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SECTION 1.0

Introduction
1.1 Background

The purpose of this project is to evaluate potential sites for the location of a Multi-Modal Hub (MMH) in Indio, California. The project also includes evaluating the multi-modal transportation environment that would support the use of all travel modes throughout Indio and to-and-from the selected multi-modal hub site.

This study is being completed in response to a growing interest in providing improved passenger rail services within the Coachella Valley. Future passenger rail services may include designating a stop in Indio for current Amtrak service and secondly, to provide intercity passenger rail service between Los Angeles Union Station and Indio. The initial alternatives evaluated for intercity rail service have identified Indio as the eastern terminus of this service. A MMH is envisioned to also provide connections to bus transit, bicycle travel, pedestrian travel, shuttle buses, ride hailing services and other services.

The City of Indio was incorporated in May 1930. The City is located approximately 120 miles east of Los Angeles and approximately 30 miles east of the City of Palm Springs, in Riverside County. Indio, along with nine other cities, comprises a geographical area commonly known as “The Coachella Valley.”

Known as the “City of Festivals,” it is the home of eight major annual festivals and a host of highly-acclaimed events that bring culture, music, sports, entertainment and a variety of cuisine that bring over 1.4 million people to the City each year. The City of Indio (population 91,240)\(^1\) also continues to experience significant growth in population and jobs.

In July 2016, Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), in coordination with Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and Caltrans, completed the Coachella Valley–San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Study Alternatives Analysis (AA) Final Report that evaluated new intercity rail service between Los Angeles and Indio and identified Indio as the eastern terminus of this service.

\(^1\) 2018 Census Estimate
A passenger rail station facility provides the opportunity to create a facility that can do more than serve only passenger rail. This station can become a multi-modal hub, which is a place where people can make connections between public transit and other travel options. Multi-modal hubs are designed to make it easier for residents, employees, and visitors to use transit to travel from home to work and a wide variety of destinations in between. This report describes the process used to identify a site for the multi-modal hub. It includes a description of the recommended facility layout and provides guidance on how to improve access to and connections from the site to reach destinations in Indio.

## 1.2 Study Organization

Section 1 provides an overview of the project including describing public involvement efforts.

Section 2 provides information about current development patterns, travel characteristics, and an evaluation of travel within the City of Indio by walking, biking, using transit and vehicle travel. This includes:

- Travel within Indio, travel within the Coachella Valley and travel within the region
- Describing existing bicycle, pedestrians and vehicular traffic circulation
- Describing the travel characteristics related to work travel

Section 3 describes the site evaluation process used to identify the most feasible location for a Multi-Modal Hub.

- Identifying potential sites for multi-modal hub in Indio that could make travel easier and more efficient
- The evaluation of sites and identifying the recommended site location for the MMH

Section 4 describes the design options for the selected Multi-Modal Hub site.

Section 5 evaluates the access to the Multi-Modal Hub site by transit, bicycle, pedestrian and vehicle travel modes. This section includes recommendations to improve connectivity from the MMH site to major Indio destinations. This includes evaluating transit, bicycle, pedestrian and vehicle access to the MMH and identifying any needed improvements.

Section 6 outlines a plan for future funding opportunities as well as a management plan for the construction and ongoing operations of the proposed multi-modal facility in the City of Indio.
Figure 1.1: Indio Study Area
1.3 Project Location

The area under consideration for location of a multi-modal hub is generally located along the Union Pacific Railroad that parallels Indio Boulevard within the City of Indio. The location of the study corridor is shown in Figure 1.1. The corridor is developed predominantly with commercial and industrial uses as well as vacant land.

1.4 Community Outreach

The City of Indio values the experiences and opinions of its residents, the public at large and other stakeholders in preparation of its studies. Public participation is a vital component to ensuring that the public is aware of the study and to provide feedback. Community outreach activities were completed for informing and engaging the project stakeholders and the public.

The study mainly encompasses the City of Indio city limits, but will have far reaching impacts to the region’s mobility. The team worked closely with City staff and stakeholders to ensure a broad range of stakeholders received information in order to make informed decisions and opinions.

Demographic data for the City of Indio was used to implement and adjust outreach tactics. The graphics below are based on the most current information available for consideration.

Notification Tactics

Notification tools were developed including a notification template (eblast and web banner) to generate participation to events the project that were presented.

Online Survey

In November 2018, the City of Indio launched an online, interactive Type-form survey in order to better engage its stakeholders in jointly developing a comprehensive strategy to map out a better plan for walking, rolling, and bicycling throughout the Coachella Valley. The survey was promoted on the Better Connected Indio Facebook page and through the Better Connected Indio booth at the 2018 International Tamale Festival. Over a span of approx-
Approximately two months, the project team collected more than 250 responses through the Typeform survey. The survey included questions on general and specific transportation priorities for residents and commuters to the City of Indio. A total of 190 participants provided their email for further project updates. In addition to the online survey, visitors were asked to provide feedback in which they could pinpoint specific locations in Indio where they feel a multimodal facility would best serve the community. The survey results are provided in Appendix A.

The following is a summary of key questions and comments received:

- When will the center be built?
- Where will the center be built?
- Will there be any meetings?
- What is the cost?
- Rail service across the Coachella Valley is desired.
- Keep the City of Indio historic.
- The project is long overdue.
- Don’t forget about active transportation in the design.
- Would like to see more bicycle connectivity.
- Want to see Amtrak and Metrolink connection.
- The historic aspects of Indio must be maintained when developing the center.
- Consider regional connectivity for people who travel through the City of Indio.
- Need to have rail service in the City of Indio.
- Please move forward with the project. The festivals congest the streets.

**Social Media**

The “Better Connected Indio” Facebook page was created in order to post project updates and announce major project milestones. Facebook announcements have included the study’s launch, subsequent posts included announcements of information at the Tamale Festival and the launch of the survey.

**Community Based Events**

The study team presented at two community-based events to provide information firsthand to the public about the project and to solicit feedback via an online survey. The first event included a booth at the Tamale Festival in the City of Indio. This event was voted one of the top ten food festivals by the Food Network and it attracts several thousand people every year.
from within the Coachella Valley and beyond. The second public event was a presentation and public comment at a City Council Meeting in May, 2019. At this meeting, project information related to the selection of a preferred site was presented and the public provided comments on the location and desired features of a multi-modal hub. The final report was presented to the City Council in January, 2020.
SECTION 2.0
Overview of Indio’s Transportation System
2.1 Introduction

Information on the transportation system in Indio has been reviewed to provide background and context for the evaluation of potential Multi-Modal Hub (MMH) sites. Transportation data and studies were identified and reviewed for use in understanding current transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities in a city-wide context. The following information was reviewed:

- Mobility Element of General Plan (Adopted 9-18-2019)
- Complete Streets Plan (in progress)
- CV Link Conceptual Master Plan
- Public Transportation Services in Indio
- Rail System Field Inventory
- Passenger Rail Service Studies
- Coachella Music Festival Grant Information
- Community Profile
2.2 Community Profile

Selected population and travel characteristics of Indio are summarized in this section. Total population and ethnic characteristics are presented in Table 2.3. Employment by type of job is shown in Table 2.4.

Additional information about population characteristics include:

- The household density provides a measure of where population concentrations are located in Indio. This is shown in Figure 2.9.
- The location of employment is shown in terms of employment density by census tract in Figure 2.3.
- Lower income populations are shown in Figure 2.3. This figure presents the number of households within a census block group with incomes below the poverty level.
- The location of major community destinations are shown in Figure 2.4. This includes civic, recreational, and festival destinations.

### Table 2.1: Indio Population Characteristics (2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>58675</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>28192</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86867</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>22911</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2071</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2118</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey, 2017

### Table 2.2: Indio Employment by Type (2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Primary Jobs</td>
<td>35,963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Hunting and Mining</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>4,355</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Management and Administrative Services</td>
<td>4,103</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services, Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>6,848</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, Recreation, Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>7,217</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services (excluding Public Administration)</td>
<td>2,319</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey, 2017
Figure 2.1: Household Density
Figure 2.2: Employment Density
Figure 2.3: Households Below Poverty Line
The market for commuter rail services is most needed when work trips are long. The Center for Economic Studies at the U.S. Census produces and updates importation on employers and employees under a program called the Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD). This is a new source of data that is developed from a variety of sources. This provides information on many employee characteristics including distances traveled to work. The LEHD travel distance information is summarized in Tables 2.3 and 2.4. Table 2.3 shows the distance traveled by Indio residents to their place of work. It shows that 59 percent of the residents travel less than 10 miles to work, but approximately 24 percent of residents travel over 50 miles to work.

Table 2.4 shows the distance traveled by persons who work in Indio. Approximately half of the people working in Indio travel less than 10 miles to work. However, approximately 32 percent of Indio workers travel over 50 miles to work. These long distance travelers provide a potential market for users of commuter rail services.

### Table 2.3: Distance Traveled to Jobs in Indio (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 miles</td>
<td>8,290</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 24 miles</td>
<td>1,846</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 50 miles</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50 miles</td>
<td>3,377</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14,044</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census LEHD Origin-Destination Data

### Table 2.4: Distance Traveled by Employed Persons Living in Indio (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 miles</td>
<td>13,730</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 24 miles</td>
<td>4,431</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 50 miles</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50 miles</td>
<td>8,888</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27,547</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census LEHD Origin-Destination Data
2.3 Mobility Element

A Mobility Element was prepared by the City of Indio to provide a baseline of transportation conditions and to forecast roadway conditions in the future. The draft Mobility Technical Report provides information about roadway, bicycle, pedestrian and transit facilities.

Roadway System

Based upon information provided in the Mobility Element, most of the street system serving the Indio area is uncongested. The roadway capacity provided by the City of Indio is shown to be sufficient to provide for the smooth movement of traffic on nearly all streets. Golf Center Parkway, from Avenue 44 to Highway 111 is the one exception. This roadway segment operates at Level of Service E, which indicates that during peak times, some traffic congestion and slower travel speeds exist.

The major intersections in Indio were evaluated in the Mobility Element. The report indicated that there were three intersections within Indio that operated at a Level of Service E during the AM and/or PM\textsuperscript{1} peak travel period. These locations include:

- I-10 EB Ramp & Jefferson Street – LOS E during AM peak hour and LOS F during PM peak hour;
- Jackson Street & Avenue 50 – LOS F during both the AM and PM peak hours; and
- Madison Street & Avenue 50 – LOS E during the AM peak hour.

\textsuperscript{1} Typically 7:00 - 8:00 AM and 5:00 - 6:00 PM.

Location of Current Transit Sites
**Bicycle System**

A bicycle facilities inventory was completed as part of the Mobility Element.

Bikeway facilities can be classified into four types:

1. Off-street trails or paths (Class I)
2. On-street bike lanes (Class II)
3. Shared street or routes (Class III)
4. Physically-separated bike lanes/cycle tracks (Class IV)

The City of Indio's existing bicycle network consists of approximately 22.3 miles of bikeways, of which, 0.7 miles are Class I bike paths and 21.6 miles are Class II bike lanes. The Class I bike paths are located adjacent to Jefferson Street near Shadow Hills High School and Desert Ridge Academy. Class II bike paths are typically located along segments of arterial roads and collector roads. Roadways with Class II bike lanes include Jefferson Street and Avenue 46. Figure 2.1 shows the existing bicycle facilities in the City of Indio. There are no designated Class III bicycle routes or Class IV physically separated bike lanes / cycle tracks.

Bicycle facilities located in the Indio Project Corridor are limited. The existing railroad has limited grade separated crossings and only one of those – Golf Center Pkwy has bicycle lanes. Interstate 10 (I-10) and the adjacent Whitewater River are other barriers to bicycle movement with access across the interstate provided only at interchange areas. There are no bicycle facilities provided at these interchanges. Bicycle lanes are provided on Jackson Street south of I-10, including a narrow travel shoulder on the bridge over the Whitewater River.

Bicycle facilities are limited in the central part of Indio, along Indio Boulevard, on Highway 111 and in the downtown area. Potential improvement will be examined in the next sections of this report.

