

Ontario International Airport Connector Project



Appendix C Public Comment Submissions February 2025



Prepared for:

San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
1170 West Third Street, Second Floor
San Bernardino, California 92410-1715



December 2, 2024
Sent via e-mail

Tim Watkins
Chief of Legislature and Public Affairs
San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92410
ONTconnector@gosbcta.com

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), Ontario International Airport Connector Project (PROJECT), State Clearinghouse No. 2022070039, San Bernardino County

Dear Tim Watkins:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) received a Notice of Availability of a DEIR from San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA) for the Project pursuant the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines.¹

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

A-1-1

CDFW ROLE

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

A-1-2

CDFW is also submitting comments as a **Responsible Agency** under CEQA. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21069; CEQA Guidelines, § 15381.) CDFW expects that it may need to exercise regulatory authority as provided by the Fish and Game Code. As proposed, for example, the Project may be subject to CDFW’s lake and streambed alteration regulatory authority. (Fish & G. Code, § 1600 et seq.) Likewise, to the extent implementation of the Project as proposed may result in “take” as defined by State law of any species protected under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (Fish & G. Code, § 2050 et seq.), the project proponent may seek related take authorization as provided by the Fish and Game Code.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Proponent: San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA)

Description: The Project proposes to expand access options to ONT, reduce roadway congestion, and support autonomous electric vehicle technology usage for transit. The objectives would be met by the construction of three at-grade passenger stations and a 4.2 mile tunnel (24-foot-inner-diameter bi-direction tunnel) between the Cucamonga Metrolink Station and Ontario International Airport (ONT) via Milliken Avenue and Airport Drive.

A-1-3

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

Primary Project activities include construction of three at-grade passenger stations, one vent shaft, one Maintenance and Storage Facility (MSF), and a 4.2-mile tunnel. There would also be a construction staging area at each of the three proposed stations. A tunnel boring machine (TBM) would be used to excavate the tunnel and would be stored and assembled at the construction staging areas. Cut-and-cover sites would occur at each proposed station location. The cut-and-cover sites at the Cucamonga Metrolink Station (Cucamonga Station) and at the ONT Terminal 2 Station would be used as the TBM launching and receiving pits. Ultimately, the cut-and-cover sites would serve as the vehicle ramps where the underground guideway would transition to at-grade.

The Cucamonga Station would be approximately 8,000 square feet and located in the northwest corner of the existing station. Approximately 180 existing parking spaces would be permanently removed to accommodate the proposed Cucamonga Station. The ONT Terminal 2 at-grade passenger station would be approximately 10,000 square feet and would be located within the ONT right-of-way. Approximately 80 existing parking spaces would be permanently removed to accommodate the ONT Terminal 2 station. The ONT Terminal 4 at-grade passenger station would be approximately 10,000 square feet and would be located within the ONT right-of-way. Approximately 115 existing parking spaces would be permanently removed to accommodate the ONT Terminal 4 station. The approximate 11,000 square-foot MSF would be located at the proposed Cucamonga Station.

Location: The project site is located in the City of Rancho Cucamonga and City of Ontario within the County of San Bernardino. The northern segment of the Project, including the proposed at-grade passenger station, is located within Cucamonga Metrolink Station and its parking lots. From the Metrolink Station, the tunnel would travel to Milliken Avenue and follow Milliken south under the existing roadway. At Ontario Mills Parkway, the tunnel alignment would shift to the western side of Milliken Avenue and would travel south under I-10. The tunnel alignment would continue to run south; at Guasti Road, the alignment would curve southwest to connect to East Airport Drive. At East Airport Drive, the tunnel alignment would continue to travel west toward ONT Terminal 4 and Terminal 2 where the two other proposed at-grade passenger stations would be located. The tunnel depth would be approximately 70 feet below the ground surface.

Timeframe: Overall construction of the Project would last approximately 56 months, beginning in 2025 and ending in 2031.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CDFW has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of fish, wildlife, native plants, and habitat necessary for biologically sustainable populations of those species (i.e., biological resources). CDFW offers the comments and recommendations below to assist SBCTA in adequately identifying and/or mitigating the Project's significant, or potentially significant, direct and indirect impacts on fish and wildlife (biological) resources. Editorial comments or other suggestions may also be included to improve the document.

I. Environmental Setting and Related Impact Shortcoming

Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFW or USFWS?

COMMENT 1: Burrowing Owl (*Athene cunicularia*)

Draft EIR Section 3.3, Appendix D: Biological Resources Technical Report

A-1-3

A-1-4

Issue: The project may impact burrowing owl (BUOW), a candidate species under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) and Project activities may result in take as defined in Fish and Game Code section 86.

Specific impact: The DEIR acknowledges the potential for BUOW to occur due to the suitable habitat and the 9 burrows found within the Biological Study Area (BSA) during the 2021 survey. No burrowing owls or sign were observed during the field site visit. CDFW notes that only two surveys were performed in July 2021 and no field investigations occurred in the undeveloped habitat in the northern portion of the BSA due to lack of legal rights to access. A focused survey for the species following a CDFW approved guideline, or similar approach, was not conducted in the entirety of the BSA. Therefore, CDFW is concerned that SBCTA may not have adequately identified potentially significant impacts. Project implementation, including grading, vegetation clearing and construction, may result in direct mortality, population declines, or local extirpation of burrowing owl not previously identified. Additionally, the CWHR dataset, Burrowing Owl Predicted Habitat (CDFW 2016), displays a high potential for burrowing owl presence within the BSA.

Why impact would occur: According to the Biological Resources Technical Report, a thorough focused burrowing owl survey was not conducted in the entirety of the BSA. Burrowing owls have been known to use highly degraded and marginal habitat where existing burrows are available. They are well-adapted to open, relatively flat expanses and vacant lots and prefer habitats with generally short sparse vegetation with few shrubs such as those occurring on the Project site. If BUOW burrows are not properly detected, prior to ground disturbance, site preparation and grading could destroy habitat and result in take of burrowing owl. Occupied site or occupancy means a site that is assumed occupied if at least one burrowing owl has been observed occupying a burrow within the last three years. Occupancy of suitable burrowing owl habitat may also be indicated by owl sign including its molted feathers, cast pellets, prey remains, eggshell fragments, or excrement at or near a burrow entrance or perch site.

Evidence impact would be significant: On October 10, 2024, the California Fish and Game Commission accepted a petition to list Western Burrowing Owl as endangered under CESA, determining the listing “may be warranted” and advancing the species to the candidacy stage of the CESA listing process. As a candidate species, Western Burrowing Owl is granted full protection of a threatened species under CESA. If Project activities could result in take, appropriate CESA authorization (i.e., Incidental Take Permit under Fish and Game Code section 2081) should be obtained prior to commencement of Project activities. Take of any endangered, threatened, or candidate species that results from the Project is prohibited, except as authorized by State law (Fish & G. Code, §§ 86, 2062, 2067, 2068, 2080, 2085; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 786.9). Take of individual burrowing owls and their nests is defined by Fish and Game Code section 86, and prohibited by sections 3503, 3503.5 and 3513. Inadequate avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures for impacts to sensitive or special status species will result in the Project continuing to have a substantial adverse direct, indirect, and cumulative effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species by CDFW.

Recommended Potentially Feasible Mitigation Measure(s) to reduce impacts to less than significant: CDFW recommends that prior to commencing Project activities for all phases of Project construction, focused and preconstruction surveys for burrowing owl be conducted by a qualified biologist in accordance with the *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (CDFG 2012 or most recent version) in all potential habitat areas of the BSA, including the undeveloped habitat of the northern portion of the BSA that was previously not surveyed. Because appropriate surveys were not conducted prior to circulation of the DEIR, the DEIR may not adequately identify potentially significant impacts. CDFW recommends the DEIR be revised and recirculated following completion of survey so that results and appropriate specific avoidance and minimization measures can be included, to ensure that impacts to burrowing owl are reduced to less than significant. However, if SBCTA chooses not to follow this path, CDFW recommends the following revisions to MM-BIO-2 (edits are in strikethrough and

bold) to ensure an adequate assessment is completed and CESA authorization is obtained, if needed. Deferring focused surveys until the time of construction may result in significant Project delays should burrowing owls be detected on-site.

Mitigation Measure 2:MM-BIO-2 Burrowing Owl Nesting Habitat

1. Prior to construction activity, a focused protocol survey (four field visits) **during BUOW breeding and non-breeding season** and pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for burrowing owls where suitable habitat is present within the construction areas. **Pre-construction** surveys shall be conducted no less than 14 days prior to commencement of construction activities and surveys shall be conducted in accordance with California Department of Fish and Wildlife burrowing owl survey protocol.
2. If no occupied burrows are found in the focused survey area, a letter report documenting survey methods and findings shall be submitted to the lead agency San Bernardino Transportation Authority, as well as the California Department of Fish and Wildlife for review and approval, and no further mitigation is necessary.
3. If occupied burrows are found, **and if Project activities, including burrow exclusion and closure, may impact burrowing owl, the Project Proponent shall begin early coordination with CDFW for appropriate CESA authorization (i.e., Incidental Take Permit (ITP) under Fish and Game Code section 2081) prior to commencement of Project activities. Any plans for relocation, eviction, or translocation shall be provided to CDFW for review and approval, prior to implementation, and shall describe, at a minimum, project activities and equipment, proposed avoidance/buffers and seasonal restrictions, temporary and permanent impacts, monitoring methods and objectives, relocation, eviction, and/or translocation specifics, and minimization and compensatory mitigation actions. Compensatory mitigation will be fulfilled by one or more of the following options, in coordination with and approval of CDFW: 1) Permittee-responsible mitigation land acquisition or 2) Conservation or Mitigation Bank credits (if available). If burrowing owl occupancy is confirmed, the Designated Biologist shall provide to CDFW a GIS or KMZ map of BUOW burrow complex(es) and atypical burrows (e.g. culverts, buckled concrete, etc.) The map shall be at a scale of 1:24,000 or finer to show details and shall show locations of all BUOW sightings and labeled if sightings were potential burrows, occupied burrows, satellite burrows, areas of concentrated burrows, and BUOW sign. Locations documented by use of GPS coordinates must be collected in NAD83 datum. The map shall include an outline of the Project Area. The map shall include a title, north arrow, scale bar, and legend.**
- ~~4. impacts on the burrows shall be avoided by providing a buffer of 165 feet during the non-breeding season (September 1 through February 14) or 250 feet during the breeding season (February 15 through August 15). The size of the buffer area may be adjusted if a qualified biologist and California Department of Fish and Wildlife determine it would not be likely to have adverse effects on the owls. No Project Alternative activity shall commence within the buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that the burrow is no longer occupied. If the burrow is occupied by a nesting pair, a minimum of 7.5 acres of foraging habitat contiguous to the burrow shall be maintained until the breeding season is over.~~
- ~~5. If disturbance of occupied burrows is unavoidable, on-site passive relocation techniques approved by California Department of Fish and Wildlife shall be used to encourage owls to move to alternative burrows outside of the impact area. However, no occupied burrows shall be disturbed during the nesting season unless a qualified biologist verifies through non-invasive methods that juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival. Mitigation for foraging habitat for relocated pairs shall follow guidelines provided in the California Burrowing Owl Consortium's Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines, which ranges from 7.5 to 19.5 acres per pair.~~

ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

CEQA requires that information developed in environmental impact reports and negative declarations be incorporated into a database which may be used to make subsequent or supplemental environmental determinations. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21003, subd. (e).) Accordingly, please report any special status species and natural communities detected during Project surveys to the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). The CNDDDB field survey form can be filled out and submitted online at the following link: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Submitting-Data>. The types of information reported to CNDDDB can be found at the following link: <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Plants-and-Animals>.

