Perris	MP 19.68 002X-19.7 027349B	1-R	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PROHIBIT left turns from southbound Case Road to G Street as this cannot be properly gated to prevent vehicles from entering track way and provide required turning clearances for large vehicles such as tractor trailers. Signage and raised median islands will physically prevent this movement. 2. Block off west side of Case where unpaved road enters intersection. 3. Install two standard No. 9 gates and flashing signal devices. 4. Install approximately 80 T.F. concrete grade crossing panels. 5. Modify grade crossing profile to eliminate hump and provide track drainage. 6. Widen roadway at crossing (for median and to meet existing pavement on north side LJM 2/2/09). 7. Install traffic signal at the adjacent intersection with Case Road and interconnect with railroad signal system. 8. A right turn pocket is needed on Case Road so that when the gates are down, traffic on Case Road may flow freely and not be blocked by a right turn vehicles. 	<p>FEMA OK, but south half of G St. is in the 100 year flood plain</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lower track 4 inches to meet AASHTO guidelines to remove "hump" crossing. Revised lowering to 4". (LJM 2/2/09) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Exist track at centerline G St, is 1425.3 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. 1425.3 – 30 inches = 1422.8 ii. 100 yr flood surface = 1422 which is below bottom of ballast = OK <p>Update 11/16/09 RECOMMEND PERPENDICULAR CROSSING. Realignment of G Street to create perpendicular crossing is feasible since City owns additional ROW adjacent to RCTC ROW. A corner of a vacant parcel may also be required for new T roadway. This design would allow all turn movement to and from G Street.</p>
19	East Ellis Ave, City of Perris	MP 19.87 002X-19.9 027350V	1-R	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PROHIBIT left turns from East Ellis to southbound Case Road as this cannot be properly gated to prevent vehicles from entering track way and provide required turning clearances for large vehicles such as tractor trailers. Signage and raised median islands will physically prevent this movement. 2. Block off west side of Case where unpaved road enters intersection. 3. Install two standard No. 9 gates and flashing signal devices. 4. Widen Case Road and East Ellis Avenue to accommodate raised median and truck turning radii. This results in significant widening of the Ellis across the RR to allow for trucks to make a right turn from Case Road to Ellis Avenue. 5. Construct 100' raised median on east side of crossing. 6. Construct raised channelization islands on west side of crossing. 7. Close off access from future Ellis Avenue on west side of Case Road as it is currently an unpaved street and access is available from Goetz Road. 8. Install traffic signal with pre-emption at Case Road and East Ellis Avenue as required for operation of rail gates. 	<p>FEMA Top of existing rail = 1418 100 year flood surface = 1422 50 " " = 1419 10 " " = 1417 Coordinate with JLP on track elevation at crossing</p> <p>Realignment of Ellis Avenue to create perpendicular crossing is not feasible without ROW acquisition therefore maintain existing angle. Future plans for widening should address skew angle and incorporate changes to alignment of Ellis Avenue at Case Road to create a perpendicular crossing.</p> <p>Update 11/16/09 RECOMMEND CLOSURE. City's General Plan calls for Ellis to be a truck route to I-215 with 6 lanes. At that time, the crossing design must address increasing number of through lanes on both Ellis and Case, turning movements of large trucks and angle of crossing. Current use of Ellis is limited to a 3 industrial businesses which can be accessed via Redlands.</p>
20 - A	Relocated Mapes Rd., City of Perris	New Crossing Location	N/A	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design new crossing for Mapes adjacent to South Perris Station 2. Provide 4-#9 crossing gates for vehicular traffic 3. Provide pedestrian gates on station side only, no sidewalks on other side therefore no pedestrian treatments. 	<p>Update 11/16/09 RECOMMEND NO IMPROVEMENTS. Layover facility was redesign so that no trains in service or accessing layover cross Mapes Road.</p>

**Table 1.0
Grade Crossing Enhancements (continued)
PVL – San Jacinto Branch Line**

No.	LOCATION	MILEPOST CPUC No. DOT No.	EXISTING DEVICE TYPE	Crossing Design	ADDITIONAL NOTES and ACTION
20 - B	Mapes Rd. City of Perris Original Location	MP 21.59 002X-21.6 027352J	2-No. 8	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Install two standard No. 9 gates and flashing signal devices. 2. Install 96 T.F. concrete grade crossing panel 3. Install raised medians at least 100 feet long. 4. Widen roadway to the south and improve curb return at the Case Road intersection. City of Perris proposes Mapes Rd improvements in conjunction with anticipated private development. 5. Install traffic signal at the intersection of Mapes and Case Road and interconnect with railroad signaling. 6. 	

Agency Communication Log

For the preparation of this SEA an analysis of indirect and cumulative effects were evaluated. Inclusion in this evaluation were interviews with County and City planning agencies for the purpose of identifying potential impacts that may be foreseen related to the PVL and the County/City planning context. All agencies indicated that the PVL was anticipated and accommodated within their planning efforts, including Specific Area Plans.

Projects were identified, which would also generally be constructed or in place for the PVL's opening year of 2012. Planned developments and roadway projects that would be completed by 2012 within the study area were evaluated for their potential, along with the PVL, to contribute to indirect and cumulative effects to the environment.

The following is the planning Agency Communication Log who were contacted for interviews in the preparation of this SEA:

- Diane Jenkins, Principal Planner
City of Riverside Planning Division
6-23-2009
- John Terrell, Planning Official
City of Moreno Valley
6-23-2009
- Mitra Mehta-Cooper, Principal Planner – Strategic Programs
Riverside County Planning Department
6-23-2009
- Brad Eckhart, Planning Manager
March Joint Powers Authority
6-25-2009
- Rick Bishop, Executive Director
Western Riverside Council of Governments
6-29-2009