**Pedestrian System**

The Mobility Element provides an overview of Indio's pedestrian system. These studies conclude that the City of Indio already possesses the framework for pedestrian-friendly environments. The inventory of sidewalks completed in those projects is shown in Figure 2.2. This figure shows that many of the streets in Indio already have existing sidewalks, particularly within the central core of the City. The study did identify notable sidewalk gaps still present towards the northern and southern areas and along corridors such as Avenue 44, SR 111, and Indio Boulevard.
Figure 2.5: City-wide Bicycle Facilities Inventory (2018)

Source: Mobility Technical Element
Figure 2.6: City-wide Sidewalk Inventory (2018)

Source: Mobility Technical Element
2.4 Complete Streets Plan

The City of Indio is conducting a concurrent but separate planning effort to prepare a Complete Streets Plan. The purpose of the Complete Streets Plan is to enhance connectivity across all travel modes. Although the City of Indio has over 20 miles of existing bikeways and various miles of existing sidewalks, there are still critical connectivity gaps for both bicyclists and pedestrians. As part of this project, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian connectivity improvements identified in the Mobility Element are being reviewed in the Complete Streets Plan to identify remaining connectivity gaps and identify projects to address these gaps. The project also includes a safety evaluation of each travel mode. The city-wide collision analysis total is shown in Figure 2.7 and the bicycle and pedestrian collision severity analysis is shown in Figures 2.8 and 2.9.
Figure 2.7: Indio Total Collisions (2013-2017)

Source: Mobility Technical Element
Figure 2.8: Indio Bicycle Collisions

Source: Mobility Technical Element
Figure 2.9: Indio Pedestrian Collisions

Source: Mobility Technical Element
2.5 CV Link Conceptual Master Plan

The CV Link is a 50-mile, alternative transportation corridor for bicycles, pedestrians, and low-speed (up to 25 mph) electric vehicles along the Whitewater River Channel and Tahquitz Creek. The CV Link will extend from the City of Palm Springs to the City of Coachella. CV Link will initially connect eight of the nine cities in the Coachella Valley and three tribal land reservations. When constructed, bicycles, pedestrians, and low-speed electric vehicles (LSEVs) will be able to use the corridor to access employment, shopping, schools, friends, and recreational opportunities. LSEVs include golf carts and Neighborhood Electric Vehicles (NEVs) that can travel up to 25 miles per hour.

The first segment of the CV Link opened in 2019 between Ramon Road in Cathedral City and Vista Chino in Palm Springs. Within the City of Indio, the CV Link will be located on the south side of the Whitewater River channel (See Figure 2.6). Following the channel eastward, the alignment would move northward crossing Indio Boulevard and the Union Pacific Railroad just west of Clinton Street to parallel I-10 through much of Indio. At present, no CV Link connections have been identified to connect to the rail corridor or potential multi-modal hub sites that would be located within this corridor.

Source: CVAG
Figure 2.10: Planned CV Link

Source: CVAG
2.6 Public Transportation Services

The public transportation system includes services provided by Sunline Transit Agency, Greyhound and Amtrak. Each is described below.

Sunline Transit Agency

The Sunline Transit Agency provides a network of transit routes that connect the communities in the Coachella Valley. Transit route transfer facility hubs are located in Coachella, Indio, Palm Desert and Palm Springs, with additional route transfer connections in the other valley communities.

One of the major transfer points within the Sunline transit system is located on the south side of Highway 111 at Flower Street. Bus pull-outs are provided to remove buses from Highway 111 traffic lanes. Small bus shelters are provided to provide protection for transit users from the sun and weather. This transfer location is located between 0.3 miles to 1.0 miles from a potential multi-modal hub location.

Sunline Transit routes provide regional connections to neighboring cities and also circulation routes within Indio. The following summarize the current regional connections operated by Sunline Transit:

- Commuter Link 220 provides a transit connection between Palm Desert and Riverside. The route primarily operates on I-10 and has limited stops. The route time is 2 hours 15 minutes. The route operates three times a day in each direction.

- Bus Line 111 provides a connection between the Indio transfer point at Flower Street and Palm Desert. The full length of the route operates between downtown Coachella and downtown Palm Springs. The route has frequent stops. Travel time between Indio and Palm Desert is approximately 20 minutes. Service operates between 20 and 30 minute headways. This route carries the highest number of riders in the Sunline Transit System. Service operates between 6:30 AM and 8:00 PM.

- Bus Line 54 operates between Indio and Palm Desert on Fred Waring Drive. Travel time is approximately 35 minutes. Service is operated on 40 minute headways. Service operates between 6:00 AM and 8:00 PM.

The following summarizes the local transit routes currently operated by Sunline Transit within the City of Indio:

- Bus Line 80 – Indio Southbound Loop provides a loop around Indio operating in a clock-wise direction. Service frequency is 60 minutes. Travel time around the loop is approximately 45 minutes. Service operates between 6:00 AM and 8:45 PM.

- Bus Line 81 – Indio Northbound Loop provides a tighter loop around Indio, with more coverage in the downtown area. The route operates in a counter-clockwise direction. Service frequency is 60 minutes. Travel time around the loop is approximately 50 minutes. Service operates between 5:25 AM and 8:15 pm.

- Bus Line 90 – Indio to Coachella. This is a short route that operates in a section of Indio that is located south of Highway 111 to the downtown area of Coachella. The route operates in both northbound and southbound directions. Service frequency is 60 minutes. Travel time in each direction is approximately 30 minutes. Service operates between 5:30 AM and 10:00 PM.

Transit ridership statistics by route are shown in Table 2.5. Route 111 is the backbone of the system providing a transit connection across the Coachella Valley. Route 220 is commuter peak oriented, to provide a regional connection from the Coachella Valley to Riverside from which riders can access the Metrolink rail system. With service focused on the commute peak hours, Route 220 does not have as high of ridership as compared to the other transit routes.

The existing system does not provide direct service to the Empire Polo Club, the location of many of the larger festivals in Indio. Future planned service changes identified in Sunline Transit’s Short Range Transit Plan include realignment of Lines 111 and 70 that would serve the Coachella Valley Music and Arts Festival, Stagecoach Festival and BNP Paribas Open.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Passengers/Year</th>
<th>Passengers/Revenue Hr</th>
<th>Passengers/Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>75,157</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>141,170</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>89,266</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>140,831</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1,396,966</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>4,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>13,458</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.11: Sunline Transit Routes Serving Indio

Source (Table): Sunline Transit Short Range Transit Plan, Ridership FY 2016/17, Source (Figure): Mobility Technical Element
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Greyhound:

Greyhound utilizes privately operated facility on city owned land located at the Indio Transportation Center. Greyhound offers four daily trips in each direction between Indio and Los Angeles. The route follows I-10, with one intermediate stop in San Bernardino. Scheduled travel time varies between 2 hours 55 minutes and 3 hours 35 minutes.

Amtrak:

Amtrak operates passenger service through the project corridor via their Sunset Limited route. Amtrak operates three round trips per week between Los Angeles and New Orleans, with stops in Pomona, Ontario, and Palm Springs. This service does not currently stop in Indio. Operating speeds for passenger service vary between 50 and 79 MPH in this area. Metrolink does not currently operate commuter rail service to/from the City of Indio. There is currently no daily intercity passenger rail service east of Riverside-Downtown, though Amtrak operates a thruway bus service via one round trip between Fullerton and Indio.

2.7 Rail System Inventory

The railroad corridor that runs through the City of Indio is owned and operated by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR). The double track corridor, which consists of two main tracks, is part of UPRR's Yuma Subdivision. This UPRR line connects the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach to other cities along the southwestern and southern United States such as Phoenix, Arizona; El Paso, Texas; Houston, Texas; and New Orleans, Louisiana. Two main tracks run within Indio's city limits from approximately the Indio Boulevard overpass eastward to the Dillon Road overpass. The width of the railroad right-of-way is approximately 150 feet for the majority of the corridor. However, between the Jackson Street overpass and the Golf Center Parkway overpass, the Union Pacific right-of-way increases to 200 feet.

UPRR operates freight service through this corridor on a regular basis consisting of approximately 80 trains/day. UPRR carries double-stack marine containers from the Southern California ports to New Orleans. The following goods are transported east through this corridor: automobiles, mixed freight, food stuffs, beverages, chemicals and metals. On the return trip westward, trains transport the following goods: metals, petroleum, chemicals, fuel food and livestock. Operating speeds for freight service vary between 50 and 60 MPH in this area.

There is additional freight rail infrastructure east of the Jackson Street overpass and west of the Golf Center Parkway overpass. There are three storage/yard lead tracks parallel to the UPRR main tracks. These tracks serve as short-term storage and/or support for switching operations between two adjacent rail delivery tracks. The two delivery tracks service a building identified as Building Materials & Construction Solutions (BMC) that is located at 45-491 Golf Center Parkway.
2.8 Passenger Rail Service Studies

In 1991, Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) completed the first in a series of studies to evaluate the feasibility of operating up to four daily intercity rail round trips between Los Angeles and Indio. From 1991 to 2013, RCTC completed additional feasibility studies of the Coachella Valley–San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service. In July 2016, RCTC, in coordination with Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and Caltrans, completed the Alternatives Analysis (AA) Final Report that evaluated several alternatives for a new intercity rail service between Los Angeles and Indio and identified a preferred alternative route.

The AA Report considered reasonable buildable alternatives for daily intercity rail service to the Coachella Valley, and determined which alternatives demonstrate superior performance and were worthy of more detailed evaluation. The AA Report determined that the endpoints of the proposed passenger rail service are to Indio and Los Angeles. The AA Report identified Indio as the eastern station terminus of this rail service.

The RCTC is now moving forward with the Federal Transit Administration’s Capital Grant Investment Program process. The RCTC is currently in the Project Development Phase.

With the completion of the AA Report, work is under way to prepare the Program Environmental Impact Statement/Program Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) document, consistent with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements. The EIS/EIR will analyze impacts of implementing service. Along with completing the Draft EIS/EIR, a Service Development Plan will be prepared to conceptualize how the service would operate through the Corridor and what infrastructure improvements would be needed to accommodate the new intercity passenger rail service.

Caltrans has developed service plans that describe how potential passenger rail service could be provided between Indio and LAUS. The travel time for a trip between Indio and LAUS is approximately 3 1/2 hours. At this time, it is anticipated that two passenger rail round trips will be provided each day, with one round trip beginning in Indio and one round trip beginning at LAUS in the morning with return trips made in the afternoon/evening. It is also anticipated that the service level would increase to four round trips in the future. The service would be provided by the LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency who currently contracts with Amtrak to provide the Pacific Surfliner intercity train service between San Luis Obispo and San Diego.

Ridership estimates were prepared as part of the Coachella Valley–San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Study Alternatives Analysis (AA). New ridership forecasts are being prepared as part of the next phase of the First Tier Environmental Analysis for the San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor. The most current information is based on Trip Optimization Study, completed by the Caltrans Division of Rail and Mass Transit in February, 2015 that was used in the Alternatives Analysis.

A Trip Optimization Study, completed by the Caltrans Division of Rail and Mass Transit, February, 2015, for the following service levels.
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2.9 Passenger Rail Service to the Coachella Music Festival

The Los Angeles – San Diego – San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor Agency in partnership with the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) was awarded a grant to provide a Coachella Valley Special Events Train between Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) and the Coachella Valley. The train would be operated during three weekends every April for a five-year period to serve the Coachella Valley Music and Arts Festival and the Stagecoach Festival. The service is tentatively scheduled to begin in 2021.

Key elements of the Coachella Valley Special Events Train include:

- Passenger rail service between Los Angeles and the City of Indio during the three festival weekends, over a five-year period;
- One-way travel distance of approximately 140 miles, and one-way travel time of approximately three and one-half hours;
- Two round trip trains on the Thursday prior to the start of each event weekend, and two round trips on the following Monday;
- Ticketing and baggage handling will be handled by Amtrak; and
- Shuttle service will be provided at the Indio platform to route passengers to the festival venue and local area hotels.