A-1-5

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT FILING FEES

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

A-1-6

CONCLUSION

CDFW appreciates the opportunity to comment on the DEIR to assist SBCTA in identifying and mitigating Project impacts on biological resources.

Questions regarding this letter or further coordination should be directed to Amelia Viera, Environmental Scientist at 909-544-2528 or amelia.viera@wildlife.ca.gov.

A-1-7

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

84F92FFEEFD24C8...

Kim Freeburn
Environmental Program Manager

cc: Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse, Sacramento

ec: Eric Kawamura-Chan
Senior Environmental Scientist, Supervisor
Eric.Chan@Wildlife.ca.gov

Amelia Viera
Environmental Scientist
Amelia.Viera@Wildlife.ca.gov

Lisa Cardoso
Environmental Scientist
Lisa.Cardoso@Wildlife.ca.gov

REFERENCES

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Natural Diversity Database (2024, November). Burrowing owl [ds45]. Calif. Dept. of Fish and Wildlife. Biogeographic Information and Observation System (BIOS). Retrieved November 8, 2024, from <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/BIOS>
- California Department of Fish and Game (2012). Staff report on burrowing owl mitigation. State of California, Natural Resources Agency. Available for download at:
<https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=83843&inline=true>



Ontario International Airport Administration Offices

1923 E. Avion Street, Ontario, CA 91761

ALAN D. WAPNER
President

CURT HAGMAN
Vice President

RONALD O. LOVERIDGE
Treasurer

JIM W. BOWMAN
Secretary

JULIA GOUW
Commissioner

ATIF J. ELKADI
Chief Executive Officer

LORI D. BALLANCE
General Counsel

DECEMBER 2, 2024

Tim Watkins
Chief of Legislative and Public Affairs
SBCTA – ONT Connector
1170 W 3rd Street, 2nd Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92410

Via Email Only (ONTconnector@goSBCTA.com)

Re: ONT Connector Project

Dear Mr. Watkins:

On behalf of the Ontario International Airport Authority (OIAA), I am writing to express appreciation for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) and Draft Environmental Assessment (Draft EA) prepared by the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA) for the proposed Ontario International Airport Connector Project (ONT Connector Project).

As the owner and operator of Ontario International Airport (ONT), we recognize and value the importance of varied transportation options and transit accessibility in our region. The proposed ONT Connector Project, as described in its Draft EIR, would “provide a direct airport connection between ONT and the Cucamonga Metrolink Station” via an underground 4.2-mile-long, bidirectional tunnel that is served by autonomous electric vehicles. (Draft EIR, p. ES-1.) Two passenger stations are proposed to be sited at ONT Terminal 2 and Terminal 4 to facilitate passenger access and use. (Id. at p. ES-3.) Therefore, the proposed ONT Connector Project would increase the number of multi-modal transportation options available to members of the air traveling public served by ONT, as well as the numerous staff and employees of OIAA and ONT’s tenants that support operation of the airport on a daily basis. These benefits are consistent with the need for the proposed ONT Connector Project described in the Draft EIR, which also discusses the importance of the “last-mile connection” between SBCTA’s existing Metrolink system and ONT; opportunities to reduce traffic congestion and improve trip reliability; and, the ability to reduce VMT and corresponding air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through enhanced transportation efficiencies. (Id. at p. 2-1.)

OIAA is thankful for the interagency partnership we have developed with SBCTA over the years. And, in our view, the achievement of this milestone – i.e., release of the draft environmental compliance documents – builds upon the Memorandum of Understanding No. 21-1002463 (MOU) entered into by our respective agencies in 2020 for purposes of exploring the possibility of a direct transit connection between SBCTA’s Metrolink system and ONT. Moving forward, we

www.flyontario.com

A-2-1

recognize the continued importance of meaningful collaboration and consultation between our two agencies. These joint efforts will be particularly important with respect to finalizing design-level specifications for the proposed ONT Connector Project that align with OIAA's own plans for on-airport development at ONT (including determining whether one passenger station would better align with OIAA's plans for on-airport development at ONT); facilitating access to ONT property for purposes of construction and operation in a workable manner; and coordinating with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), where needed.

A-2-1

In closing, thank you again for the opportunity to review SBCTA's environmental compliance documents for the proposed ONT Connector Project, as prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and National Environmental Policy Act. OIAA remains committed to our regional partnership with SBCTA, and the development of innovative, collaborative transportation solutions for the needs of the air traveling public and the many workers who report to ONT each day to keep our airport running. We look forward to continuing to work with you on the ONT Connector Project.

Sincerely,



Atif J. Elkadi
Chief Executive Officer
Ontario International Airport Authority



CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

10500 Civic Center | Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730 | 1-909-477-2700 | www.CityofRC.us

December 2, 2024

Tim Watkins
Chief of Legislative and Public Affairs
San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA)
1170 West 3rd Street, 2nd Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92410

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON DRAFT EA AND EIR FOR ONT CONNECTOR PROJECT

Dear Mr. Watkins:

I am writing to provide comments on the Draft EIR and EA published by SBCTA for the ONT Connector Project and weigh in on the findings in the reports. The City of Rancho Cucamonga (City) appreciates the opportunity to partner with SBCTA as this important project—which seeks to create an underground transit connection between the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station and ONT terminals—moves forward. We recognize the significant contribution that this project, along with the Brightline West High-Speed Rail and West Valley Connector projects, will make in creating a much-needed transportation hub at Cucamonga Station and the benefit to the region at large and we are in full support of the overall project objectives. The comments below are provided in an effort to ensure the success of the City and SBCTA’s vision for transportation in San Bernardino County, and make sure that all concerns are thoroughly addressed up front.

A-3-1

- Executive Summary:** The Executive Summary describes one maintenance and storage facility located adjacent to the Cucamonga Metrolink Station to store and maintain vehicles. Section 2.3.2.6 describes the facility to be approximately 11,000 square feet, with an additional 5,000 square feet second story and would contain an operations control center with lockers, breakrooms, and restrooms. Employee parking for the facility is stated to be at the existing parking lot owned by SBCTA, in the southeastern quadrant of the Milliken Avenue/Azusa Court intersection. It is unclear where this existing parking lot is located at Cucamonga Station and the City suggests clarifying the location in the Final EIR. Further, given the compact nature of Cucamonga Station and the infrastructure already planned for this station, the City suggests incorporating reasoning or analysis in the Final EIR that describes why the maintenance facility is a better fit at the Rancho Cucamonga end of the line, or if it would fit better in Ontario, why Rancho Cucamonga is being chosen instead. If there is no clear choice, an analysis of the Maintenance Facility being moved to Ontario is highly suggested. The City believes that the maintenance facility is more appropriately sited in Ontario given space and size constraints as well as access. Also, in Table ES-1: Summary of Environmental Effects and Proposed Mitigation Measures, the City of Rancho Cucamonga Building and Safety Department should be included in any project design reviews for approval in the Final EIR. Specifically, MM-HWQ-2 only requires Project design plans to be submitted to Ontario Building Department and San Bernardino County Building Department to obtain approval. The Final EIR should include Rancho Cucamonga’s Building and Safety Department for approval as well. In the same table,

A-3-2

A-3-3

A-3-4

MM-BIO-2, Burrowing Owl Nesting Habitat, requires surveys be conducted for burrowing owls where suitable habitat is present with the construction areas. In the event that occupied burrows are found, construction will provide a buffer of 165 feet during non-breeding season, or 250 feet during breeding season. If this is the case, the mitigation measures may further impact both the existing Metrolink and/or Brightline West projects currently ongoing in nearby areas. We recommend including a discussion of the effects of disruption of all three projects in order to assess the effectiveness of this mitigation measure or inclusion of alternate mitigation approaches. In addition, the City is extremely concerned about the current plan to start construction on the tunnel on the Rancho Cucamonga side of the Project. We have previously expressed these concerns and nothing has changed. In fact, as more time passes, and additional details become available it is clear to us that there is insufficient space to start the tunnel from Rancho Cucamonga without undue and extreme community impacts. Given the current construction at Cucamonga Station from Brightline West and resort development north of 6th Street, an alternate route starting in Ontario should be explicitly analyzed and considered for the Final EIR. In this analysis, the Project should reconsider MM-TRA-1 because it does not appear to apply equally if the Project begins at ONT rather than Cucamonga Station. With respect to MM-TRA-1, we recommend that the Transportation Management Plan be routed to the City's Engineering Services and City of Ontario Engineering Departments for review and comment at least 30 days prior to any implementation.

A-3-4

A-3-5

A-3-6

2. **Project Description:** In the Cucamonga Station and MSF Haul Route, which appears in many sections and appendices, trucks would be traveling through one of the busiest intersections in Rancho Cucamonga, namely Foothill Boulevard and Day Creek Boulevard. The Project timeline is approximately 37 months, so this haul route would include holiday traffic times with potential impacts to Victoria Gardens and the businesses therein, other commercial properties in the area, as well as the on/off ramp impact at I-15. Those cumulative negative fiscal impacts to the City would be substantial. This is a long timeframe with significant impact on the traffic in the City. Additionally, this would route hauling through one of Brightline West's construction areas in which there may be construction-term capacity constraints as lanes are closed for construction activities. Further, we believe a haul route that directs traffic along Foothill Boulevard to I-15 is not the shortest route to the highway system. Rather, an export route to I-10 should be considered in the Final EIR because it would be shorter and less impactful to local traffic operations and have less secondary business disruption impacts. Finally, the City is concerned that only one ventilation shaft for a 4.2 mile tunnel does not meet safety standards. More specifically, we request that ONT Connector reevaluate NFPA Standards to ensure that the tunnel will be properly ventilated and accessible in the event of an emergency. Further, it is important that the Project's final design for ventilation and access points be based upon a comprehensive emergency response plan developed jointly with the Rancho Cucamonga Fire Protection District, the City of Ontario Fire Department, Ontario Police Department, Rancho Cucamonga Police Department and SBCTA to ensure safe and efficient access (including non-vehicular entry) at multiple points along the Project route during emergencies. The City also has concerns regarding parking space analysis and availability during and after construction. First, it is stated that there is a loss of 180 parking spaces in the existing Cucamonga Station parking lot from the Maintenance and Storage Facility. It is unclear currently whether that loss includes the space for the Facility itself. We recommend clarifying, and potentially further identifying how much parking will be lost to the Maintenance and Storage Facility if that is not currently allocated for in the published numbers. In addition, in Section 2.3.2.9.2 Construction Details for Cucamonga Station and Maintenance and Storage Facility, the total loss of parking spaces during the 37 months of construction is 180 for the new Cucamonga Station and Maintenance and Storage Facility, and an additional 170 during construction only. We suggest clarifying whether these numbers are additive for a total of 350 total spaces lost post-construction or sequential. We would like to

A-3-7

A-3-8

A-3-9

see further evaluation of parking space loss alongside the lost parking spaces from the concurrent construction of Brightline West. The City is concerned that this extensive loss of parking availability may completely close off the west parking lot of Cucamonga Station, and that it may further impact the east parking lot and bus turnaround. Without more detailed analysis it appears to us that functionally the loss of parking will essentially make this Metrolink station inaccessible to most people desiring to park and ride from this location, which is among the Top 3 busiest locations on the entire line. An evaluation of parking alongside the lost parking from Brightline West to determine total parking loss is suggested. If the parking loss has any of these impacts, it is further suggested that the Final EIR identify alternative parking options for patrons of the station to maintain access and avoid disrupting Metrolink services.