### Table 2.6: Passenger Rail Ridership-Indio Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Round Trips</th>
<th>Indio Annual Ridership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Trip Optimization Study, Caltrans and KOA Corporation
SECTION 3.0
Multi-Modal Hub - Site Evaluation
3.1 Introduction

In July 2016, Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) in coordination with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and Caltrans, completed the Coachella Valley–San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Study Alternatives Analysis Final Report that evaluated several alternatives for a new intercity rail service between Los Angeles and Indio. The study was conducted to select a site location for the passenger rail station. This section of the report describes the site selection process used to evaluate potential site locations for a rail station.

The station site provides an opportunity to develop a Multi-Modal Hub that can serve all of Indio. MMHs are places where people can make connections between public transit and other travel options. The hubs are designed to make it easier for residents, employees, and visitors to use transit to travel from home to work and a wide variety of destinations in between. A multi-modal hub area includes not just the transit station itself but all those services and destinations that are accessible within a 5-minute walk, bike, or drive to/from a high quality transit service like intercity passenger rail or high frequency inter-community transit service. The general layout of a MMH could include the features shown in Figure 3.1. The features provided can include:

- Transit amenities – enhanced transit waiting areas, passenger zone loadings, real-time traveler information
- Pedestrian amenities – improved walkways and street crossings
- Bike amenities – bikeways, bike parking and bikeshare
- Motorized service amenities – dedicated transit lanes, electric bike and scootershare, carshare, on-demand rideshare, parking
- Support services and information – wayfinding
- Area for adjacent Transit Oriented Development (TOD)

Figure 3.1: Features of a Multi-Modal Hub
3.2 Site Evaluation Process

The sites identified were assessed using a two-tier evaluation process:

- Level 1 uses a simple pass/fail analysis, and any site that fails one or more of the criteria will be eliminated from further consideration. This level of analysis is intended to quickly and efficiently eliminate any sites with potential ‘fatal flaws’ that could significantly delay the design, approval and construction process, so that the project could focus on more promising sites.

- The Level 2 evaluation will provide additional detail that can be used to compare a smaller number of sites that move forward from the Level 1 screening. This process will evaluate and measure the criteria and provide a site score.

3.3 Site Descriptions

Potential station sites were identified along an approximately 3.2-mile corridor adjacent to the existing Union Pacific rail line that extends from Jefferson Street to Date Avenue. Within this area, 15 sites were identified to be evaluated with the Level 1 criteria. These sites are shown in Figure 3.3. To be included in this initial level of analysis, sites had to have limited vertical structures in order to provide for reasonable acquisition. Vacant lots, surface parking, or sites with a small number of low-rise buildings were considered. Blocks with complete coverage by structures, high-rise buildings, high-value buildings or historically significant buildings (that could not be reused) were not considered. The size of the site needed to be a minimum two acres, with a minimum four acre site desired.

**Site 1**
Site 1 is the western-most of the parcels and is located three-quarter miles north of the river channel. It is a large site composed of three parcels, all controlled by a single owner. Each of the parcels is big enough to be used alone as a transit center; the three parcels share similar characteristics and are aggregated into a single parcel for this evaluation. The site is currently vacant, as are all adjacent parcels. Closest active uses are industrial along Indio Boulevard, and single family residential to the west. The site would be accessed from Interstate 10 and Indio Boulevard as it enters the core city area. The site has approximately \( \frac{3}{4} \) mile of frontage on Indio Boulevard and the existing adjacent rail corridor. It is approximately a \( \frac{1}{4} \) mile from the highway interchange, including east- and westbound on/off ramps and an elevated vehicular crossing of the rail corridor.

**Site 2**
Site 2 directly abuts the south side of Indio Boulevard. It offers a fairly rectilinear and efficient shape, with access from three sides. There appears to be approximately 25-30 feet of land between the existing rail corridor and the edge of Indio Boulevard; this edge is uncurbed, and includes a nearly full-lane width shoulder at this location. Adjacent uses include single family residential homes as well as a manufactured housing park. Assessor’s records indicate a single owner, and the lot is currently vacant. The southern half is surrounded by a construction fence and an uncompleted concrete slab is evident on inspection.
Site 3
Site 3 directly abuts the north side of the existing freight tracks, and would require acquisition of three separate parcels. Two of the parcels that are 0.95 and 0.52 acres respectively are owned by a private business. These parcels are occupied by a single-story office building. The third, largest parcel is approximately 1.52 acres and is occupied by a small office/commercial building and a large fenced storage yard/parking area. Together, the three parcels form a triangle; although it meets the minimum depth, this shape is likely to provide less efficient layout options than more rectangular or square sites and requires conceptual layout to ensure the parcel can accommodate the desired site program. Adjacent uses include industrial, vacant land, and the campus of the Coachella Valley Mosquito and Vector Control District.

Site 4
Site 4 directly abuts the north side of the existing freight tracks, and would require acquisition of two separate parcels. The first parcel is approximately 1.59 acres and is currently home to Hertz Equipment Rental. The property includes one, single-story industrial-type building. The second, larger parcel is approximately 2.08 acres and is owned and occupied by Claremont Equipment. The property includes two single-story industrial buildings. The site can be accessed from only one side, off Industrial Place, and is approximately a quarter mile from a signalized intersection with Monroe Street, which provides access to an existing overpass over the rail corridor and to downtown Indio. All adjacent uses are industrial.

Site 5
Site 5 abuts the north side of the existing UPRR right-of-way. The 3.45-acre site has a single owner, and offers a roughly rectangular shape (although the rail-edge of the site is diagonal). The majority of the site is occupied by parking/storage, with a single-story industrial building and adjacent trailer in the middle of the site. The site is occupied by Pauley Construction. The site provides access from only one site, off Industrial Place; the parcel currently has two curb cuts along this frontage. The site is approximately 0.15 mile from the signalized intersection with Monroe Street, which provides existing overpass access over the rail corridor. Adjacent uses are all industrial in nature.

Site 6
Site 6 directly abuts the south side of Indio Boulevard. There is approximately 25-30 feet of land between the existing rail corridor and the edge of Indio Boulevard. This site is composed of three separate sites with a single owner. The area is approximately 6.9 acres. The site could be accessed from three sides, from Indio Blvd, Hoover Street and Fred Waring Dr. Adjacent uses include multi- and single-family residential to the west, small-scale retail (restaurant) to the east, and a vacant lot to the south.

Site 7
Site 7 is immediately east and next to Site 6, also on the west side of Indio Boulevard. Station and other amenities would occupy this parcel, with the actual passenger platform across the roadway. Like Site 5, the rail corridor is offset from Indio Boulevard approximately 25-30 feet. The parcel is 2.63 acres and has a single owner. The parcel offers access from Indio Boulevard and a southern access road. The parcel is roughly triangular in shape with the ‘long’ side abutting Indio Boulevard. Current uses include two small commercial/retail structures, one of which is a restaurant and the other a solid-sided/no window storage shed. There is a large, approximately 40-foot long above-ground storage tank on site. Adjacent uses include vacant land, a restaurant, and Riverside County Veterans Services and Social Services.

Site 8
Site 8 would utilize approximately half of this 10-acre parcel, which is under the control of a single owner. The site has approximately 210 feet of frontage on the west side of Indio Boulevard, as well as access to a mid-block alley, but is a largely mid-block parcel surrounded by other developed uses. Adjacent parcels are a mix of hotel, commercial and residential including both single- and multi-family homes.

Site 9
Site 9 abuts the east side of the existing UPRR right-of-way. The 2.63-acre site comprises two parcels with a single owner, Triangle Distributing, and is currently vacant. The site fronts Market Street and Fleming Way. The site is approximately a half-mile from the signalized intersection with Jackson Street, which offers an existing overpass of the rail corridor. Adjacent uses include vacant land, a for-rent storage unit facility and multi-tenant, single-story commercial.

Site 10
This site is immediately east of Site 6 and abuts the south side of Indio Boulevard. This site could be accessed from 3 sides: Indio Boulevard, Deglet Noor and Arabia Street. It is a combination of four sites, with three owners. Three of the parcels are vacant; the remaining central parcel houses two one-story commercial structures. Adjacent block uses are single family residential.

Site 11
The area between Indio Boulevard and the existing rail tracks begins to widen as it approaches the Jackson Street overpass. The narrow width of this...
Site 12
This site is located adjacent to the Jackson Street overpass. Recorded parcel size is just over an acre, so the site includes additional land between recorded parcel and railroad tracks are owned by the UPRR. Even with this land, however, the site is only 1.85 acres which does not meet the minimum size requirement.

Site 13
Site 13 is approximately 6.2 acres and is owned by the City of Indio. The southern portion of the parcel narrows and abuts an existing spur track from the existing rail. To the north, the site extends under the Jackson Street overpass. A greyhound trailer and surface parking lot occupy the northern portion of the site; the southern portion is vacant land. Adjacent uses are vacant land and single-story retail/commercial.

Site 14
This area is a single parcel that includes a tire/smog check shop, a muffler shop, a lumber yard and a vacant gas station/auto shop. Parcel depth varies from approximately 160 to 300 deep, measured from consistent fence line against the rail corridor. Adjacent uses include single-story commercial/retail and motel.

Site 15
Site 15 includes three parcels that total 4.2 acres. The site is located on the north side of the tracks, just south of the Golf Center Parkway overpass. The properties are vacant, but are part of an office/light industrial park that is being developed.
3.4 Level 1 Evaluation

**Level 1 Criteria**

Using a single pass/fail analysis, an initial evaluation was used to assess the initial 15 potential MMH site locations. The evaluation is shown in Table 3.1. The evaluation criteria used in the Level 1 evaluation includes criteria related to the ability of the site to provide needed functions and items related to community acceptance and project implementation.

**Functional Criteria**

This group of criteria looks at site size, potential circulation to and within the site, multi-modal connectivity to downtown destinations, and environmental issues.

1.1 Does the site have a minimum of 2.0 acres?
This site size would be able to contain the general features of a multi-modal hub, including 200 parking spaces (70,000 Sq. ft.), a dedicated 12-shuttle/bus/taxi lot (18,000 Sq. ft.), a 3,500 Sq. ft. station structure, a 7,500 Sq. ft. plaza, and provide buffer from the roadway.

1.2 Does the site provide sufficient depth for rail siding, platform, station building and parking?
The UPRR has stated that a rail siding will need to be provided for passenger access. This arrangement would require a minimum depth of approximately 300 feet (from track to roadway) to provide a buffer (10 feet), parking (60 feet), a drop-off roadway (25 feet), a plaza (40 feet), the station (100 feet) then the platform and siding (60 feet).

1.3 Will the site have sufficient length to accommodate the rail siding and platform?
In order to avoid disruption of freight service, the RCTC coordinating with the Union Pacific Railroad has determined that a passenger platform will need to be located on a minimum 1,800-foot long siding. The passenger platform will need to be a minimum 800 foot long passenger platform.

1.4 Does the site offer two access points to the multi-modal facility?
The station is anticipated to provide up to 200 parking spaces; for efficiency and safety, at least two access points are desired.

1.5 Will the site provide close connections with the existing Greyhound and Sunline Transit?
Multi-modal connections are important. This measures the degree that the site would provide convenient transfer to transit, or the degree in which existing routes would need to be modified.

1.6 Does the site have convenient access to Interstate 10?
This measures the ease in which park and ride access from Interstate 10 can be provided.

1.7 Does the site have adequate pedestrian connections to Downtown Indio and other city destinations?
Distance or barriers that would make it difficult for pedestrians to reach downtown or other key destinations, either because the barrier cannot be crossed or because it would require a lengthy or circuitous route to do so.

1.8 Known environmental problems, including but not limited to
hazardous materials, floodplain, contamination, air quality or historic resources?
These types of issues could result in significant delays and/or cost increases in site development or would require mitigation.

**Implementation**
These criteria looks for any issues related to land acquisition or lease, site preparation or cost that could make it difficult to design and construct a new transit station within a timely manner.