A-3-9

3. **Operational Impacts, Energy:** Broadly, the City is concerned that Section 3.5 fails to consider electricity infrastructure impacts, which should be evaluated in the Final EIR. Of particular importance, we encourage consideration of construction energy demand and impacts as it is not clear if Southern California Edison (SCE) SCE or Rancho Cucamonga Municipal Utility (RCMU) have the local infrastructure to meet demand for the tunnel boring machine. It may be infeasible regardless of other impacts, to start construction in Rancho Cucamonga for the tunnel if the only sufficient available power is in the City of Ontario at the other end of the line. Section 3.5.6.1.2.2 describes the operational impacts to energy resources from the implementation of the Project yet does not describe the logistics related to charging the ONT Connector vehicles. The City believes it is especially important to consider the total power draw needed on a daily basis, or during peak power hours, and how this may impact local circuits, if at all. We suggest that the Final EIR detail the processes required to charge a vehicle, including the time it would take to charge a vehicle, the number of times per day each vehicle would need a charge, and whether the charge would be supplied by SCE or RCMU. Included in the Final EIR Energy Operation Impacts should be an analysis of power demand for the Tunnel Boring Machine and whether that can be supplied without additional infrastructure. Importantly, if the tunneling starts at Cucamonga Station, RCMU does not have the capacity to supply the necessary power without additional physical infrastructure, possibly including a new substation, since the only substation currently under operations for RCMU is near capacity. Finally, no RCMU or SCE specific renewables mix is identified in the Draft EIR. We request that the Final EIR to include consideration of power availability, and additional review the Greenhouse Gas analysis alongside these new considerations.

A-3-10

A-3-11

A-3-12

4. **Noise and Vibration:** The Executive Summary describes that no mitigation is required for generation of excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels. While Section 3.11.6.1.2 describes the steps taken to make this determination, the City is still extremely skeptical and hesitant to believe without further detail that there would truly be construction noise of no significant impact for the entire project, especially during tunnel boring work immediately adjacent to residential uses. Anticipated vibration levels are well below the thresholds for impact, but the noise levels are much closer to the threshold values. We encourage SBCTA to have a contingency plan for mitigation in the event that businesses or residents begin to alert the developers that the noise relating to tunneling and construction is impacting them. Further, we encourage SBCTA to consider more preventative measures up front in order to mitigate potential impact before it becomes a problem in the construction phase.

A-3-13

5. **Public Services:** The Final EIR should specify which locality is responsible for public services along the ONT Connector route, or where one locality's responsibility ends and the next begins. Broadly, it is important to know which locality is the lead during an event. For public services it is especially important to know in the event of an incident requiring police or fire services, specialized equipment, or any sort of emergency response. It is also crucial that there is a strategy in place to determine where exactly an

A-3-14

incident occurs and which locality, or both, is expected to respond to each location. Similar protocols exist and were worked out successfully for the Pacific Electric Trail; however, the tunnel response is even more complicated, albeit shorter in length, and ensuring there is a clear plan for a public safety response is critical to ensure the public is safe while using the facility.

6. **Appendix I: Energy:** The total energy usage described in Appendix I Section 6.1.2.1 Construction Impacts, and Table 6-1: Proposed Project Energy Consumption Estimates During Construction appear significantly lower than previously discussed. The City asks that SBCTA reexamine this estimate to ensure its accuracy, and explain why the new energy usage is so much lower than previously anticipated, if this value is accurate. Finally, as a minor concern, Section 2.3.2.3 has a reference error in its first paragraph meant to illustrate the overview of the proposed station footprint.

7. **Appendix F: Construction Methods:** Page 4-1 describes that up to 200 employees are anticipated at the project site, therefore 200 individuals will require off-site parking. Given that Cucamonga Station will not be available for parking because it will be under construction while the Brightline West Station is developed, the Final EIR should include parking options and an analysis of parking or traffic impact from the incoming employees. Also, Table 4-1 on Page 4-2 describes a Haul Route from Cucamonga Station that moves "eastbound on Azusa Court, northbound on Milliken Avenue..." Note that there is not a direct connection from eastbound Azusa Court to northbound Milliken Avenue. The haul route would require haulers to exit on 7th Street to access northbound Milliken, which should be clarified in the Final EIR. Finally, Page 4-9 states that construction at the proposed Cucamonga Station is stated to require approximately 3.2 acres but does not explain where the 3.2 acres will be located. The Final EIR should address specifically which area has been dedicated to this space.

8. **Appendix Q: Transportation Technical Support:** Section 4.4.2, Cucamonga Metrolink Station Parking, shows that parking surveys were performed on two typical weekdays and typical weekend days for a span of 24 hours. The days selected were June 22, 25, 27 and 29, 2024. These are likely typical summer days but not at all typical of year-round peak periods as students would have been on summer break at this time. Therefore, the parking surveys very likely may be inaccurate or may underrepresent parking demand during the school year. The City encourages SBCTA to reconsider these surveys, and evaluate potential parking constraints that may appear during the school year. In addition, Table 8-6: Cucamonga Metrolink Station Parking Analysis During Project Construction describes parking surplus or deficit. The data in the table is concerning because it uses information from the surveys that do not take school traffic into account. Further, the East Lot of the station will be unavailable during the construction period because it will be under construction itself due to the Brightline West Rancho Cucamonga Station project. The Final EIR should reconsider the values in Table 8-6 without the East Lot's availability. We also encourage a review of Figure 3.14-26 Construction Traffic Distribution for Cucamonga Station before the Final EIR is published. Currently, the figure shows that 100% of all trips will travel from and return to I-10. However, the haul route identified in Table 2-1 of Appendix F states that some haul trucks will travel northbound on Milliken Avenue to eastbound Foothill Boulevard to instead access the I-15. This discrepancy should be reevaluated before publishing the Final EIR because as the table currently proposes, and as discussed above, the routes travel some of the highest traffic areas in Rancho Cucamonga and have a high chance of impacting traffic for many years. It is critical to appropriately evaluate these impacts in the Final EIR.

9. **Cumulative Impacts:** There are a few errors in the cumulative analysis of ongoing projects. Currently, the Draft EIR incorrectly depicts The Resort project description. Specifically, the development footprint and number of units is only a fraction of the true project, and the location needs to be updated. Similarly, related

A-3-14

A-3-15

A-3-16

A-3-17

A-3-18

A-3-19

A-3-20

A-3-21

projects 22, 23, 24, and 25 are completed and do not need to be considered in the Final EIR. Finally, the Brightline West project location is incorrect and missing Rancho Cucamonga as the terminus. Cumulative Energy Impacts currently does not describe RCMU as part of the service area. This is also the case in related Sections 3.18.5.16 and 3.18.5.16.1, which also do not mention cumulative impacts to electricity. As described above, both RCMU and SCE have constrained infrastructure in this area and may not be able to serve the tunnel boring machine. In addition, the Cumulative Transportation Impacts analysis in general should have a construction component considering all of the construction planned for Cucamonga Station in the coming years. Along a similar vein, given the traffic and electricity constraints at Cucamonga Station, the Final EIR should take into serious consideration a project alternative that looks at beginning the construction and tunnel activity at ONT. Finally, the Final EIR should consider Rancho Cucamonga Capital Projects like the Advanced Traffic Management System (ATMS). Milliken Avenue is included in Phase 2 of that project which will begin in Spring 2025 and is projected to last approximately one year.

A-3-21
A-3-22
A-3-23
A-3-24

In conclusion, we emphasize the importance of a comprehensive and transparent environmental review process for the proposed ONT Connector route. We are excited for the potential benefits for the region that such a facility might provide and want to ensure its success by considering all possible roadblocks and concerns. We respectfully request SBCTA respond to these comments in the Final EIR for this project, to ensure all reviewers have an adequate understanding of the proposed project.

A-3-25

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this Draft EIR and EA. Please consider these comments during the development of the Final EIR, and feel free to contact me if you require any additional information or clarification. We appreciate SBCTA's progress on the environmental review of this project and request that you continue to notify the City of all future steps and opportunities to participate in the environmental review process.

Sincerely,



Matt Burris
Deputy City Manager

December 2, 2024

San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
Attn: Tim Watkins, Chief of Legislative and Public Affairs
1170 W. Third Street, 2nd Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92410
Submitted via email to ONTConnector@gosbcta.com.

Re: ONT Connector Project Draft Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2022070039)

Dear Tim Watkins,

This letter is being provided on behalf of the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice (CCA EJ) to respond to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (SCH #2022070039) which has been prepared for the proposed Ontario (ONT) International Airport Connector Project. We are concerned with the Project as proposed for a number of reasons including the lack of alternatives considered, the use of limited local funds for a project without much capacity

O-1-1

The first concern is for the lack of alternatives considered. In the Introduction section of the EIR document, 1.1 Background details previous work and study regarding getting a rail transit connection to ONT with some sort of *rail* shuttle to the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink station coming out as the best option in most cases. However, Section 2.3 Alternatives Evaluated shows that the current effort only looked at the Tunnel concept which is extremely problematic. Leaping over the wealth of studies on the topic, the proposed Project arose not from careful study to best match available public resources with the need and potential use, but from the whims of a company which has since withdrawn its own involvement in the scheme¹ as costs have risen beyond the rosy promises made in the past². Instead, as detailed in the EIR documents, the latest cost estimates have risen substantially to be more commensurate with those which were forecast in the previous studies for other more conventional options.

O-1-2

At the same time, while the costs have risen, the value has not. As detailed in Figure 1, with the exception of the bus alternative, previous studies of rail transit connections to ONT were forecast to provide more than 350 seats per hour per direction. This is more than triple the *capacity* which the EIR documents state will be provided by the proposed Project and the most robust of the options would exceed the stated capacity of the Project by more than **five** times. However, despite that, the Project is not only one third (much less one fifth) the cost of other alternatives. Per Table 2-1: Project Cost and Funding Sources, the estimated cost of the Project is more than \$538 million (including \$132 million of local funds), nearly 10 times as expensive as when first announced by The Boring Company as an unsolicited proposal. In comparison, Table ES.2: Summary of Evaluation of Alternatives of the Ontario Airport Rail Access Study where cost estimates varied from \$618M to \$1B which in 2024\$, would be from \$802M to \$1.34B. While larger numbers overall, these would obviously have a lower per-rider cost than the proposed Project.

O-1-3

O-1-4

San Bernardino County residents and taxpayers already face many constraints with their personal budgets as well as travel options, with many unmet needs on the transit front. Similarly, SBCTA faces difficult decisions for funding projects, particularly for transit. In frontline communities such as Bloomington, bus service has been cut back, making it harder for people to travel to neighboring communities. The proposal for this Project to absorb at least \$132 million of local funds represents a lot of opportunity for much-needed improvements elsewhere in the county

O-1-5

¹ [Elon Musk might not build tunnel to Ontario Airport after all – Daily Bulletin.](#)

² [Elon Musk’s Boring Co. proposes tunnel to Ontario airport as alternative to light-rail – Daily Bulletin.](#)

CENTER FOR COMMUNITY ACTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

“Bringing People Together to Improve Our Social and Natural Environment”

which would provide much better connectivity for more people. Furthermore, it is concerning to see that Omnitrans would also be in charge of managing the tunnel and vehicles as that could put additional strain on the operations budget. In a time when we are in desperate need of better bus service in the San Bernardino Valley which Omnitrans serves and when projects and proposals for achieving those better service options are languishing for want of funding, we cannot let what has amounted to little more than a gimmick to distract officials from the in-progress options for transit projects, including a connector to ONT but with additional benefits beyond *just* going back and forth between the airport and Rancho Cucamonga, to suck up so much money.

O-15

CCAIEJ would like to reiterate that this Project represents a setback for achieving additional and improved transit services in San Bernardino County. While we appreciate the the idea of technological advancement and having additional travel options, this Project does not appear to represent an opportunity to equitably meet the needs of and the lack of considering other previously-studied options as alternatives to the Project underscores the depth of the disconnect of this Project and broader transportation needs in the region. Furthermore, the costs threaten other more worthy projects and it does not seem to be the best use of public funds. It would be ideal for SBCTA to review the Project in comparison to other alternatives and at most, let the private sector realize construction and operation so as to not further burden local resources.

O-16

Thank you for your time and attention to these matters. If there are any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us for clarification.

Sincerely,



Marven E. Norman, MPA
Policy Coordinator

CC: RailPAC, CER

CCAIEJ is a long-standing community based organization with over 40 years of experience advocating for stronger regulations through strategic campaigns and building a base of community power. Most notably, CCAIEJ's founder Penny Newman won a landmark federal case against Stringfellow Construction which resulted in the 'Stringfellow Acid Pits' being declared one of the first Superfund sites in the nation. *CCAIEJ* prioritizes community voices as we continue our grassroots efforts to bring lasting environmental justice to the Inland Valley Region.

Mailing Address

PO Box 33124
Jurupa Valley, CA 92519
www.ccae.org

7.2.1 System Capacity

System capacity in transit operations is measured as the maximum number of passengers that can be carried past a single point on a fixed route, in a given period of time. The most common measure of capacity is in terms of passengers per hour. For this analysis, system capacity was determined as weekday seats by direction for peak hour, based on a typical number of seats per vehicle for the technology combined with the number of vehicles in operation during the peak hours of operation. **Table 7.3** presents the results of the system capacity analysis.

Table 7.3: System Capacity

Alternative	Peak Hour Seats by Direction
A-3	368
A-4	368
A-7	368
B-2	120
C-5	552
D-1	532

Based on the findings, alternatives C-5 and D-1 are expected to provide the highest peak hour passenger capacity by direction, while the bus alternative (B-2) would provide the lowest capacity.

Figure 1: Section 7.2.1 System Capacity from the SANBAG [SBCTA] Ontario Airport Rail Access Study (2014) detailing the hourly capacity of the various proposals. Retrieved from <https://www.gosbcta.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Ontario-Airport-Rail-Access-Study-Report.pdf>.

San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA)

ONT Connector

C/O: Tim Watkins (ONTconnector@gosbcta.com), SBCTA Board (clerkoftheboard@gosbcta.com), Ray Marquez, SBCTA Chair (rmarquez@chinohills.org)
1170 W. Third Street, 2nd Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92410

CC: Ray Tellis, FTA Administrator Region 9 (Ray.Tellis@dot.gov); Alan Wapner, Ontario City Council Member (awapner@ontarioca.gov); L. Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga Mayor (council@cityofrc.us); Brightline West (outreach@brightlinewest.com), Metrolink (boardsecretary@scr.ra.net)

SUBJECT: ONT Connector Draft EIR Public Comment Letter

Dear Tim Watkins, FTA, ONT Connector Staff, and SBCTA Staff and Board Members,

On behalf of IE Urbanists, a coalition of San Bernardino and Riverside County residents advocating for transportation improvements in the Inland Empire, Californians for Electric Rail (CER), which advocates for rail electrification around the state, and The Transit Coalition, which supports transit projects in Southern California and nationwide, we write to express our strong opposition to the [Ontario International Airport \(ONT\) Connector](#) project as proposed.

As local stakeholders and strong advocates for effective and fiscally-responsible public transit in San Bernardino County, we believe the proposed project and mode choice will not meet the region's needs for reliable, robust, and high-capacity transit between ONT Airport and the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink/Brightline West Station. In this letter we outline our deep concerns with the [Draft Environmental Impact Report \(DEIR\)](#) and provide our technical input on the project.

In short, we urge SBCTA to reject the Build Alternative which relies on an unproven and low-capacity service model of “autonomous, zero-emission vehicles on an ‘on-demand’ basis.” We also urge you to return to the drawing board and provide a fair analysis and consideration of rail alternatives, which is what this corridor and region deserves. We ask you to prioritize the long-term transportation needs of San Bernardino County residents by rejecting the ONT Connector Project as planned and commit instead to a reliable, high-capacity rail solution.

It is our strong position that the DEIR performed an inadequate and deficient analysis of the rail alternatives that were extensively studied in 2008, 2014, and 2018. One cannot fail to notice that these rail alternatives were rejected promptly after the unsolicited Boring Company proposal was received in 2019. Reasons provided for rejecting the rail alternatives do not hold up to evidence and best practices. Reasons given include impacts to roadway capacity and difficulty of right-of-way (ROW) acquisition, which have not impeded other light rail (LA Metro, San Diego MTS) and Metrolink projects in Southern California. Also cited are high maintenance and operations costs, which fail to acknowledge that SBCTA already spends significant sums on maintenance and operations spending for Metrolink DMU and ZEMU projects for which this project could piggyback on, and fails to identify potential ridership and farebox revenue gains from investment in rail.

O-2-1


O-2-2

O-2-3

The Strategic Planning Study Report for Metro Gold Line Extension to the Ontario International Airport (2008), Advanced Regional Rail Integrated Vision – East (ARRIVE) Study (2014), Ontario Rail Access Study (2014), Hybrid Rail Service Planning Study (2018), and SCAG Los Angeles and San Bernardino Inter-County Transit and Rail Connection Study (2018) identified several viable rail alternatives, including MetroLink, Metro Gold Line (now A Line) DMU, ZEMU, and light rail extensions which have the potential to provide reliable and proven connectivity between ONT and Rancho Cucamonga Station and support frequent service across counties and a wide range of travel patterns. Such alternatives would significantly ease traffic congestion from vehicles and reduce VMT and emissions in the region, which is plagued with the worst air quality in the nation.

O-2-40-2-1

To visualize one proposal of rail connections to ONT Airport based on previous studies cited above, see Nick Andert’s YouTube productions, [The Insane Potential of Ontario International Airport](#) and [Full Metro Region Proposal](#), with a portion of his [2075 vision](#) captured below. Note the prominence of Ontario Airport as a hub for light rail and heavy rail service in the broader context of the region.



O-2-5

Below are the major concerns we find in the ONT Connector’s Build Alternative that must be adequately addressed in the Final EIR and we feel are grounds to reject the current model:


1. Severely Limited Capacity:

The DEIR provides the following description of the service model: “The proposed Project would operate autonomous electric vehicles to transport passengers between the Cucamonga Metrolink Station and ONT. The autonomous electric vehicles would be grouped and queued at their origin station and depart toward the destination station once boarded with passengers. After the group of vehicles arrives at the destination station and passengers disembark, new passengers would board, and the group of vehicles would return to its origin station.... The proposed Project would provide a peak one-way passenger throughput of approximately 100 per hour.” (ONT Connector DEIR, 2-15).

The project’s peak throughput of 100 passengers per hour is wholly inadequate compared to transportation needs between passengers at the airport and rail station and the project’s

O-2-6

own stated required capacity of 300 per hour: The DEIR states “SBCTA estimates that a peak passenger throughput of 300 people per hour is required for the proposed Project” (DEIR, 5-9). The higher capacity of rail is acknowledged in the Alternatives Considered section but given as a reason to reject rail, citing “operating capacity for a double-track DMU or LRT is between 2,808 passengers to 4,860 passengers per hour (Metro 2022)...The capacity of the rail systems greatly exceeds the required specifications of the proposed Project. Therefore, investment in a high-capacity rail system is not justified” (DEIR, 5-9). Given that the ONT airport is undergoing expansions and high speed rail will reach Rancho Cucamonga station within the decade, why is the “required specification” of 300 per hour for the project taken as an upper limit?



Bus rapid transit, light rail, and heavy rail can support 20,000-100,000 per hour. This capacity is orders of magnitude higher than projected peak capacity of the ONT Connector, and is on par with projected throughput at the growing Ontario Airport and future Brightline West high speed rail terminating at Rancho Cucamonga Station. ONT Airport sees upwards of 23,500 passengers per day with thousands more traveling daily via Metrolink and, eventually, Brightline West. Why does the DEIR not present passenger demand at these stations? Peak capacity of the ONT Connector fails to meet future demand.

2. **Redundancy With Existing Transit:**

This project will duplicate the above-ground ONT Connect shuttle currently in-service and the under-construction West Valley Connector BRT without enhancing capacity. We commend SBCTA and local agencies like Omnitrans for providing shuttle options and bus rapid transit along this corridor, and we do not understand how the ONT Connector Project would provide any meaningful alternative to the existing and future shuttle and bus services. There is no adequate justification provided in the DEIR for an underground service that essentially duplicates bus service. Staff resources and limited regional transit funding would be better spent on enhancing these existing and future rapid bus options to ease congestion, improve travel times, and add frequency and service hours.

3. **Technical Risk and Unproven Technology:**

There are no delivered examples of the proposed autonomous vehicle technology. The Las Vegas Loop system has required constant heavy intervention from operators to correct software and technical deficiencies with the current Tesla vehicle technology and tunnel infrastructure. Furthermore, the Las Vegas Loop is not an example of public transit and operates as a private conference-only system, raised serious worker safety and OSHA issues while being built, and continues to be ridiculed as “hilariously bad.” Autonomous vehicles have not successfully transitioned from a research and development platform to revenue service outside of extremely limited deployments in 2024. Adopting such an immature technology raises real and present risk that \$500 million dollars (or more) are spent on a

model which underperforms even its current insufficient technical specifications. Tech moguls promising such technology without proving it in practice are selling vaporware.

The DEIR is deficient in its analysis of the proposed technology and lacks operational data on public transit reliability for the ONT Connector model. The Final EIR should include a review of performance data from existing projects such as the Las Vegas Loop and how these findings would apply to the San Bernardino County context. It should also compare this to operational data and reliability of existing rail services. SBCTA and its partners have experience operating light rail and heavy rail in Metrolink and Arrow trains. SBCTA's serious entertainment of unproven and "gadgetbahn" technology in pursuit of this project instead of rail options poses a grave misuse of public funds and violation of public trust.

O-2-8

4. **Safety & Emergency Concerns:**

The Las Vegas Loop, a similar model of autonomous vehicle underground transit, has been plagued by traffic, slowdowns, confusion among drivers, and serious safety and emergency response concerns during construction and in operation. This is a faulty system that relies on human operators operating individual vehicles, instead of proven and reliable rail systems that utilize high-capacity trains with multiple cars on tracks and following industry-standard and federally-regulated safety mechanisms.

O-2-9

The Final EIR must comprehensively address emergency protocols, including evacuation procedures, fire safety, and passenger assistance within a confined tunnel system using autonomous vehicles. Please include an analysis of emergency response times in the event of a breakdown, collision, or fire in the ONT Connector. Adequate analysis must compare these safety and emergency risks with those of light rail and heavy rail options, which could be constructed aboveground along dedicated ROW, are in operation daily in San Bernardino County, and have federally-regulated requirements for construction and safety.

5. **Cost & Funding Risks:**

The over \$490 million estimate for this project is severely understated, given LA Metro tunnelling and excavation costs at similar project lengths ranging from \$1-7 billion. The project must also address funding instability and sourcing, given that the project is drastically uncompetitive, receiving zero dollars from the most recent round of California TIRCP grants.

Given high initial cost estimates and ongoing maintenance requirements, the EIR should include a detailed financial analysis of projected operating and maintenance costs over the next 20 years, and compare these fairly to rail alternatives. The EIR should include a discussion of funding stability, considering the rejection of this project for statewide transit funding. This project should not rely on speculative or uncertain funds for construction or operation. Funding viability of the project as proposed is in serious question, indicating proven transit, such as rail, is preferred and would be far more competitive for funding.