1.9 Does the City believe that adjacent owners would be amenable to a new transit station on the site?
Community support is critical to any development project, and this question seeks to identify any known or potential opposition to a transit station.

1.10 Does the City believe that the property owner(s) would be amenable or neutral regarding potential property sale or long-term lease?
This question assumes that the City will not use eminent domain to acquire property. While it is not possible to know the disposition of a property owner at an unidentified point in the future when the City decides to move forward with the project, this question does seek to identify properties that may be difficult to acquire.

1.11 Is the site believed to be free of existing uses with existing businesses in operation?
This question seeks to identify any existing uses that may require acquisition and relocation costs.

1.12 Can the site be developed without the relocation of any major trunk utilities?
This question seeks to identify any sites that may have significant overhead or underground facilities crossing the site that may require re-location. This question is very high-level; additional utility research may be undertaken during Level 2 evaluation.

1.13 Is the site free of any known factors that would preclude it from eligibility for federal funding?
This site assumes that the City may apply for federal funding in the future. This includes environmental activities related to hazardous waste and toxics. Types of sites protected under Section 4(f) of the USDOT Act of 1966 include public parks, recreation areas, wildlife refuges and historic. Development of these sites would require extensive documentation that there is ‘no feasible and prudent alternative’ that avoids impacts to the property in question.

---

**Level 1 Evaluation**

The evaluation of the initial 15 sites as shown in Table 3.1 is summarized below. The following sites are recommended for continued evaluation in Level 2:

- Site 1 – has sufficient size and shape, as well as providing good access. Connectivity to existing transit and to the downtown area was a concern, but not sufficient to eliminate the site in Level 1.

- Site 9 – has sufficient size and shape and met the other criteria. The site is not highly accessible by vehicle, nor is it in close proximity to the existing Greyhound or Sunline Transit Agency routes. However, since the site would provide a functional site, it was carried forward into Level 2.

- Site 13 – Site 13 is the site of the existing transportation center. This site met all Level 1 criteria.

- Site 15 - has sufficient size and shape and met the other criteria. The site is not highly accessible by vehicle, nor is it in close proximity to the existing Greyhound or Sunline Transit Agency routes. However, since the site would provide a functional site, it was carried forward into Level 2.

Based on the evaluation of the initial 15 sites as shown in Table 3.1, the following sites are not recommended for continued evaluation in Level 2.
### Table 3.1: Level 1 Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional</th>
<th>Site 1</th>
<th>Site 2</th>
<th>Site 3</th>
<th>Site 4</th>
<th>Site 5</th>
<th>Site 6</th>
<th>Site 7</th>
<th>Site 8</th>
<th>Site 9</th>
<th>Site 10</th>
<th>Site 11</th>
<th>Site 12</th>
<th>Site 13</th>
<th>Site 14</th>
<th>Site 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size/Shape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Utilization &amp; Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area &amp; Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Level 2 criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition/Displacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>FAIL</td>
<td>FAIL</td>
<td>FAIL</td>
<td>FAIL</td>
<td>FAIL</td>
<td>FAIL</td>
<td>FAIL</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>FAIL</td>
<td>FAIL</td>
<td>FAIL</td>
<td>FAIL</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>FAIL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Level 2 Evaluation

Level 2 Criteria

This section describes the second level site selection process used to evaluate the seven remaining potential sites for the location of a Multi-Modal Hub. The Level 2 evaluation was completed to provide a more detailed evaluation of the four remaining potential MMH sites. A preferred site has been identified as a result of the Level 2 evaluation. The Level 2 evaluation was completed using input received from the City of Indio, Sunline Transit and Caltrans. General guidance included:

- A site near downtown is desired, and a multi-modal hub would be consistent with the planning being completed by the City with the Downtown Specific Plan.
- A site close to existing transit routes and near the Highway 111/Flower Street Transfer Center is desired as this would minimize any needed changes to the street transit system to coordinate service with the new site.
- All of the sites provide similar proximity to access from Interstate 10 and to-and-from festival locations.

The following describes the Level 2 Criteria:

Functional Criteria

The functional criteria looks more critically at how well the site could provide space for additional modes, such as buses or private shuttles, provide modal separation and mitigate multi-modal conflict. It also considers how easily patrons can connect between the site and other existing origins and destinations.

2.1 Transit access – How much space does the site offer to accommodate local buses and regional buses on site?
This highlights whether bus bays can be included within the site itself. This is measured by the overall area of the site.

2.2 Vehicle access – Level of directness to vehicle access points from major arterial routes?
This measures the level of access and the capacity for vehicle movement in and out of the site. Measured in distance to an arterial route from each site.

Sites with Development Limitations

- Site 2 - Lacks sufficient depth to provide platform and track siding adjacent to the tracks. There is a Bureau of Reclamation standpipe visible in the center of Site 2; the irrigation line running through the site would be very difficult to relocate
- Site 3 - Lacks sufficient size to accommodate all multi-modal uses
- Site 4 - Has existing development, requiring purchase and relocation of businesses
- Site 5 - Has existing development, requiring purchase and relocation of businesses
- Site 6 - Lacks sufficient depth to provide platform and track siding adjacent to the tracks
- Site 7 - Lacks sufficient depth to provide platform and track siding adjacent to the tracks
- Site 8 - Lacks sufficient depth to provide platform and track siding adjacent to the tracks
- Site 9 - Site not sufficient size to provide for needed MMH features
- Site 10 - Lacks sufficient depth to provide platform and track siding adjacent to the tracks. Site not sufficient size to provide for needed MMH features
- Site 11 - Lacks sufficient depth to provide platform and track siding adjacent to the tracks
- Site 12 - Site not sufficient size to provide for needed MMH features. Lacks size for sufficient access and internal circulation
- Site 14 - Eliminated over environmental concerns related to two establishments located on this site listed in the EPA data base for hazardous materials
2.3 Pedestrian access – Degree of pedestrian access as measured by distance to major employment and retail nodes downtown or along Highway 111.

A half-mile (approximately a 10-minute walk) is considered to be the typical pedestrian catchment area for transit-oriented development and transit stations. Distance from the potential sites to activities located along Highway 111 is measured.

2.4 Does site provide sufficient length for passenger rail platform? This identifies if the site has sufficient width to be able to accommodate a passenger loading/unloading platform. Measured in width of the site, with a minimum 800 feet needed for the platform.

2.5 How much impact will the site have on existing bus operations? Even small changes to routes can have large-scale impacts to the overall transit system. With this criterion, the distance from the potential MMH site and the Highway 111/Flower Street transit center is measured.

2.6 Proximity to Interstate 10 – what is the distance for park and ride access? Some rail passenger riders will come from outside the city of Indio, and many may use I-10 to travel to the MMH. This criterion measures the distance of the MMH from the I-10 Freeway for regional commuters accessing the site.

2.7 Proximity to Coachella Valley (CV) Link - Is the site within 3 miles of the CV Link trail? This measures the distance from the proposed CV Link alignment to each potential site.

Safety
These criteria measure the degree of safe access for vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists.

2.8 Location in relation to high collision locations
Is the site located in close proximity to high collision locations? This criterion is measured by the number of collisions on roadway and intersections located adjacent to each potential site.

2.9 Measure of bicycle and pedestrian level of comfort on adjacent and connecting roadways.
Is the site connected to a network or a route that provides good bicycle and pedestrian service? This criterion measures the availability of sidewalk and bicycle facilities which connect the potential site to destinations.

Economic Development Potential
These criteria consider how well a new station would be compatible with adjacent land uses and how it might work as a catalyst to future development or neighborhood enhancement around a particular site.

2.10 Would a transit station on the site align with or promote City goals for the site and adjacent area, as identified in existing, adopted plans including the 2009 Indio Boulevard Study or the on-going Downtown Specific Plan? This question compares how well potential sites fit into the larger community vision, as recorded in planning documents.

2.11 Does the site offer the potential for a transit center to act as a community gateway? Transit stations represent a significant investment of public money and can often provide enhanced benefit as a piece of community character and placemaking. If the potential MMH site is located on a major arterial, it is considered to provide a gateway location.

2.12 Would a transit station integrate with adjacent land uses, existing or planned? A transit station offers many important community benefits, but can also come with increases in traffic, noise, light and other impacts. It is important that the transit station blend with adjacent uses, both in scale and use patterns. If the potential site was located adjacent to commercial or office land uses, it was rated as a positive. If located adjacent to residential land uses, it was rated as a negative. Site compatibility with adjacent industrial and airport land uses were determined to be neutral.

2.13 If the site were developed as a transit station, what is the possible impact on identified environmental justice communities? Each site was rated positive, neutral or negative based upon the percentage environmental justice population located near the potential site.

Implementation
Level 2 criteria focus on hard and soft costs associated with each site, including business relocation and property value.
2.14 What is the likely, (comparative/order of magnitude) cost of business relocation?
This question ranks (but does not provide a specific dollar figure) likely business relocation costs, based on size, number and type of existing buildings.

2.15 What is the likely, (comparative/order of magnitude) cost of property acquisition?
This question ranks likely property acquisition costs, using assessor’s records.

Level 2 Evaluation

The four sites were evaluated. Scores were given for site based a positive (1 point), neutral (0 points) or negative (negative point). The Level 2 evaluation is shown in Table 3.2.

**Recommended Site:**

**Site 13**
Site 13 provides the best functional space for a MMH site of those sites evaluated. Vehicle access is good, and the site is close to current transit and to Downtown. The site is currently owned by the City and has a parking lot already constructed for use. The site is not close to the CV Link, and access to I-10 is also not direct. Site 13 is the recommended site for the location of the MMH.

**Positive**
- Size of site sufficient width for platform, depth for platform, and contain MMH activities
- Would provide a gateway for city
- Less impact to bus operations
- Site has good vehicular access
- Better located for bicycle and pedestrian access
- No cost to acquire site or to relocate businesses
- Does not impact lower income populations
- Consistent with Downtown plans and economic development

**Neutral**
- Proximity of site to existing collisions

**Negative**
- Access from I-10 is the farthest distance of the sites evaluated.
- Longest distance to CV Link

**Site 1**
Site 1 has sufficient size to accommodate rail and multi-modal services. The site is near I-10 and at Jefferson Street which provides good access for regional travel and for many Indio residents. The site is the farthest from downtown, existing transit routes, and Greyhound. Given the location near I-10, the site has strong commercial development potential and a proposal to develop this site as a commercial node has been presented to the City for review. As such, this site may be difficult to obtain. Given issues related to the availability of the site, distance to existing transit and other activities, and consistency with current plans, this site is not recommended.

**Positive**
- Size of site sufficient width for platform, depth for platform, and contain MMH activities
- Would provide a gateway for city

**Neutral**
- Safety – good access, low number of collisions in vicinity

**Negative**
- Not close to Downtown, existing transit, CV Link
- Cost of property acquisition

**Site 9**
Site 9 is a small site, but there are adjacent vacant parcels that can be combined to make a larger site. The primary site issue is the width of the site is not wide enough for a 680 foot long platform. Located on the north side of the railroad tracks, the site does not provide short distance connections to Downtown, current transit routes or Greyhound. The property is undeveloped, and the assessed value is relatively low. Based on the Level 2 evaluation, this site is not recommended.

**Positive**
Access to the site is adequate

**Safety impacts**

**Neutral**
- Access to I-10
- Compatibility with adjacent land use
- Cost of property acquisition

**Negative**
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Site 15

This site provides sufficient size and width to support a MMH. The site provides good access to both I-10 and to the CV Link. The access to the site is on a local roadway through an industrial park. The site is located on the north side of the tracks, resulting in some distance to connect to the Downtown area or to existing transit services. There would be an acquisition cost to obtain this site for MMH use. Based on the Level 2 evaluation, this site is not recommended.