O-2-10

6. **Environmental Impacts:**

This project as proposed will increase VMT and emissions during construction as stated in the DEIR, and will be ineffective in reducing long-term congestion, air pollution, or greenhouse gas compared to rail due to low service capacity at this cost and scale. SBCTA must provide an honest analysis of the proposed project compared to rail alternatives with regards to VMT, congestion, and emissions. A full VMT and trip generation analysis for rail

O-2-11

O-2-12

extensions of Metrolink, Brightline West, or A Line light rail versus the ONT Connector model is missing. There is no accounting for the lifecycle emissions, resource demands, and environmental impact generated from a large fleet of electric vehicles and subsequent battery disposal compared to high-capacity electric rail that can run on renewable energy from overhead traction power. The tunnel option also creates greater impact to paleontological and archeological resources and subsurface utility hazards compared to a surface project. Why is a tunnel necessary given land use in the planned area?

SBCTA must pursue real rail alternatives, as recommended in prior studies in 2008, 2014, and 2018. Options include, but are not limited to: Metrolink Riverside Line extension West to ONT, a Brightline West and Metrolink San Bernardino Line extension South to ONT, an Arrow Line extension East and South to ONT, and a Metro/SBCTA A Line Extension to Rancho Cucamonga and/or ONT. Any or a combination of these options would be far more competitive for state and federal transit funding and better suited for quality service into the region's future. Rather than duplicating existing service, these options provide increased regional connectivity (e.g. access to Riverside, Los Angeles, and Orange Counties) and have far greater VMT reduction potential.

The model as proposed is rendered obsolete by existing shuttle and BRT service along the same corridor, which is justification alone to halt this planning process. However, our organizations and advocates around the region understand the incredible potential of pursuing rail extensions between ONT and Rancho Cucamonga Station and urge SBCTA to look long-term and regionally to invest in durable, high-capacity rail solutions as a better investment of public funds instead of this flawed and limited model that fails to meet projected demands or provide any long-term benefits.

We strongly urge the SBCTA board and staff to prioritize high-capacity, reliable rail solutions to meet San Bernardino County's long-term transportation needs, and reject the low-capacity, costly, unproven, and high-risk model in the ONT Connector Build Alternative that fails to provide the transit service that this region and its residents deserve. It is not too late to change course, for the benefit of the region. Thank you for considering and responding to our comments.

Sincerely,

Brianna Egan
Lead, Inland Empire Urbanists
Loma Linda, CA (San Bernardino County)

Adriana Rizzo
Co-Founder, Californians for Electric Rail
Riverside, CA (Riverside County)

Bart Reed
Executive Director, The Transit Coalition
Los Angeles, CA (Los Angeles County)



O-2-12
O-2-13
O-2-14
O-2-15
O-2-16

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 12, 2024, 2:35:36 PM

FULL NAME:

Yonatan Ahituv

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

ahituvyonatan@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

To whom it may concern,

The ONT airport deserves an effective transit connection, and for that reason, I highly oppose any sort of "autonomous vehicle tunnel" to ONT. These have been highly ineffective in Las Vegas, suffer from all sorts of safety, reliability, and capacity issues. For example, cars cannot follow closely to one another and must keep a distance, they also must autonomously follow curves, and each require an individual battery. If only there was a technology which would allow these cars to follow closely, and raise capacity, decrease costs by having one motorized vehicle carry others, and some sort of system that would allow the vehicles to follow the path easily...oh wait, that's called a train. Please instead connect ONT via an A-line extension or a DMU shuttle which can later be converted to an Arrow connection and save valuable taxpayer dollars.

1-1-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 26, 2024, 2:19:23 PM

FULL NAME:

JOSE DENNIS DIMAPILIS ALABASO

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

ORGANIZATION:

California Abilities Network

EMAIL OR PHONE:

dalabaso@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I think I'm beginning to like it. Why? Because it could become the perfect connection from Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station to Terminals 4 & 2 located near the bus tops of Ontario International Airport. For the International Terminal: Will there be an addition for both 'British Airways' and perhaps 'Air France/KLM' in nonstop European Flights?

1-2-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

EMAIL

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 10, 2024, 12:49:12 AM

FULL NAME:

Mohammed Alam

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

Abir2021@gmail.com

COMMENTS:


The traffic in Inland Empire has gotten much worse and expanding freeways has not worked. We need alternative transportation for well known traffic corridors. As we are expanding service for Metrolink, Arrow Service, and breaking ground on Brightline High Speed Rail we need expand local metro rail within the Inland empire.

I-3-1

Please build a double track ELECTRIC train connection that is underground or separate from traffic. I am tired of having to pay \$40 to \$60 for a rideshare to sit in traffic.

I also do mean an actual train. Please DO NOT build a tesla car in firetrap tunnel! Electric trains are built in all advance countries and even now developing countries! Our region cannot fall behind developing countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

I-3-2



Inland Empire Mass Transit

-
-
-
-



ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 30, 2024, 9:46:43 PM

FULL NAME:

Adam Appesh

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

aappesh@outlook.com

COMMENTS:

It would be much more preferable to have this project be completed with rail, and use vehicles with steel wheels but the route SBCTA has taken is understandable. Teslas should not be used for this project, given the major reliability issues and track record of Tesla.

1-4-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

From: Tim Watkins twatkins@gosbcta.com
Subject: FW: ONT Connector - Public Comment - Faraz Aqil
Date: December 2, 2024 at 7:30 AM
To: MadisonViola madison@costinoutreachgroup.com
Cc: ErinRyan erin@costinoutreachgroup.com



From: Faraz Aqil <aqil_faraz@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 7:28 AM
To: ONTconnector <ONTconnector@gosbcta.com>
Subject: ONT Connector - Public Comment - Faraz Aqil

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Ontario International Airport Connector Team.

My name is Faraz Aqil, and I use public transportation everyday for work. And although I'm a resident of Downey, me and my family much prefer to take flights here at Ontario Airport due to the less congestion of travelers, it's a smaller airport (less distance walking between terminals), and cheaper prices for flights. So we would love to use public transportation to quickly travel between our home and Ontario Airport without car. But after reading the Draft EIR, I do not support the ONT Connector using car shuttles as the mode of transportation to carry riders from Ontario Airport to the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink/Brightline stations.

I-5-1

First, I'm worried that if one of these autonomous cars stalls or has an accident, it will cause big delays. The Draft EIR says the underground path is a 24-foot inner diameter bidirectional tunnel (12 ft for each direction). Since the average space for a 1 car lane is 12 ft, that means there's only enough space for 1 car to travel in each direction. Which means if something like trash or an obstacle blocks the path of the autonomous cars, they would not have anywhere to go and will be stalled at their spot (and blocking traffic behind them). Also electric vehicles use lithium batteries, and if something happens that causes them to be engulf in flames, it will be extremely difficult to put them out (to the point where firefighters just let the car burn). Battery fire chemicals can cause environmental damage to the underground tunnel, the soil, and the groundwater. And a potential fire will block the underground tunnel from being used until the fire is out and damaged vehicle(s) are removed (which can take many, many days).

I-5-2

The Draft EIR mentions the ridership per hour is expected to be a shockingly low 100 riders per an hour for each direction. For reference, 1 LA Metro train can hold more than 100 people (about 150 people) and their frequency is an average of every 8-10 minutes. Even the planned West Valley Connector Bus Rapid project will be able to carry more riders per an hour between Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station, Ontario Mills, & the Airport than the proposed autonomous cars (and for much cheaper too). And I read SBTCA has already studied rail alternatives and found the amount of passengers per an hour for a light rail alternative comes to 2,808-4,860 riders (page: 5-9). This right away tells me as the ONT Connector project currently stands, SBTCA is not serious in its mission to provide a public transportation alternative for airport riders/employees to use if only 100 people per a direction can head to/leave from the airport. I can only imagine how rush hours will look like as people are hurrying to get to an autonomous car on time, only to have a long queue line and having to wait a long time (maybe up to an hour) just to ride in a car. Not to mention the delays it will take for passengers to load/unload their luggage and if a disability passenger needs help getting on/off the autonomous car. As a result, the 100 riders per an hour can easily drop to even a lower amount.

I-5-3

Therefore I strongly advise ONT Connector to change its mode of transportation from autonomous cars to trains. Building an underground train instead (that's also underground grade separated) will prevent accidents and is a much more reliable form of public transportation than cars (which still cause traffic jams and accidents with each other). And with the ability to transport more riders in higher frequencies, rail will be a reliable alternative to getting to the airport without using a car. ONT Connector should have gone with one of the rail alternatives discussed in page 5-2 (I especially liked the Goldline extension to Ontario Airport rail idea).

1-5-4

Lastly, I recommend you also add a proposed station stop at either Concurr St/Milliken Ave. Ave or at Inland Empire Dr/Milliken Ave. That way, riders can more easily access events at the Toyota Arena, access the Ontario Mills mall, and the nearby hotels within a 0.5 mile distance. This will also greatly improve other businesses in and around these locations (so that the ONT Connector won't just be limited to just airport riders). A successful transit project doesn't solely rely on just 1 group of riders (airport riders/employees) in order to be successful. This project has more chance of having a higher ridership if it diversifies it's ridership by giving people more reasons to use this public transportation (other than just 2 locations). It is unfortunate that there are currently no bus routes that take riders from Metrolink station to Ontario Mall/Toyota Sports arena, and to the Airport all in a 1-seat ride.

1-5-5

And it's a shame, because I do want this project to be successful, and I want me and my family to go to Ontario Airport without having to drive, and to visit the Ontario Mills Mall as well. But it appears that this will not a reliable public transportation project that will make a noticeable difference in reducing traffic congestion and getting people to ride instead of drive. Again, if you want to actually support reducing greenhouse gas emissions and support a public transportation people will really use, my best advise is to use a train (maybe even an autonomous one) as the mode of transportation through the underground tunnel.

1-5-6

Thank you for your time in reading my comment.

Sincerely,
Faraz Aqil

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Dec 2, 2024, 4:32:58 PM

FULL NAME:

Jeffrey Audett

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

jdaudett@yahoo.com

COMMENTS:

The capacity and utility of this project is laughable. The problem with these Tesla tunnels is that there is nothing that it can do in a way that is superior to a fixed guide way people mover.

I-6-1

On the other hand, supporting and connecting the A line to the Brightline West Rancho Cucamonga station and/or Ontario Airport would provide a 1 seat ride from most places in the San Gabriel Valley to Ontario Airport, making the airport a more desirable destination for passengers and therefore airlines, as well as to support feeding passengers along the future High Speed Rail corridors using Ontario as their airport of choice for longer distance travel.

I-6-2

This project should be changed/ended in favor an LA Metro A line extension to Ontario Airport to make Ontario the intermodal hub of the IE in the future.

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 12, 2024, 1:29:13 PM

FULL NAME:

Anthony Aviguetero

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

ORGANIZATION:

Self Employed

EMAIL OR PHONE:

aaviguet@yahoo.com

COMMENTS:

This is concerning the "autonomous vehicle tunnels." They are a massive waste of money and a boondoggle. This is to ask for an A Line extension, a DMU shuttle that can later be converted to an Arrow extension, or both.

1-7-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 31, 2024, 7:53:22 PM

FULL NAME:

Brian Ayala

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

ORGANIZATION:

None

EMAIL OR PHONE:

nesseb1@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I believe that making a tunnel for an autonomous vehicle loop is misguided. The Las Vegas convention center already has such a system and encounters traffic and back ups regularly. If the county is willing to expand public access to Ontario airport, the most efficient method would be rail. A subway/underground train would transport more passengers more efficiently without the same restrictions of an autonomous vehicle loop. Please take into consideration that you can always add more rail services, but adding more autonomous vehicles such as Las Vegas would only create traffic.

1-8-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 29, 2024, 7:45:24 PM

FULL NAME:

Gloria Barroso

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

[REDACTED]

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

I-9-1

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 15, 2024, 7:40:21 AM

FULL NAME:

Jack Bartlett

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

jackbartletthistory@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I frequent ontario airport because I have family in the Inland Empire and prefer to use it instead of LAX or even Burbank. I would love to take public transit to the airport that is rapid and reliable. An Elon Musk style tunnel "gadgetbahn" that is not proven is not the solution. Safe, reliable, frequent, and time tested public transit such as trains, bus rapid transit, or frequent all day shuttles are the solution. The Boring Company is not even relevant anymore. Lets not fall to Musk's grift.

I-10-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

EMAIL

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Dec 2, 2024, 3:01:46 PM

FULL NAME:

Cameron Bartosiewicz

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

Cameronbartosiewicz@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

This is a ridiculous proposal, exorbitantly expensive, and not at all practical. The airport would be better served by some form of rail service, with connections to regional transportation options.

1
1
1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 12, 2024, 10:48:23 AM

FULL NAME:

Michael Begany

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

mpb4449@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

The autonomous car tunnel proposal for this project is a poor choice for this project. I would much rather prefer a light or heavy rail connection to the greater rail network.

1-12-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 21, 2024, 6:51:59 PM

FULL NAME:

Danilo Braga

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

danilobraga98@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

To whom may be reading this,I'm an avid traveler who has had the experience of riding many different public transit systems both within, and outside of the US. This includes the Tesla tunnels at the Las Vegas Convention center.Does it look sci-fi and futuristic? Yes!Is it practical? No..I understand the city wants to impress its visitors by being futuristic and cool but I assure you, only the opposite will happen.With a large number of passengers getting off the trains to catch a flight at ONT, there will be a large line of people waiting for a "car" to get to the airport. Not only is this more stressful for someone who may already be late, but also less efficient costs, and time-wise. A rail service used by most other airports will take many more people at a fraction of the time. Please reconsider this project as rail. As someone who grew up experiencing the best of the best, I assure you, this is not progression, only regression.

I-13-1
I-13-2

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 13, 2024, 7:57:11 PM

FULL NAME:

Danilo Braga

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

[REDACTED]

COMMENTS:

Cars belong on the road, not underground. If the plan is to have vehicles shuttle passengers back and forth, then it would be much cheaper and more reliable to go with busses in dedicated lanes instead.

Please see my attached text file for the rest of my comment.

I-14-1

FILE UPLOAD:

TXT comment.txt
1.3KB

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SBCTA website

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

Dear Chair Marquez, SBCTA Board Members, and ONT Connector Project Staff,
I would like to add my comment to the DEIR as I heavily oppose the connector project as proposed.

As someone who frequently travels to Las Vegas, I have personally seen the "autonomous vehicles in a tunnel" in operation and it was incredibly slow. Considering the convention center Tesla tunnels would only receive a fraction of ridership as one plane's number of passengers, and still has lines, is sign enough that this would not work for our County.

Furthermore, as we will be receiving even more passengers from the Brightline addition, this project will become overwhelmed before its able to complete its first year.

Long term, we need underground light rail. Imagine if San Bernardino, Loma Linda, and Redlands residents could hop on a FLIRT train that would have stops in the ARROW corridor, then turns into an express train to ONT. Is it possible? It certainly won't be with this current proposal. Until trains are more convenient than cars, people will always choose cars. This extra connection plus hailing an autonomous tunnel taxi will only add delays to a trip to ONT.

This project as currently proposed is an enviromental sabotage job. Cars are and will always be less efficient than electric rail.

Thank you.

I-14-2
I-14-3

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 26, 2024, 2:27:54 PM

FULL NAME:

Victor Braga

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

victorbraga98@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Hello,

I have experience using the boring tunnel in Las Vegas as I often go to convention centers at NAB. While the system works and is very capable, I do not believe this is the appropriate approach to transport passengers between rancho and ONT. the reason why is because autonomous passenger vehicles cannot handle high capacity well. An average jet carries over 200 people, with larger capacity planes that can land at ONT, like an A380, can carry over 500. A plane of about 350 people would take 88 vehicles to transport all these passengers. Add luggage and cargo and it would delay everyone significantly. In my opinion, the best transport would be a metro rail as other world airports have done and has proven to work.

1-15-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

EMAIL

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 12, 2024, 9:28:23 AM

FULL NAME:

Kyle Brown

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

khbrown400@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed autonomous vehicle tunnels, which I believe are an inefficient use of public funds. Given the significant costs and limited benefits of this project, these resources could be better allocated to extend the A Line or to establish a Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) shuttle system that could later be adapted for Arrow service.

An A Line extension would provide immediate, practical benefits to residents by enhancing connectivity and reducing traffic congestion. A DMU shuttle, which could eventually evolve into an Arrow extension, would similarly support a sustainable, future-proof transit solution for our community.

Please consider prioritizing these alternatives over the proposed tunnels, which I believe are a financial risk with little tangible public benefit.

Thank you for your consideration.

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

I-16-1

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 23, 2024, 8:28:50 PM

FULL NAME:

Justin Bryant

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

ptct2098@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I am strongly opposed to a car tunnel. It is a waste of taxpayer dollars to subsidize private vehicles on the road. This tunnel should be a Metrolink, Arrow or LA Metro extension, not a wasteful car tunnel that moves a fraction of the people. It will create more pollution, more driving, and will only make connectivity at Ontario Airport worse. I strongly oppose this project and will gather my community to stand firmly opposed to this sad, wasteful project. Please use the funds elsewhere and stop wasting time on a boondoggle that serves no purpose but to make our lives worse.

I-17-1
I-17-2

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 14, 2024, 10:01:06 AM

FULL NAME:

Jesse Budlong

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

jesse.budlong@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

This is an absolutely terrible and unproven idea. Even Elon Musk himself abandoned it. Please just build an actual rail connection! That's all people want. Please don't waste \$500,000,000.00 idea.

] I-18-1

<https://cal.streetsblog.org/2024/11/13/unproven-tunnel-idea-getting-in-the-way-of-inland-empire-transit-solutions>

] I-18-2

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 31, 2024, 12:41:06 AM

FULL NAME:

Justin Andrew Camarena

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

juscamarena@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Expand LRT A LINE. This will be low ridership otherwise... metrolink does not run often, what's the point? 1-10-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

From: Kevin Chu chuhouse2003@gmail.com
Subject: ONT Connector
Date: November 10, 2024 at 11:24 PM
To: ONTconnector ONTconnector@gosbcta.com



CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it may concern

Thank you so much for bringing us more public transit in San Bernardino County. Public Transportation is our future to solve traffic congestion and help the environment, especially Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station will be the future station of Brightline West. But I think we should reallocate the budget for this ONT Connector to other improvement projects. The reasons are follows:

1. West Valley Connector



The one that within the yellow box can totally replace this ONT Connector Project. The budget could be used to improve the connection between the terminals and the bus stops like sidewalks, signals, bus stop environments. The budget could also be used to purchase electric buses and charging stations, since EVs are the future. And grade separation on San Antonio Ave and Campus Ave. Both of them will have a stop for West Valley Connector.

2. Brightline West

Brightline West is a high speed rail that is currently being built between Las Vegas and Rancho Cucamonga. If underground tunnel is allowed to be used to connect Rancho Cucamonga Station and Ontario Airport, then Instead of us building it, we should communicate with them if they have a plan to expand to the Ontario International Airport in the future. So we could save the budget.

In conclusion, ONT connector is not necessary. We would like to see more public transportation, but we don't need this connector. With this budget, you could use it to improve public transit in a different way.

Thank you so much for your time.

Kevin Chu
A Ontario Resident

I-20-1

I-20-2

I-20-3

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 14, 2024, 8:03:05 PM

FULL NAME:

Wesley Chuang

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

wesley0chu@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

As a resident of SoCal, I strongly oppose the ONT Connector project.

What is your vision for the future of transit in San Bernardino County?

Does that vision include Teslas shuttling people around in claustrophobic underground tunnels? Or world-class fast, frequent, reliable, proven electrified passenger rail?

Choose wisely.

I-21-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

Streets for All

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 13, 2024, 4:12:57 PM

FULL NAME:

Jonathan Chue

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

jonathan.chue@yahoo.com

COMMENTS:

I'd like to express my strong opposition to the project as proposed. I am deeply concerned that the proposed model will not meet our region's needs for reliable, scalable, and safe transit.

I-22-1

- The project's peak throughput of 100 passengers/hr is inadequate compared to the project's own required capacity of 300/hr and the 20,000-100,000/hr achievable by BRT, light rail, or heavy rail, failing to address future demand.

- The Boring Company's Las Vegas Loop, a similar model, has been plagued by traffic, slowdowns, confusion among drivers, and serious safety concerns during construction and operation.

I-22-2

- The \$490+ mill estimate for this project is likely understated, given LA Metro light rail costs at similar lengths ranging from \$1-7 bill.

- This project will increase VMT and emissions during construction and will be ineffective in reducing long-term congestion, air pollution, or greenhouse gas compared to rail.

I-22-3

SBCTA should pursue real rail alternatives, as recommended in prior studies.

I-22-4

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 13, 2024, 9:49:43 PM

FULL NAME:

yehudit coutin

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

yehudit.s.coutin@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Please reject the Musk/Tesla proposal. A light rail for the public (like it is around the world) is the right answer

1-23-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

EMAIL

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 9, 2024, 11:37:36 AM

FULL NAME:

Aaron Coyoca

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

monsterofcookie@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Having an autonomous car tunnel is a severely insufficient use of tunnel space, thusly being an inefficient use of money. Each car will fit, at most, 8 people and will run into capacity problems. Please instead consider extending light rail service from San Bernardino and from Metro A Line, none of which would require expensive tunneling.

I-24-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

From: Brandon Crawford brc910@gmail.com

Subject: ONT Connector

Date: November 13, 2024 at 3:55 PM

To: ONTconnector ONTconnector@gosbcta.com

Cc: clerkoftheboard clerkoftheboard@gosbcta.com, rmarquez@chinohills.org, awapner@ontarioca.gov



CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Chair Marquez, SBCTA Board Members, and ONT Connector Project Staff,

My name is Brandon Crawford, and I am a resident of Murrieta and Los Angeles, an ONT airport passenger, and a Metrolink rider. I would like to comment on the DEIR and express my strong opposition to the Ontario International Airport (ONT) Connector project as proposed. As a proponent of effective and fiscally-responsible public transit in San Bernardino County, I am deeply concerned that the proposed model will not meet our region's needs for reliable, scalable, and safe transit between ONT and Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink/Future Brightline West Station.

I-25-1

Key concerns about the ONT Connector's Build Alternative that must be addressed in the EIR:

- **Limited Capacity:** The project's peak throughput of 100 passengers per hour is inadequate compared to the project's own required capacity of 300 per hour and the 20,000-100,000 per hour achievable by BRT, light rail, or heavy rail, failing to address future demand at ONT and the Rancho Cucamonga/Brightline Station.
- **Safety & Emergency Concerns:** The Boring Company's Las Vegas Loop, a similar model that is privately operated, has been plagued by traffic, slowdowns, confusion among drivers, and serious safety and EMS concerns during construction and in operation.
- **Costs & Funding Risks:** The \$490+ million estimate for this project is likely understated, given LA Metro light rail costs at similar project lengths ranging from \$1-7 billion. Address funding instability and sources, given that the project is severely uncompetitive, receiving \$0 from the most recent round of California TIRCP grants.
- **Redundant Shuttle Service:** This project will duplicate above-ground ONT Connect shuttle service and West Valley Connector BRT without enhancing capacity. Is this project even necessary?
- **Environmental Impacts:** This project will increase VMT and emissions during construction and will be ineffective in reducing long-term congestion, air pollution, or greenhouse gas compared to rail due to limited service capacity for mode shift. Provide an honest analysis of the proposed project vs rail alternatives with regards to VMT, congestion, and emissions.