Positive
• Sufficient size and width
• Close proximity to I-10
• Safety of access

Neutral
• Size and shape of site
• Connectivity with CV Link

Negative
• Site access from local roads in industrial park
• On north side of tracks away from Downtown and current bus service
• Poor pedestrian and bicycle access to site
• Cost of property acquisition

Table 3.2: Level 2 Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Screen</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Site 1</th>
<th>Site 9</th>
<th>Site 13</th>
<th>Site 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Amount or space and shape of lot to accommodate local buses and regional buses on site or on adjacent roadways?</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Level of directness to vehicle access points from major arterial routes?</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Degree of pedestrian access as measured by distance major employment and retail nodes downtown or along SR-111.</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Will the site have sufficient length to accommodate the rail siding and platform?</td>
<td>Feet</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Impact to bus operation (distance to existing bus transfer sites)?</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Is the site located in close proximity for park and ride access from I-10.</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Proximity to CV Link?</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Location in relation to high collision location</td>
<td>Collisions w/ adjacent roadway int.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Measure of bicycle and pedestrian level of sidewalk and connect</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Potential for site to provide community gateway.</td>
<td>On arterial at City entry (Y/N)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Integration or compatibility with adjacent land uses</td>
<td>Land Use Review</td>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>Industrial/Service</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Impact to environmental justice populations?</td>
<td>% of Disadvantaged Pop</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>Cost of business relocation.</td>
<td>Current business (Y/N)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Cost of property acquisition.</td>
<td>Need to acquire (Y/N)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score: 3
SECTION 4.0
Multi-Modal Hub - Site Development
4.1 Introduction

Based upon the location at Indio Boulevard and Civic Center Drive is recommended as the preferred location for the MMH. The purpose of this report section is to describe the services that can be provided at a MMH and to provide site concepts that could be constructed on this preferred site.

4.2 Mobility Hub Services

Multi-modal hubs are places where people can make seamless connections between passenger rail, public transit and other travel options. The primary feature of a mobility hub is a transit station serving rail or bus transit. Each MMH can be designed specifically for the surrounding community it serves, ultimately making it easier for residents, employees, and visitors to use transit to travel from home to work and a wide variety of destinations in between.

Development of the MMH could potentially include additional travel services consisting of:

- **Public Transit**
  A MMH Site could be used as a transfer location between intercity rail and public transit or the other services listed below.

- **On-Demand Rideshare**
  On-demand rideshare services can facilitate connections for visitors carrying out inter-regional travel and residents that may not have access to a personal vehicle.

- **Bikeshare**
  Bikeshare services can encourage private first-last mile connections while providing convenient and secure bike parking options. As planned bikeways expand, bikeshare can help residents and visitors connect to neighboring communities.

- **Passenger Loading Zones**
  Designated curbside facilities contribute to seamless passenger loading and unloading while helping to reduce conflicts with transit vehicles and others parking at the station.

- **Other Transit**
  On-demand shuttles could be provided from this location to provide service to local music festivals, other events, hotels and casinos.

- **Park-and-Ride**
  Given the existing parking facility, the MMH location could be used as a park-and-ride lot site for regional transit routes.
4.3 Passenger Rail Station Concepts

The multi-modal hub station concepts developed follow the station concept format that Amtrak has developed to categorize its stations based on anticipated passenger volume. Decisions such as whether the station is staffed or un-staffed, and the amenities and customer service components provided are based upon the actual or anticipated passenger volume at the station. A station concept was developed that provides three separate construction phases. This phased plan minimizes local operating costs, and phases in services as passenger use increases over time. These concepts are defined as follows:

- Base Station (similar to Amtrak Unstaffed Station)
- Mid-Level Station (similar to Amtrak Caretaker Station)
- Transit Hub Station (a higher level Amtrak Caretaker Station)

**Base Station (Phase 1)**
The Base Station is shown in Figure 4.1. This is the type of station that would be developed when initial services start or to serve the Festival Passenger Train service or bi-weekly Amtrak service. This type of station is a low-cost and low-maintenance approach to providing a multi-modal hub. This station is basically a park-and-ride lot that includes only a shelter and/or platform canopy to protect passengers from the weather. This station is not staffed. This type of station would be consistent with initial forecasted service passenger rail service levels and ridership.

This concept includes the following features and amenities:

**STATION BUILDING:**
- No building/No baggage services
- Open air shelter type facility with benches
- Open access to trains (ticketing done on train)
- Automated ticketing (Quik-Trak Machines) optional
- No wireless service provided
- No vending machines
- No public restroom

**PLATFORM ACCESS:**
- Hard surface path provided from parking area to platform.

**MOBILITY CONNECTIONS:**
- Amtrak Station Program and Planning Guidelines
- Transit: uses existing bus pull-out area on Indio Boulevard that can accommodate up to four buses.
- Greyhound: Shown at current location.
- Pedestrian: Pedestrian walking area using pavement markings through parking lot area to indicate connections to transit stop area.
- Bike: bicycle racks provided
- TNC (Lyft, Uber) informal pick-up/drop-off locations used for transportation network companies
- Parking: Over 100 spaces are available in the existing lot that would more than accommodate a typical day.

**Mid-Level Station (Phase 2)**
The Mid-Level Station is shown in Figure 4.2. This is the type of station provides amenities that could be provided initially, or be provided as ridership and service levels increase over time. This Phase 2 alternative does not include interior space, rather it includes a canopy to provide a shaded waiting area as service levels increase. Interior waiting space may be considered in the future.

This concept includes the following features and amenities:

**STATION BUILDING:**
- Unstaffed
- No baggage services
- Canopy waiting area
- Open access to trains (ticketing done on train)
- Automated ticketing (Quik-Trak Machines)
- Wireless service provided
- Food & Beverage
  - Vending
- Retail/Hotel
  - Space available for future development
- Restrooms
  - No public restrooms are provided
- Real-Time Transit Info (ITS)
  - Next train/next bus arrival time

**PLATFORM ACCESS:**
- Hard surface path provided from parking area to platform.

**MOBILITY CONNECTIONS:**
- Transit: modifies existing bus pull-out area on Indio Boulevard for
saw-tooth access to accommodate up to four buses.

- Greyhound: Shown relocated to north end of the parking area. A dedicated on-street bus bay provided to reduce need for internal circulation.
- Pedestrian: Pedestrian walking area using pavement markings through parking lot area to indicate connections to transit stop area. In addition, a sidewalk provided along entrance drive to accommodate foot traffic, with connections to Downtown. Crosswalks enhanced at Indio Boulevard and Civic Center Drive.
- Bike: bicycle racks provided. Bicycle route or lane provided to connect to city-wide bicycle network.
- TNC (Lyft, Uber) spaces
  - Dedicated pick-up/drop-off area for transportation network companies (TNC) and for kiss-and-ride
- Potential area for Carshare spaces (Zipcar, Car to Go, etc.)
- Bikeshare / Scooter Share
  - Assume dockless, so need a (large) plaza area with designated area to park bikes and e-scooters
- Parking: Over 100 spaces are available in the existing lot that would more than accommodate parking demand. Additional parking available on the west side of Indio Boulevard. Shade canopies are shown.

**Transit Hub Station (Phase 3)**

The Transit Hub Station Concept is shown in Figure 4.3. This station concept provides capacity for Sunline Transit to use this location for all Indio transit transfers. The on-street bus pull out area would be re-constructed in a saw tooth pattern to facilitate individual bus movement in and out of the station area. This station concept includes a building area that would provide a waiting area, vending space, and outdoor plaza space. This station would not be staffed, but would include the following features and amenities:

**STATION BUILDING:**
- Unstaffed (security needed at some level)
- Self-service baggage
- Climate-controlled waiting area
- Open access to trains (ticketing done on train)
- Automated ticketing (Quik-Trak Machines)
- Wireless service provided
- Food & Beverage
  - Vending
- Office Space

- Area available for Sunline Transit
- Retail/Hotel
  - Space available for future development
- Restrooms
  - Operator
  - Regular
- Real-Time Transit Info (ITS)
  - Next train/next bus arrival time

**PLATFORM ACCESS:**
- Hard surface path provided from parking area to platform.

**MOBILITY CONNECTIONS:**
- Transit: enhanced saw-tooth bus pull-out area on Indio Boulevard that can accommodate up to five buses. Additional area available to the south.
- Greyhound: Relocated to north end of the parking area. A dedicated on-street bus bay provided to reduce need for internal circulation.
- Pedestrian: Pedestrian walking area constructed through parking lot area to indicate connections to transit stop area. In addition, a sidewalk provided along entrance drive to accommodate foot traffic, with connections to Downtown. Crosswalks enhanced at Indio Boulevard and Civic Center Drive.
- Bike: bicycle racks provided. Bicycle route or lane provided to connect to city-wide bicycle network.
- TNC (Lyft, Uber) spaces: Dedicated pick-up/drop-off area for transportation network companies (TNC) and for kiss-and-ride
- Potential area for Carshare spaces (Zipcar, Car to Go, etc)
- Bikeshare / Scooter Share: Assume dockless, so need a (large) plaza area with designated area to park bikes and e-scooters
- Parking: Over 100 spaces are available in the existing lot that would more than accommodate a typical parking demand. Additional parking available on the west side of Indio Boulevard. Shade canopies are provided.
Figure 4.1: Base Station Concept (Phase 1)
Figure 4.2: Mid-Level Station (Phase 2)
Figure 4.3: Transit Hub Station (Phase 3)
4.4 Rail and Platform Improvements

A rail passenger platform and needed track modifications at the Indio MMH site will be constructed as part of the grant received to provide a three-weekend Coachella Valley Special Events Train. The passenger train operations are funded over a five-year period, beginning in 2021. For the selected MMH site, the proposed location for the platform will be the same location as selected in the MMH site. The platform and rail siding would be placed on a Union Pacific-owned lot that is adjacent to the MMH site. In addition to the temporary platform, a rail siding will need to be constructed to provide train access to the platform away from the Union Pacific mainline tracks. The platform, rail siding, paved access to the platform will be constructed as part of this grant. A general layout of where the platform and siding may be located is provided in Figure 4.4. Coordination with the Union Pacific Railroad and the engineering for this project is being completed by the RCTC, and that effort will determine the specific location for these rail facilities.
Figure 4.4: General Layout of Track and Platform
4.5 Site Development Costs

Preliminary estimates of probable costs have been prepared for the three Multi-Modal Hub concept phases. In addition, multi-modal site access project costs are also presented. This opinion of probable construction cost is only a rough order of magnitude valuation intended to provide general information to establish construction budget.

Phase 1 Station – Short-Term

The Phase 1 concept was developed for short term users. Potential use of the site includes the Festival Train, funded by RCTC, use by SunLine Transit for a park-n-ride and possible use by Amtrak for its longer-range service. The Phase 1 Station construction activities include providing a boarding platform, rail track sidings, and pedestrian access with a hard surface pedestrian path from the platform to the parking area.

- The platform access will be a hard surface pedestrian path from the platform to the parking area. This path will be paid for by the RCTC grant.

This phase is funded by RCTC’s Festival Train grant. These costs are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Costs</td>
<td>$8,688,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCTC Match</td>
<td>$2,745,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Rail Assistance Grant</td>
<td>$5,942,510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $8,688,241

Phase 2 Station – Mid-Level

Phase 2 is a mid-level station used to accommodate the proposed passenger rail service. It may be used by SunLine Transit as a transfer center and may also be used by Amtrak. The cost would be approximately $3.0 million and could be funded through state and federal grants.

This station is basically a park-and-ride lot that includes only a shelter and/ or platform canopy to protect passengers from the weather. This station is not staffed. It includes features consistent with the Amtrak Unstaffed Station category guidelines, such as no building, no baggage services, just an open-air shelter type facility with benches and security fencing.

- There will be a variety of mobility connections, including transit (SunLine), Greyhound, bicycle racks, parking, rideshare services and informal pick-up/drop off locations.
- Any other improvements would be negotiated with the Union Pacific Railroad.
- The on-street bus pull-out area would be re-constructed in a saw tooth pattern to facilitate individual bus movement in and out of the station area, and would be provided if SunLine Transit buses would utilize this facility for local bus transfers.