I-25-A2

I-25-3

I-25-4

I-25-6

I-25-5

SBCTA should pursue real rail alternatives, as recommended in prior studies in 2008, 2014, and 2018. Options such as a Metrolink Riverside Line extension West to ONT and a Brightline West/Metrolink San Bernardino Line extension South to ONT would be more competitive for state and federal transit funding and better suited for future demand.

I ask the board to prioritize high-capacity, reliable rail solutions to meet San Bernardino County's long-term transportation needs, and reject the low-capacity, high-risk, unreliable model in the Build Alternative that fails to provide the transit service our region deserves.

I-25-7

Sincerely,

Brandon Crawford
Murrieta/Los Angeles, CA
Riverside & Los Angeles Counties

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 30, 2024, 1:53:48 PM

FULL NAME:

Bruce Culp

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

lakerboy526@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

This is a horrible idea. What happens if a disaster hits, such as an earthquake or fire, or an accident underground? All transportation stops immediately until repairs are performed, which could take months. It's way too expensive.

A simple, inexpensive fleet of electric buses going down multi-lane Milliken Ave would make much more sense. If an earthquake, accident or fire occurs, transportation can continue immediately. It's cheap, it's clean, and it also reduces traffic congestion.

I-26-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list



From: Tim Watkins twatkins@gosbcta.com
Subject: Fwd: ONT Connector
Date: November 29, 2024 at 7:08 PM
To: Madison Viola Madison@costinoutreachgroup.com
Cc: Erin Ryan Erin@costinoutreachgroup.com

FYI

Tim Watkins

Begin forwarded message:

From: Catherine Curtis <ctc91711@gmail.com>
Date: November 29, 2024 at 2:42:59 PM PST
To: ONTconnector <ONTconnector@gosbcta.com>
Subject: ONT Connector

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

We are very excited about and supportive of the prospect of continuing connections from the Montclair transit center on to Ontario Airport. This would provide a way to get - by one sort of train or another - between Union Station in downtown LA and Ontario Airport, providing lots of great transportation options for those of us living between these two fantastic destinations.

Considerations for this connection must include the need for longer-term parking at gold line and metrolink stations, especially in the eastern LA and western SB county area, so people can drive and take the train to Ontario Airport or Union Station (where they can already continue on via other ground transport to LAX).

Also, if Claremont and our surrounding sister foothill cities wish to really be transit-friendly we must plan ahead for the "last mile" issue, either with parking at train stations or with well-publicized alternatives (Uber and ???) to get from home to trains.

I'm heading out on a flight next week and would love to NOT have to prevail upon family to give me a lift to and from ONT.

We could get people used to the idea - and start building ridership even before the train connects to ONT - by offering regular shuttle/bus service between the Montclair Transit Center and Ontario airport.

Looking forward to updates!

Catherine Curtis & Diana Miller
ctc91711@gmail.com

Stay curious!

I-27-1

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 23, 2024, 8:17:33 PM

FULL NAME:

Kevin Dedicatoria

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

krdedic1@svsu.edu

COMMENTS:

I oppose the ONT Connector being built. I advocate for SBCTA to reinvest that money on investments and expansions for local transit and Metrolink.


Omnitrans service is limited and infrequent at Ontario International Airport and the entire Pomona "West" Valley. I suggest spending it on longer service hours on Omnitrans, bus rapid transit, and Omnitrans' unconstrained plan (except the ONT Connector/Tunnel to ONT).

I also recommend the agency to reconsider extending the Metro A/Gold Line to Ontario International Airport. The light rail service has longer service hours than Metrolink and can serve more people in the San Gabriel and Pomona Valleys than Metrolink. The A Line extension is also consistent with the Ontario Plan 2040. I attached the a SCAG report from 2018 & image from the Ontario Plan 2040.

Did the studies actually talk to employees at ONT? I work at the airport! Metrolink is impractical for me and likely most employees. The ONT Connector won't make a difference.

I-28-1

I-28-2



MOBILITY

Figure M-03
Public Transit

Transit Centers

-  Existing Bus Transfer Center
-  Existing Metrolink Station
-  Amtrak Station/Proposed Metrolink Station
-  Future Multimodal Transportation Center
-  BRT Corridor
-  Metro Goldline Extension
-  Metrolink
-  Ontario Airport Loop
-  Railroad
-  Ontario City Boundary
-  County Boundary

I-28-5



Source: The City of Ontario 2020 Date: 5/9/22

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Dec 2, 2024, 10:31:48 PM

FULL NAME:

Brianna Egan

ADDRESS:



ORGANIZATION:

IE Urbanists, Californians for Electric Rail, The Transit Coalition

EMAIL OR PHONE:

briannajungegan@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Dear Tim Watkins, FTA, ONT Connector Staff, and SBCTA Staff and Board Members,


On behalf of IE Urbanists, a coalition of San Bernardino and Riverside County residents advocating for transportation improvements in the Inland Empire, Californians for Electric Rail (CER), which advocates for rail electrification around the state, and The Transit Coalition, which supports transit projects in Southern California and nationwide, we write to express our strong opposition to the Ontario International Airport (ONT) Connector project as proposed.

We urge the board to reject the Build Alternative which relies on an unproven and low-capacity model of “autonomous, zero-emission vehicles on an ‘on-demand’ basis.” We urge you to provide a fair analysis and consideration of rail alternatives, which is what this corridor and region deserves.

Please read our full letter in the File Upload, where we outline our deep concerns with the DEIR and provide technical input and recommendations.

I-29-1
I-29-2
I-29-3

IMAGE UPLOAD:



SouthernCalifornia-Rail-Map.png

I-29-4

FILE UPLOAD:

PDF SBCTA ONT Letter - IE Urbanists-CER-TTC.pdf
1.2MB

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

EMAIL

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

From: Thomas Erickson thomaserickson42@gmail.com
Subject: ONT Connector
Date: November 1, 2024 at 3:44 PM
To: ONTconnector ONTconnector@gosbcta.com



CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I was reviewing the upcoming projects for SBCTA, and noticed an inconsistency in the planned projects.

The ONT Connector autonomous vehicle project is meant to run from the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink station to the Ontario Airport, and open at an indefinite point in the future.

The West Valley BRT is funded and under construction, and will open in 2026.

What is the justification for constructing a \$538.5 million dollar tunnel underneath an existing transit corridor instead of allocating the money to accelerating Phase 2 of the BRT, or increase service on the corridor?

Thank you,

Thomas Erickson

I-30-1
I-30-2

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Dec 2, 2024, 12:54:48 PM

FULL NAME:

Maha Fathali

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

maha.fathali@md.cusm.edu

COMMENTS:

I'd like to express my strong opposition to the ONT Connector project as proposed. As a proponent of effective and fiscally-responsible public transit, I am deeply concerned that the proposed model will not meet our region's needs for reliable, scalable, and safe transit between ONT and Metrolink/Future Brightline West Station.

I-31-1

Key concerns about the ONT Connector's Build Alternative that must be addressed: limited capacity, safety & emergency concerns, costs & funding risks, and redundant shuttle service.

I-31-2

SBCTA should pursue real rail alternatives, as recommended in prior studies. Options such as a Metrolink Riverside Line extension West to ONT and a Brightline West/Metrolink San Bernardino Line extension South to ONT would be more competitive for funding.

I-31-3

I ask the board to prioritize high-capacity, reliable rail solutions to meet long-term transportation needs, and reject the low-capacity, high-risk, unreliable model that fails to provide the transit service our region deserves.

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 18, 2024, 7:07:30 PM

FULL NAME:

Emmett Florence

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

emmettflorence@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Say no to grifter Elon Musk's "autonomous vehicle tunnels" boondoggle! We need real public transit like an A Line extension. Tunnels for Teslas would be wasteful, inefficient, and dangerous. Trains and busses move people better than cars. The infrastructure we invest in for the future should reflect this.

I-32-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 9, 2024, 11:53:10 AM

FULL NAME:

David Flores

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

davidflores3978@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I'm writing to express my complete indignation at the proposal to use "autonomous vehicle tunnels" for the connector project. Ontario is my first choice airport for travel and I would MUCH rather we make our existing passenger rail infrastructure more resilient and efficient by perhaps extending the A line east to reach the airport or extend the Metrolink Arrow west to it, as the existing service is grossly underutilized. People are tired of public welfare projects being sold out to the best interest of profit and coporations, from warehouses to car manufacturers like Tesla. The infrastructure of the region is the laughing stock of the world, despite California alone being among the world's largest economies We deserve better.

I-33-1
I-33-2
I-33-3

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

FULL NAME:

William Frankenfeld

ADDRESS:



ORGANIZATION:

individual

EMAIL OR PHONE:

WLFRAKNEFELD@YAHOO.COM

COMMENTS:

My name is William, and I am a resident of Long Beach, an ONT airport passenger, and a Metrolink rider. I am opposed to the Ontario International Airport (ONT) Connector project as proposed. I am concerned that the proposed model will not meet our region's needs for reliable, scalable, and safe transit between ONT and Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink/Future Brightline West Station. The project's peak throughput of 100 passengers per hour is inadequate compared to the project's own required capacity of 300. The Boring Company's Las Vegas Loop has been plagued by traffic, slowdowns, confusion among drivers, and serious safety and EMS concerns during construction and in operation. The \$490+ million estimate for this project is likely understated, given LA Metro light rail costs at similar project lengths ranging from \$1-7 billion. SBCTA should pursue rail alternatives, such as a hybrid DMU line connecting the future Brightline Rancho Cucamonga Station to ONT

William Frankenfeld

LA County

I-34-1
I-34-2
I-34-3
I-34-4

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

EMAIL

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 24, 2024, 8:16:02 AM

FULL NAME:

Jon Gollihugh

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

crowncity@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

While I think this is a great idea it should be expanded to have a station at the Toyota center and the new baseball stadium being built in the Ontario Ranch area south of the airport. I live in Azusa and work in San Bernardino, ONT is my preferred airport. Also many times myself and my wife use the Metrolink station in RC to reach the area. As this part of the IE is planned to grow in the next decade having opportunities to move around the area to the various entertainment venues using autonomous transportation will be a huge benefit to people inside and outside of the immediate area.

I-35-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 10, 2024, 12:10:48 AM

FULL NAME:

Giovanni Gitsai Gong

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

conkeru@hotmail.com

COMMENTS:

Building autonomous vehicle tunnels is a waste of money and it's not a serious transit solution. Build instead an A line extension or DMU extension for Arrow or both instead of building tunnels for cars. The Vegas Loop isn't something that should be replicated and trains are better in every damn way.

I-36-1
I-36-2

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 12, 2024, 8:27:55 PM

FULL NAME:

Andrew Graves

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

andrewcgraves@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Hello SBCTA,

I'm writing to you today to urge AGAINST the adoption of a system based on a system of "Autonomous electric shuttles" using a system similar to the Vegas Loop operated by Tesla. This project requires expensive tunneling to deliver, which would not be an issue if SBCTA planned on offering high frequency. However, the technology they are opting to use does NOT scale well (DEIR says 100 per hour) and has been proven in the Vegas Loop to be extremely ineffective for handling large influxes of people (i.e. after an airplane deboarding).

I-37-1
I-37-2

The board needs to reject this waste of taxpayer money and commit to building an effective link between ONT Airport and the rest of the transportation network for the IE and SOCAL that the region deserves. We need to commit to a more efficient and bulletproof implementation, such as a Metrolink extension (Riverside Line / SB Line extension) or another rail based alternative.

I-37-3

I urge you to make the smart decision for our region.

Thanks,

From: Erik Griswold <erik.griswold@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 11:35 PM
To: ONTconnector <ONTconnector@gosbcta.com>
Subject: Public Comment on Connector Tunnel Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear SBCTA,

I am submitting this comment on December 2nd, 2024.