The cost for Phase 2 is for a functioning station. The total cost is estimated to be $3,077,171 in present dollars and assumes the use of the platform to be built by the RCTC Festival Train grant. The details are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Est. Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>$30,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Site Improvements</td>
<td>$800,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greyhound Bus Depot Related Work</td>
<td>$290,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Canopies</td>
<td>$1,535,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Waiting Area w/ Canopies</td>
<td>$420,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,077,171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 3 Station – Transit Hub

Phase 3 is the full multi-modal site, used by City to coordinate transportation services provided city-wide, as well as for expanded passenger rail service. The development of this station phase is considered beyond the time horizon for this project and these costs have not been estimated. The phase would include a larger on-site structure. In addition, the cost for solar panels may be included in this phase. The solar panels cost would be an additional $1,606,028 and could be added in Phase 3, or in Phase 2.

Source: RCTC Coachella Valley Special Event Train Platform Development Project SRA Program Grant Application Package, dated January 2019, JACOBUS & YUANG, INC. for Stantec report, “Conceptual Design Opinion of Probably Cost, 10/10/19
Multi-Modal Access

The additional costs for multi-modal access include:

- The additional cost for adjusting Sunline transit operations to be re-routed to the new MMH site, as currently designed.
- The costs of a bicycle/scooter facility providing a connection to from the MMH site to the site of music festivals.
- Cost of pedestrian crossing enhancement on Indio Boulevard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Est. Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-year Transit Operations Change</td>
<td>$1,257,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oasis Street Bicycle Lanes</td>
<td>$424,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center Drive/Requa Bicycle Boulevard</td>
<td>$38,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian refuge Indio Blvd/Civic Center</td>
<td>$425,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,145,070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION 5.0
Multi-Modal Hub - Site Access
5.1 Introduction

The benefits provided by a multi-modal hub will depend on the level of connectivity between the modes and services provided at a Multi-Modal Hub. In order to determine the opportunities available, the major transportation modes providing access to the MMH were reviewed including transit, bicycle and scooter, and pedestrians. The quality of access and recommendations to improve modal connectivity are described in this section.

5.2 Transit Access

Sunline Transit currently provides a network of transit routes that connects the communities in the Coachella Valley. The system operates by providing routes connecting transit hubs located in Coachella, Indio, Palm Desert and Palm Springs. Additional route transfer connections are also provided in the other valley communities. Indio is one of the major transfer points within the Sunline transit system. The transfer point in Indio is located on the south side of Highway 111 at Flower Street. Bus pull-outs are provided to remove buses from Highway 111 traffic lanes. Small bus shelters are provided to provide protection for transit users from the sun and weather. This transfer location is located 0.4 miles from the multi-modal hub location.

The opportunity to provide connection between future passenger rail service and local bus service was explored. Bus connectivity to the MMH could be enhanced by modifying transit routes to provide a stop at the new Multi-Modal Hub. To do so, most of the routes serving Indio would be modified to bring buses to stop in front of the MMH site. Here, transit vehicles could utilize a bus pull out area on the east side of Indio Boulevard located north of Civic Center Drive.

The following describes potential route modifications that could made to Sunline Transit Agency routes to access the MMH. While Sunline Transit Agency has been consulted in developing these potential modifications, the following represents only one example of how transit routes could be modified. Any specific future route modifications would be determined based on additional study and coordination between the City of Indio and Sunline Transit Agency.

Local Transit Routes

Bus Line 80 – Indio Southbound Loop provides a loop around Indio operating in a clock-wise direction. Near the MMH site, Line 80 travels south on Jackson Street to then turn east on Highway 111. Route modification shown in Figure 5.1 would include diverting the route to Civic Center Drive, then to northbound Indio Boulevard. From the MMH site, the bus would return to the original route by traveling north on Indio Boulevard, to either Smurr Street or Oasis Street to Requa Avenue then returning to Jackson Street. The additional distance for these modifications would be 0.66 miles using Smurr Street and 1.2 miles using Oasis Street.

Figure 5.1: Line 80 Modifications
Bus Line 81 – Indio Northbound Loop provides counter-clockwise loop around Indio. There are two options to provide access to the MMH site for Line 81. If the current stop located just south of the MMH site would be acceptable, Line 81 could remain as currently provided with the stop just south of the MMH parking lot. If a stop would be desired at the bus pull out area of the MMH site, the route would be modified to provide the loop through the Downtown area as shown in Figure 5.2. The route would continue north on Indio Boulevard to Oasis Street, to Miles Avenue, to Park Street, to Requa Avenue and back to Jackson Street. The distance using this route modification is 0.15 miles shorter than the current route.

Bus Line 91 – Indio to Coachella is a short route that operates in a section of Indio that is located south of Highway 111 to the Downtown area of Coachella. This route could provide a transit feeder from communities located to the south, including Coachella, Thermal, Mecca and Oasis. This route currently provides service to the Flower Transfer Center on a limited number of runs. Extending this route to the MMH site times when passenger trains would be arriving or departing would provide a feeder route to the MMH to-and-from communities to the south. This route modification as shown in Figure 5.3 would add approximately 0.3 miles to the end of the route.
Regional Transit Routes

Bus Line 54 operates between the Cities of Indio and Palm Desert on Fred Waring Drive. Line 54 would be adjusted to access the MMH site as shown below in Figure 5.4. From Requa Avenue and Jackson Street, the route could be adjusted to use Civic Center Drive to Indio Boulevard to access the transfer location (Option 1); or it could continue on Jackson Street to Highway 111 to Indio Boulevard (Option 2). The distance for Option 1 is shorter by 0.9 miles and provides less route coverage than does the existing route. Option 2 is the same length as the existing route, but does result in a large route "loop".

Figure 5.4: Line 54 Modifications

Bus Line 111 - This route operates between Downtown Coachella and Downtown Palm Springs. As shown in Figure 5.5, access to the MMH site could be achieved by modifying the route by using Jackson Street, Civic Center Drive and Indio Boulevard before returning to the original route alignment. In order to minimize additional route circulation needed to access the MMH site, a stop would need to be provided on both sides of Indio Boulevard just south of Civic Center Drive, rather than at the bus pull out area. Transfers between Line 111 and other buses would have a block of travel. This route modification results in 0.4 additional miles of travel.

Figure 5.5: Line 111 Modifications
Transit Operating Changes

The adjustment of local and regional SunLine Transit lines impacts route distance and route cost. The potential change in annual operating cost by route cost is shown in Table 5.1. The modification of all Indio lines would result in an increase of approximately $144,000 in annual operating cost. This amount would vary based upon the line alternatives selected.

If transit operations are unable to be increased, the impacts to annual operating costs could be reduced with minor transit line stop modifications. For example, if Line 111 is not adjusted, the annual impact to transit operations would be half. Transit operational impacts be further minimized if the MMH transit stops for Line 81 would remain in its current location on the east side of Indio Boulevard, south of Civic Center Drive. Likewise, if the MMH site Stop for Line 80 is located on the west side of Indio Boulevard, south of Civic Center Drive, the impact to transit operations would be reduced. With these changes, the net impact to transit operational costs would be minimal. These are potential options that can be explored as the concept is developed further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Existing Length</th>
<th>New Length</th>
<th>Change in An. Operating Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line 80 Alt 1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>$ 55,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 80 Alt 2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>$ 80,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 81</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>$ 7,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 91</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$ 1,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 54 Alt 1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>(34,791)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 54 Alt 2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>(139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 111</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>$ 79,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 144,443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alternative 1 used for both Line 80 and Alternative 2 for Line 81

5.3 Bicycle/Scooter Access

Existing and planned bicycle facilities in the study area are shown in Figure 5.6. The planned projects were initially identified in the City’s Mobility Element of the General Plan, and was then included as part of the Complete Streets Plan. A planned project to note is the proposed bicycle facility on Oasis Street between Highway 111 and Avenue 48. The plans also call for Class III bicycle routes to be established on other streets in the Downtown area.

A bicycle level-of-comfort analysis was completed to rate the safety and comfort for bicyclists for the streets in the vicinity of the MMH site, and is shown in Figure 5.7. The bicycle level of comfort/stress indicator assists in the analysis of bike route corridors by scoring the safety and comfort element of each corridor segment. The bicycle LOS analysis identifies potential areas for bicycle improvements that enhances both the safety and comfort for the riders. The bicycle comfort scores from 1 to 4 are determined through an analysis of road characteristics including speed limit, number of lanes and availability of protected buffers.

- Bicycle Comfort Score – 1: The route is suitable for all levels of bikers including children.
- Bicycle Comfort Score – 2: The route is suitable for most adult riders of varied levels.
- Bicycle Comfort Score – 3: The route is suitable for the average and above level adult riders.
- Bicycle Comfort Score – 4: The route is suitable only for expert adult riders.

The major roads in Downtown Indio with low bike comfort scores include Highway 111, Jackson St, Indio Blvd, and Oasis St.
Figure 5.6: Bicycle Level of Comfort
Bicycle Access Enhancement

The City of Indio is addressing the need to improve the comfort of travel for bicyclists and pedestrians through a Complete Streets Plan that is now underway and the recently completed Mobility Element of the General Plan. Bicycle and pedestrian access to-and-from the MMH will enhance the multi-modal function of the site.

The Mobility Element and Complete Streets Plan under development have proposed to complete a city-wide bicycle network with a focus on major corridors. Using this information and the bicycle level-of-comfort information presented in Figure 5.6, a project was identified to provide improved bicycle connectivity to the downtown, the College of the Desert, the Fairgrounds and to the CV Link Connector on Avenue 48 and other bicycle lanes that would connect to the Empire Polo Grounds. The project includes bicycle boulevard elements and cycle track elements as shown in Figure 5.7. The location for the project is shown in Figure 5.8.

Figure 5.8: Existing and Planned Bicycle Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Distance (ft)</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class IV Cycle Track:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$51,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oasis</td>
<td>Civic Center Drive</td>
<td>Hwy 111 Dr Carreon Blvd</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>4 buffers, two stripes, signage</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$51,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Carreon Blvd</td>
<td>Ave 48</td>
<td></td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>4 buffers, two stripes, signage</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$103,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 buffers, two stripes, signage</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$103,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III - Bike Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$145,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center Drive</td>
<td>Indio Blvd</td>
<td>Oasis St</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Sharrows and Signs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design &amp; Inspection</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$145,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$509,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Pedestrian Access

Pedestrian connections were reviewed between the MMH and key destinations located within walking distance. The walkshed analysis shown in Figure 5.9 depicts the average distance pedestrians can achieve within 5 and 10 minutes walking from the proposed MMH location. Most of Downtown Indio can be reached within a 10 minute walk.

The pedestrian Level of Comfort (LOC) methodology analyzes pedestrian path and sidewalks by scoring the safety and comfort element of each corridor segment. The pedestrian comfort scores from 1 to 4 are determined through an analysis of road characteristics including speed limit, number of lanes and availability of protected buffers.

- **Pedestrian Comfort Score – 1**: The path is suitable for adults and children.
- **Pedestrian Comfort Score – 2**: The path is suitable for most adults and supervised children.
- **Pedestrian Comfort Score – 3**: The path is suitable for most adults with awareness.
- **Pedestrian Comfort Score – 4**: The path is suitable only for adults with high awareness.

As shown in Figure 5.9 the pedestrian LOC is fair or good on most local-oriented Downtown streets. Major roads in Downtown Indio with a difficult pedestrian comfort score (LOC: 4) include Highway 111, Jackson Street, and Indio Boulevard. The low score is a result of the higher speeds on these streets and lack of a buffer between the sidewalk and the travel lanes. The Jackson Street Bridge over the UPRR also has narrow sidewalks causing the bridge to be a barrier for comfortable pedestrian travel. The crossing of Indio Boulevard and Jackson Street is important for access to-and-from the Downtown area. Pedestrian movement has been accommodated by a crosswalk and pedestrian signal heads indicating time for crossing. A project to further improve pedestrian crossing at Indio Boulevard and Civic Center Drive could be considered by providing a pedestrian refuge in the median of Indio Boulevard. This project is shown on the MMH site plan.
Figure 5.9: Pedestrian Level of Comfort
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5.5 Roadway Access

Vehicle access to the MMH is provided by arterial routes through Indio. Access from I-10 to the MMH site is provided from Jackson Street and Golf Center Parkway and from Jefferson Street continuing on Indio Boulevard. Other access to the MMH site is provided by Indio Boulevard, Highway 111, Jackson Street and other routes. These streets are described below:

Indio Boulevard

Indio Boulevard parallels the Union Pacific Railroad tracks and extends the length of the city. From Jefferson Street to Avenue 48 is a four-lane roadway with a raised median. The posted speed is 50 MPH between Jefferson Street and Monroe Street, and 45 MPH between Monroe Street and Highway 111, then 50 MPH southerly to Avenue 48. Daily traffic volumes (2017) are 23,000 at the location of the MMH.

Jackson Street

Jackson Street runs north-south through Indio. It provides connections to I-10 and would be used as a major route to access the MMH. Jackson Street is primarily a four-lane roadway for much of its length. It provides a four-lane overpass of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. The intersection with Civic Center Drive is signalized. The posted speed limit on Jackson Street in the Downtown area is 40 MPH. Daily traffic volume (2017) in the Downtown area is 17,000. No bicycle facilities are present on Jackson Street.

Golf Center Parkway

Golf Center Parkway provides access to I-10 and connects to Highway 111. In the northern part of Indio, Golf Center Parkway is a four-lane roadway with median, with a posted speed limit of 50 MPH. South of Avenue 45, the roadway is two-lanes with an overpass of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks and Indio Boulevard. The posted speed is also 50 MPH on this section. Daily traffic volume (2017) near Highway 111 is 15,200. Bicycle lanes are provided on Golf Center Parkway.

Highway 111

Highway 111 provides a major east-west connection from Indio to neighboring cities. Between Monroe Street to Indio Boulevard, the median alternates between a raised median and center left-turn lane with a speed limit of 35 MPH. Highway 111 carries some of the highest travel volume in Indio. West of Jackson Street, daily traffic volumes (2017) approach 25,000. East of Jackson Street, daily volumes are lower, at 15,200. No bicycle facilities are present on Highway 111.

Oasis Street

Oasis Street runs through the heart of Downtown Indio, from Indio Boulevard to its southern terminus at Avenue 48. Oasis Street is primarily a four-lane roadway with a raised median, except for a short roadway segment just south of Highway 111 where the roadway is two lanes with a raised median. Posted speeds on Oasis Street north of Highway 111 are 25 MPH, and south of Highway 111, posted speed limits are 40 MPH. Daily Traffic volume (2017) is estimated at 5,500. No bicycle facilities are present on Oasis Street.

Civic Center Drive

Civic Center Drive is a three-lane roadway that extends from Indio Boulevard to Oasis Street and provides the entrance into the MMH site. The intersections of Civic Center Drive with Indio Boulevard and Jackson Street are signalized. Civic Center Drive directly connects the Indio Branch Library, Indio City Hall and the College of the Desert. The College of the Desert has expansion plans that will result in the City vacating a block of Civic Center Drive between Towne Street and Oasis Street.

Requa Avenue

Requa Avenue is a three-lane undivided roadway with a posted speed limit of 30 MPH between Monroe Street and Smurr Street, 25 MPH between Smurr Street and Jackson Street, and 30 MPH between Jackson Street and Indio Blvd. Requa Avenue goes through Downtown Indio, providing access to numerous destinations. Traffic volume (2017) is 7,000 per day. There are no bicycle facilities present on Requa Avenue.

Roadway System Operation

The roadway system traffic operation in the vicinity of the Indio Downtown was evaluated. Intersection traffic operation is based on the level-of-service (LOS) grading defined in the Highway Capacity Manual. This grading system rates the intersections from a LOS A to LOS F. This grading system is summarized in Table 5.3.
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Table 5.3: Intersection Level of Service (LOS) Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Average Seconds of Vehicle Delay</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10 or less</td>
<td>Short delays where many vehicles proceed without stopping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.1 to 20</td>
<td>Short delays but more vehicles stop that with LOS A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.1 to 35</td>
<td>Longer delays but some vehicles can proceed without stopping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35.1 to 55</td>
<td>Longer delays and many vehicles stop for red signals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>55.1 to 80</td>
<td>Longer delays and some vehicles may have to wait for a second green signal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>over 80</td>
<td>Longer delays and queues are long where many vehicles to not move through intersection on green signal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The traffic operations evaluation shows that the Indio roadways are relatively uncongested. Daily traffic volumes and intersection level-of-service are shown for the MMH impact area in Figure 5.10. One intersection operates at LOS D and the other at LOS C, with the other intersections at LOS A or LOS B. Overall, the higher volumes and higher delays are found on Highway 111 and on Avenue 48. These delays are still not considered to exceed City standards, with only short durations of delays occurring. In general, access to the MMH is shown to be sufficient to support rail passenger access to the station area.

Site Access

The MMH site would utilize Indio Boulevard and Civic Center Drive for vehicle access. The primary access point is the intersection of Indio Drive and Civic Center Drive. This access point is signalized. A second access right-turn in, right-turn out access point is provided on Indio Boulevard to the north of Civic Center Drive.

Parking

Approximately 130 parking spaces are currently available for use at the MMH site. This parking supply is anticipated to be sufficient for future passenger rail patrons. Additional parking is available across Indio Boulevard along the north side of Civic Center Drive for use during peak travel days.

Traffic Impacts

The traffic operations were evaluated for intersections along Oasis Street if traffic lanes were reduced in order to provide bicycle lanes. The traffic impact of lane reductions for existing year (2017) and for considering traffic growth to the year 2035 is shown in Table 5.4. The future year 2035 traffic forecast used in this analysis was developed for the Mobility Element by Iteris, Inc. using the Riverside County Traffic Analysis Model (RivTAM). The results show that even for the forecast year of 2035, the lane reduction and placement of bicycle lanes on Oasis Street will provide for an acceptable level of traffic flow.

Table 5.4: LOS Analysis for Oasis Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oasis Street:</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Future Year</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indio Blvd</td>
<td>Signal A</td>
<td>Signal A</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 111</td>
<td>Signal B</td>
<td>Signal C</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carreon Blvd</td>
<td>Signal A</td>
<td>Signal B</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue 48</td>
<td>Stop C</td>
<td>Signal C</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.10: Intersection Level of Service (P.M. Peak Hour)
SECTION 6.0
Funding and Management Plan
6.1 Introduction

This section outlines a plan for future funding opportunities as well as a management plan for the construction and ongoing operations of the proposed Multi-Modal Hub (MMH) in the City of Indio, which, in the short term, will provide a stop for the planned Festival Train and, in the long term, serve as a multi-modal facility for the City of Indio and the region.

This section provides:

- Funding Options
- Funding Plan
- Project Schedule
- Project Partners
- Management Plan
- Memorandum of Understanding

6.2 Funding Options

The following are several options to fund the capital and operating costs of the City of Indio Multi-Modal Hub.

- State Rail Assistance Program: The train platform and the pedestrian walkway from the platform to the parking area is covered by the existing RCTC grant\(^1\), which is funded with a combination of $5.9 million of a State Rail Assistance grant, matched by $2.7 million of RCTC's transportation sales tax revenue.

- State ATP Grant Program: The state Active Transportation Program would be a good source for improvements to non-motorized transportation at the station area, such as bicycle racks, additional pedestrian walkways, roadway improvements to facilitate bicycles, pedestrians and SunLine Transit Agency services. Although the next round of ATP competition has not been finalized, the grant applications would most likely be due in the fall each year with a grant decision by the state in the spring. Last year, the Riverside County area received four ATP grants, ranging from $300,000 to $5 million.

- State and Federal Transit Capital Grants: If SunLine Transit Agency were to develop the Multi-Modal Hub (MMH) as one of their stops and multimodal centers, then state and federal bus grants could be used. The City of Indio could partner with SunLine for those grants, but SunLine would have to be the lead implementor of the improvements. Some of the capital and operating grants include Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Sections 5307, 5310, 5311 and 5399 Funds. State Transit Assistance and the Bicycle program are California state funding.

- State of Good Repair Capital Grants: If the LOSSAN trains were extended to City of Indio, then LOSSAN could secure a Federal-State Partnership for State of Good Repair (SOGR) Program. This program, run by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) provides funding to repair, replace or rehabilitate publicly or Amtrak owned or controlled railroad equipment, infrastructure and facilities. FRA recently announced more than $272 million in grant funding to 10 rail projects in 10 states.

\(^1\) RCTC Coachella Valley Special Event Train Platform Development Project SRA Program Grant, March 2019
6.3 Funding Plan

The California State Transportation Agency in 2019 awarded $5.9 million to the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) to construct a temporary train station platform in the City of Indio for special event train service beginnings in 2021 for the Coachella and Stagecoach festival attendees. RCTC secured the grant through the State Rail Assistance program funded by the gas tax. RCTC is contributing an additional $2.7 million to build the $8.6 million project. This funding will build a temporary train platform at the City of Indio Transit Center, along with improved pedestrian access to Amtrak rail service that operates on adjacent tracks.

The construction of the temporary train platform will establish on a limited basis passenger rail service in the City of Indio, however, because its usage will only occur for a few weeks annually, it will not support the overall operation of the Indio Transit Center as a multi-modal facility. Therefore, in order to realize this type of facility, the City of Indio along with appropriate partners will need to seek capital and operating funding. A number of additional funding sources will be required to complete the construction of the MMH. Table 6.1 lists funding options for the capital and operating requirements of the proposed MMH, as well as a potential timeline.
Table 6.1: Funding and Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
<th>Potential Funding Sources</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 Station platform &amp; pedestrian walkway</td>
<td>$8,688,241</td>
<td>RCTC State Rail Assistance Festival Train Grant; RCTC matching funds</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 Bicycle lanes &amp; lockers</td>
<td>$462,500</td>
<td>Active Transportation Program Grant</td>
<td>2021-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 Station platform canopy, benches, security fencing</td>
<td>$3,077,172</td>
<td>State Rail Assistance Grant; RCTC, LOSSAN and SunLine Transit capital grants</td>
<td>2022-2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 Station solar panels</td>
<td>$1,606,028</td>
<td>SunLine Transit capital grants</td>
<td>2022-2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3 Multi-Modal Hub, incl. building w/ waiting area, vending space, plaza, bus facilities</td>
<td>$2,145,070</td>
<td>State Rail Assistance Grant; SunLine Transit, LOSSAN and RCTC capital grants</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Station Area Annual Maintenance &amp; Operating Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festival Train</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>City of Indio</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Modal Hub</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>City of Indio, RCTC, SunLine Transit</td>
<td>2022-2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- Capital costs are 2019 dollars and are estimated by KOA.
- The Festival Train annual estimated costs for maintenance and operations are based on City of Indio average costs\(^2\) for the Parks Department garbage pick-up and clean up with a vendor.
- The Multi-Modal Hub maintenance and operations annual costs are based on the cost of a small RCTC rail station with a building and no elevator\(^3\). This cost does not include the $9,240 of annual income from the Greyhound lease or the potential revenue from a facility lease. Assuming a 600 square foot building facility, at $1.25 per square foot, the annual income could be $9,000.

More specific funding options would be developed once more detailed cost estimates and schedules have been determined and the management options decided.

Table 6.2: Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Estimated Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiate Phase 1 Project Plan, Specification and Estimate</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Approvals Secured</td>
<td>May – July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Bids Issued</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contract Bids Due</td>
<td>September – Oct. 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contract Awarded/Notice to Proceed Issued</td>
<td>October – November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Commences</td>
<td>December 2020 - Jan. 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction is Complete/Station Ready for Service</td>
<td>Jan. 2021 – March 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Phase 1 station, the RCTC has estimated the following Festival Train Project Schedule, as shown in Table 6.2.\(^4\)

For Phase 2, it is estimated that it could begin by 2022, after a year of the Festival Train. That would give state and local agencies the confidence to invest in a longer-term use of the City of Indio station.

For Phase 3, the RCTC regional rail study estimates an initiation of the passenger rail system to the Coachella Valley by 2024.\(^5\)

---

\(^2\) Costs provided by the City of Indio
\(^3\) Costs provided by RCTC

\(^4\) Schedule included in the RCTC Coachella Valley Special Event Train Platform Development Project SRA Program Grant Application Package, dated January 2019

6.5 Project Partners

The following are the current and potential funding partners for the construction and operations of the MMH:

**Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC)** – RCTC is the recipient of the $5.9 million State Rail Assistance grant, matched by $2.7 million of its transportation sales tax revenue. It will oversee, in partnership with Amtrak, the engineering and construction of the temporary rail station platform for the Festival Train service. The grant does have sufficient funding and it is RCTC’s plan to build the pedestrian paths from the platform to the existing parking lot. RCTC will transmit a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the City of Indio’s review and consideration that will outline roles and responsibilities for this station site. See Section 6.6 for more details.

**LOSSAN** – The Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor Agency (LOSSAN) will operate the intercity rail passenger service with Amtrak as its contractor. LOSSAN is a joint powers authority originally formed in 1989 that works to increase ridership, revenue, capacity, reliability, coordination and safety on the coastal rail line between San Diego, Los Angeles and San Luis Obispo. It is governed by a 11-member Board of Directors composed of elected officials representing rail owners, operators, and planning agencies along the rail corridor. RCTC is a member. The LOSSAN Agency is staffed by the Orange County Transportation Authority.

**Amtrak** – Amtrak is the long-distance provider of rail passenger service and currently stops in Palm Springs. Amtrak also operates on contract with public rail transit service providers, such as Metrolink and LOSSAN.

**Greyhound** – Greyhound is the provider of long-distance bus transit service, and occupant of part of site. Greyhound offers frequent service between Indio to Los Angeles.

**SunLine Transit Agency** – SunLine Transit operates five daily transit routes in Indio. One of these transit routes currently has a transit stop just south of the selected MMH site. Partnership opportunities will be explored, including joint or full operations.

6.6 Management Plan

The following are three options for consideration for a management plan, which would include management, operations and maintenance responsibilities of the various partners described in Section 6.4. Once an option is finalized, the resulting management plan would be a dynamic document and should be updated as necessary throughout the project implementation.

**Option 1: City of Indio Owned and Operated Station (LOSSAN model)**

- Stations owned and operated by the City of Indio. City would need to provide the maintenance of the platform, any infrastructure and the parking lot.
- Service provided and funded by intercity rail transit agency, LOSSAN, with a contract for Amtrak to operate and maintain the passenger trains.
- Connecting transit service provided by SunLine Transit Agency, private rideshare providers and any City mobility services.
- Platform and passenger walkway connection to the parking lot paid by RCTC grant and future capital grants.

Pros: This option continues existing LOSSAN policy (and Metrolink policy in all counties except Riverside County) that passenger rail service is provided by the regional rail agency, in this case, LOSSAN, and each local city owns and operates the station in its jurisdiction. The City of Indio could contract with a private management contractor in order to provide additional support to City staff. The City could also enter into an arrangement with Greyhound and any other future facility users for lease arrangements and joint maintenance and operation of the site.

Cons: This could be a financial hardship on the City of Indio as the station facilities and usage increases in the future. A mitigating factor could be revenue that the City currently receives from Greyhound and any new leases if a facility were constructed on the site.

**Option 2: SunLine Transit Agency Owned and Operated Station (Alternative LOSSAN Model)**

- Station owned and operated by SunLine Transit (City transfers ownership to SunLine Transit or provides a lease arrangement)
- SunLine Transit provides bus service and uses site potentially as a park-and-ride facility, for a transfer point between local bus routes.
• Service provided and paid for by intercity rail transit agency, LOSSAN, with a contract for Amtrak to operate and maintain the passenger trains.
• Connecting transit service provided by SunLine Transit, private rideshare providers and any City mobility services.
• Platform and passenger walkway paid by RCTC grant. Future facilities paid by future capital grants by RCTC and/or LOSSAN.

Pros: This option continues existing LOSSAN policy (and Metrolink policy in all counties except Riverside Co.) that passenger rail service is provided by the regional rail agency, LOSSAN, and the local agency owns and operates the station. This option is in line with SunLine Transit’s expertise in operating transit stations and multimodal facilities. This option would also preserve limited City of Indio funds for its other transportation priorities.

Cons: This could be a financial hardship on SunLine Transit Agency as the station facilities and usage increases in the future. Although there would be additional bus passenger revenue and state and federal operating funds as transit ridership increases.

Option 3: RCTC Owned and Operated Station (RCTC Metrolink Model)
• RCTC owns and operates station (City transfers ownership to RCTC or provides a lease arrangement).
• Service provided and paid for by intercity rail transit agency, LOSSAN, with a contract for Amtrak to operate and maintain the passenger trains.
• Connecting transit service provided by SunLine Transit, private rideshare providers and any City mobility services.
• Platform and passenger walkway paid by RCTC grant. Future facilities paid by future capital grants by RCTC and/or LOSSAN.

Pros: Unlike other Metrolink member agencies, RCTC owns and operates all of the nine Metrolink stations that serve Riverside county.6 This option would extend that practice to the City of Indio station, which would be an intercity rail station. In addition, RCTC is a member of the LOSSAN Joint Powers Authority and could more directly benefit the success of the passenger train service to the City of Indio Multi-Modal Hub site.

Cons: This could be a financial hardship on the RCTC as the station facilities and usage increases in the future. It may also set a precedent for other LOSSAN intercity rail stations, which could increase costs for other regional transit agencies.

6 https://www.rctc.org/travel-riverside-county/passenger-rail/#cv-link

6.7 MOU Between RCTC and the City of Indio

In order to realize a full Multi-Modal Hub concept with daily train service, the RCTC Regional Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Study7 must successfully extend trains from Riverside and/or San Bernardino to the City of Indio. The City of Indio serves on RCTC’s study’s technical advisory committee. RCTC will request that the City will also have to signexecute a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the RCTC in advance of the beginning of train service to the City of Indio.

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

The RCTC has authorized its Executive Director to negotiate an MOU with the City of Indio regarding the roles and responsibilities related to the use of the MMH first for the Festival Train and second, for the long-term use of the station for passenger rail service.

At the RCTC July 7, 2019 Commission meeting, the Commission “authorized the Executive Director, pursuant to legal counsel review, to negotiate and execute agreements with LOSSAN, the City of Indio (City), Goldenvoice, Valley Music Travel, and host railroads, as may be needed for the full implementation of the Platform Project, provided that all such agreements are within the Platform Project budget estimated at $8,688,241.”8 Once transmitted for the City of Indio’s consideration, the MOU will be reviewed and, once acceptable, may be approved by the Indio City Council. Although RCTC has not transmitted an MOU to the City of Indio as of the date of this report, there are some topics that are likely to be covered in the MOU.

They include:

• Roles and responsibilities of the City of Indio, RCTC, LOSSAN, the host railroad (the Union Pacific), Sunline Transit and any private parties, as appropriate;
• Transfer to the City of Indio the responsibility of the platform, once completed.
• Any provisions in the state grant, such as the requirement to maintain the site for a specific number of years, yet to be determined;

The MOU could address ways for the City to receive additional funding support for the maintenance of the existing parking lot and Greyhound site. In the longer term, as the station usage increases, the MOU could address ways that additional capital funds could be secured and which agency or agencies are responsible for securing those funds.

Funding Source Information

The following provides more detail on several potential funding sources:

State Transit Funds:

Active Transportation Program (ATP)\(^9\) (Available to a City and/or Transit Agency) – The Legislature created the ATP in 2013 to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking. SB 1 directs $100 million annually the ATP, significantly augmenting the available funding for this popular program.

The goals of the ATP include, but are not limited to, increasing the proportion of trips accomplished by walking and biking, increasing the safety and mobility of non-motorized users, advancing efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals, enhancing public health, and providing a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many type of users including disadvantaged communities.

The program allows cities, counties, transit agencies and other public agencies to compete for grants to:

- build bicycle/pedestrian paths,
- install bike racks, and
- other projects or programs that make walking or biking easier, safer, and more convenient.

Consistent with state and federal requirements, ATP funded projects must be programmed in the TIP prior to seeking a CTC allocation. The Cycle 5 Call for Projects\(^10\) is anticipated to be announced by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) in Spring 2020. Cycle 5 is expected to include about $440M in ATP funding made up of Federal funding, State SB1 and State Highway Account (SHA) funding. The funding/programming years are expected to include 21/22, 22/23, 23/24 and 24/25. Fiscal years. The ATP legislation defines the purpose as encouraging increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking and defines the goals as:

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking.
- Increase safety and mobility of non-motorized users.

---

\(^9\) [https://catc.ca.gov/programs/active-transportation-program](https://catc.ca.gov/programs/active-transportation-program)

• Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction (GHGR) goals as established pursuant to Senate Bill 375 and Senate Bill 391.
• Enhance public health, including reduction of childhood obesity through the use of programs including, but not limited to, projects eligible for Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS) funding.
• Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program.
• Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.

STA – State Rail Assistance (SRA) (Available to RCTC and/or LOSSAN or other public rail transit agency) – the SRA was established by SB 1 to provide intercity and commuter rail agencies with additional revenue for operations and capital investments to improve and modernize the state’s rail, bus and ferry transit systems with the intention to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The following summarizes this funding source:

• Funded from sales tax on diesel fuel
• Program Uses & Restrictions
  ▪ 50 percent is allocated to transit agencies responsible for state-supported intercity rail services
  ▪ 50 percent is allocated to transit agencies responsible for commuter rail services
  ▪ Available for operations including expanded service, outreach, increased customer amenities, and discounted tickets
  ▪ Available for capital investments including new and cleaner-emissions rolling stock, track and station investments

Federal Transit Funds (Available to SunLine Transit)

The following are Federal Transit Administration Grants that flow to the RCTC and SunLine Transit for transit improvements. According to the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), the following are the key federal transit programs used in the area:

Section 5307 Funds – Section 5307 is authorized each year via the federal transportation bill in urbanized areas with populations of 50,000 or more. Funds are distributed based upon population served and the amount of transit service provided. Under Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), the use of urbanized area (UZA) formula funds has been expanded to include the former Job Access and Reverse Commute program. In addition, only urbanized areas with populations below 200,000 were eligible to use the Section 5307 funds for operating. Under MAP-21 and the current FAST Act, transit systems with 100 or fewer buses in fixed-route service during peak service hours may now use up to 75 percent of their share of funding for operations. The new program also allows up to 85 percent federal share for Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant vehicles for paratransit service.

Section 5310 Funds – The Section 5310 grant provides financial assistance to enhance mobility of seniors and persons with disabilities to serve their special needs beyond traditional public transit and ADA complementary paratransit. The program’s focus is funding mobility management activities and capital project expenses, primarily for nonprofit agencies; however, public agencies are eligible to apply for projects if the public agencies certify that no non-profit organizations are readily available to provide the services. Section 5310 funds can be used to cover both capital and operating expenses. RTA identified the use of Section 5310 funding to cover expenses for its ongoing travel training program. SunLine uses Section 5310 funds to partially fund its taxi voucher program.

Section 5311 Funds – The Section 5311 transit funding provides funds to rural or non-urbanized areas in California. The program is administered by Caltrans, and the majority of these funds are passed through to counties based on population. Currently, RTA and SunLine have identified the use of Section 5311 formula funds for operations. Remaining funds are awarded in a statewide discretionary program for rural capital projects and intercity bus programs.

Section 5339 Funds – The Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities program provides capital funding to replace, rehabilitate and purchase buses/vans and related equipment and to construct bus-related facilities. Funds can also be used to introduce new technology and safety and security items for transit systems. The program apportions funds to urban areas by population and service factors. This year’s program allocates about $764,000 million in formula funds for RTA and SunLine.