I am sorry that the SBCTA was lured into the idea of building tunnels that were supposed to be cheaper than they turn out to be when experienced and realistic contractors get involved. It has been admitted by the original proposers that hyperloop or loop or whatever the proposed name was to be is not just boring, but also intended to divert attention away from proven technology.

While they may not be as "Sexy" as an untested tunnel that, unfortunately, the Las Vegas Convention Center fell for, there are cheaper alternatives to anything thought up by lucky, opportunistic egoists who grew up with a silver spoon in their mouths assisted by a racially segregated society based on odd interpretations of Calvinism.

Look at your 380 van ridership numbers now and its relatively low cost, consider BRT or even rail transit that could also connect to the LRT line you are building into San Bernardino County from Los Angeles County.

Even a cable-drawn People-Mover, such as the one that links Oakland Airport to the Coliseum BART station, would be cheaper and safer than deep-bore tunnels in the exurban terrain of Rancho Cucamonga/Ontario.

Use your heads, and put the idea of using sewer tunnels to transport airport customers into the SBCTA office recycle bin.

-Erik Griswold, frequent user of both ONT airport as well as the Omnitrans 380 ONT Connector Van, on which I am always the only passenger.
Claremont, CA 91711

I-38-1

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 9, 2024, 10:06:16 AM

FULL NAME:

Bryan Guo

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

bryanguo77@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I believe that using “autonomous vehicle tunnels” as connectors to ONT are a massive waste of both time and money, and quite frankly, also downright worse in utility compared to other options. I would instead like ask for an A Line extension, a DMU shuttle that can later be converted to an Arrow extension, or both.

1-39-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

I do some reading and research into transportation projects as a general interest

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 27, 2024, 1:11:59 PM

FULL NAME:

Julian Hanes

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

3235526337

COMMENTS:

I understand that elevated lines are unpopular because of visual impacts, but I seriously question the need for the line to be 100% underground. This line is blessed with alignment through low-density areas, industrial areas, and wide boulevards with medians— all of these are ideal conditions for the choice of elevated rail over heavy rail.

I-40-1

I have struggle to see any downsides to an elevated alignment. For instance, an elevated line were placed in the median of Milliken road, it would be 100 feet from the closest residence— don't you think that Milliken road itself, with its fast traffic and semi trucks, is far more of a blight to these residences than an elevated rail line could ever be? Would an elevated line really be such a big downgrade to the neighborhood?

I-40-2

Choosing underground over elevated would mean spending hundreds of millions more. SB county has a need for increased bus frequency after COVID and bus lanes to deal with rising traffic— the money is much better spent there.

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 13, 2024, 5:51:58 PM

FULL NAME:

Jack Hawley

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

jackrhawley525@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

My name is Jack, and I am a resident of Glendale, but was previously a San Bernardino resident. As a proponent of effective and fiscally-responsible public transit in San Bernardino County, I am deeply concerned that the proposed model will not meet our region's needs for reliable, scalable, and safe transit.

I-41-1

The top concern about the ONT Connector's Build Alternative that must be addressed is the limited capacity. The project's peak throughput of 100 passengers per hour is inadequate compared to the project's own required capacity of 300 per hour and the 20,000-100,000 per hour achievable by BRT, light rail, or heavy rail, failing to address future demand at ONT and the Rancho Cucamonga/Brightline Station.

I-41-2

I ask the board to prioritize high-capacity, reliable rail solutions to meet San Bernardino County's long-term transportation needs, and reject the low-capacity, high-risk, unreliable model in the Build Alternative that fails to provide the transit service our region deserves.

I-41-3

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

EMAIL

From: Blue Hernandez <bluehernandez@live.com>
Date: December 2, 2024 at 8:40:52 PM PST
To: ONTconnector <ONTconnector@gosbcta.com>
Subject: Stupid tunnels

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Stop being retarded and build up public transportation. I live in Rancho Cucamonga. It should not take 3 hours to take the Metrolink from here to Glendale or Irvine. Get your heads out of your ass and build something useful.

I want to know who I need to vote out of office so real work can be done.

I-42-1

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 19, 2024, 9:49:28 PM

FULL NAME:

Ray Hernandez

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

rhezekiel@aol.com

COMMENTS:

Please keep me posted. I reside here in Ontario and use the Airport often for business and leisure travel I also travel work work in Pasadena and through LA County this will benefit our growing area so much to ease already congestion that we are seeing throughout the day.

I-43-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 9, 2024, 4:46:25 PM

FULL NAME:

Michael Hidayat

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

michaelch95@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

The autonomous vehicle tunnel is a massive waste of money. An A Line extension and/or a DMU shuttle to the Rancho Cucamonga station that could later be converted to an Arrow extension would better serve the goals of this project and be a better use of funds.

]-44-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 9, 2024, 4:18:39 PM

FULL NAME:

Lawrence Hodge

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

lthodge@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

To put it bluntly, the proposed incorporation of autonomous electric vehicles within in the tunnels for passenger transport is dumb. This is nothing more than a rehashing of the plan brough forth by The Boring Company a few years prior, just without their involvement. This idea would be better if it was light, electric rail; a small subway system. Not only would it make sense considering that it's connecting the Rancho Metrolink/Brightline station, it would also make sense as far as extending the Metro Gold Line Connector further into the county.

I-45-1
I-45-2

Simply having autonomous vehicles ferry people in tunnels below ground doesn't make sense. Simply make the system a small light rail or don't do it at all.

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 25, 2024, 2:52:53 PM

FULL NAME:

Martin S Hoecker-Martinez

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

msmithma@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

This proposal is duplicative and wasteful. SBCTA should prioritize decreasing travel times for the West Valley Connector (WVC), in particular by increasing the amount of dedicated bus lanes. SBCTA has better high capacity plan options than Connect ONT. For example the Ontario Airport Rail Access Study (2014) and the Hybrid Rail Study (2018) for a spur from the San Bernardino Line to the Ontario Airport or plans to extend the LA Metro A line A to the Ontario airport.

The duplication of the WVC and other SBCTA plans notwithstanding, the proposed vehicle types for this fully grade separated guideway are woefully inefficient. Other existing autonomous fixed guideway systems have much higher passenger capacities and throughputs which might justify the expense of a Rancho Cucamonga to Ontario Airport tunnel (e.g Sky Train in Vancouver BC, Skyline in Honolulu)

I hope you redirect SBCTA's efforts to any of the better options available to you,

Respectfully

Martín Hoecker-Martínez

-46-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SBCTA Website

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 27, 2024, 2:13:29 PM

FULL NAME:

Erin Hoops

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

eehoops@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I oppose a “subway-like bi-directional system where passengers traveling to and from ONT will be transported in autonomous, zero-emission vehicles on an ‘on-demand’ basis.” This is a huge waste of money and time.

This project did not fully consider using a train - a proven technology that serves this purpose well all over the world.

]-47-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 19, 2024, 9:13:32 PM

FULL NAME:

MARK R JOHNSTON

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

ORGANIZATION:

RESIDENT

EMAIL OR PHONE:

CANAMMJ@YAHOO.COM

COMMENTS:

Giant waste of money. No one is going to ride Express West to Rancho to transfer to this service to go to Ontario Airport. They can just fly out of Vegas. Very few people will ride Metrolink to Rancho to catch this service either- the volume of riders on Metrolink and the passenger counts at Ontario Airport do not warrant the money to be spent on this. The money for this should be spent on double tracking the Metrolink line to facilitate very frequent service on the LA-SB line to allow Express West riders to make short quick connections both east & west. Using Musks technology is also a waste- not been proven practical. You would be better building a people mover or small monorail connecting Rancho train station> the Mills> Ontario area> ONT rental car center and then into the terminals itself. Please, please don't speed our limited tax money and transportation money on this folly.

I-48-1
I-48-2
I-48-3

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

EMAIL

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Dec 2, 2024, 8:57:32 AM

FULL NAME:

Zachary Jones

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

zachjones.media@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

As a user of public transit and the Ontario airport I believe that a direct train connection is the best option. Extending Metro light rail or Metrolink's arrow would provide greater capacity for future growth. Trains would also have a much lower environmental impact than busses on tires

1-49-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 13, 2024, 7:57:27 PM

FULL NAME:

Rehan Khan

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

rikhan6855@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Hello!
I hope you're well! I am taking time out of my day to urge you to abandon these "autonomous vehicle tunnels" and instead move for an A Line extension or a DMU shuttle that could later be converted to an Arrow extension OR both. The "autonomous vehicle tunnels" seem to be a waste of money.

1-50-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 9, 2024, 3:02:31 PM

FULL NAME:

Kevin Kivikoski

ADDRESS:

Redlands, CA

EMAIL OR PHONE:

nospam973@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

**I have questions about the on demand autonomous battery operated vehicles. Is this kind of system operational anywhere in the world? How successful are they?
 Would it be cheaper to use traditional driverless subway cars, that run on a third rail or overhead catenary, with regular service?**

1-51-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Dec 2, 2024, 1:32:30 PM

FULL NAME:

Daniel Koster

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

dkoster11@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

The ONT connection already provides this service. We need to prioritize spending on increased Metrolink service and not this costly project.

1-52-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 10, 2024, 7:57:18 PM

FULL NAME:

Michael Kusaba

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

mkusaba94@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Please DO NOT consider an autonomous vehicle tunnel project.

These are a waste of valuable time and money. There are many other tried and true solutions such as heavy/light rail instead. Using heavy/light rail offers familiarity on all aspects of this project not limited to previous project management experience, systems maintenance, and pre-existing suppliers in the United States.

I-53-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 10, 2024, 11:15:46 AM

FULL NAME:

Rom Lacuesta

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

lacuestarom@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I'm in favor of this connector, it would benefit commuters connecting to ONT from Metrolink station. Less missed flights because of a dedicated connector. Please build this

I-54-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Dec 2, 2024, 3:10:47 PM

FULL NAME:

Matthew Lashbrook

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

zionmanproductions@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

This project should be heavy rail or at minimum light rail. As the last resort, it could be a people mover. This project should not have on demand cars in a tunnel. It is a terrible idea. There are tested solutions. That many airports have all over the world and are available to copy. all of these solutions work very well. There is no reason to reinvent the wheel. As someone who frequently flies out of Ontario airport and pays hundreds of dollars to Uber. I want real practical rail solutions to get to the airport. High capacity rail is the only answer.

I-55-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 21, 2024, 1:47:44 PM

FULL NAME:

Ryan Lee

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

rlee1390@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

**Would an on-ground people mover (similar to LAX) be far cheaper?
Would a below-ground people mover be cheaper?**

The *idea* of the project is great; linking ONT to the RC Metrolink (and soon-to-be Brightline) station. But the autonomous EVs seems like the project is trying to be too "cute" "tech-savy" instead of useful. An on-ground people mover might be cheaper and more useful. A below-ground people mover might be far cheaper.

I-56-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

From: Tim Watkins twatkins@gosbcta.com

Subject: FW: ONT Connector

Date: November 13, 2024 at 5:03 PM

To: Madison Viola Madison@costinoutreachgroup.com, Erin Ryan Erin@costinoutreachgroup.com



From: Tim Watkins
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2024 5:03 PM
To: Ryan Leifield <rleifield@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: ONT Connector

Thank you Ryan. Your comments are received and we will make sure they are included in the Draft EIR for the ONT Connector Project.

San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
1170 West Third Street, 2nd Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92410

From: Ryan Leifield <rleifield@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2024 5:02 PM
To: ONTconnector <ONTconnector@gosbcta.com>
Subject: ONT Connector

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi, my name is Ryan Leifield. I'm an Ontario Airport passenger and Metrolink rider. I strongly oppose the ONT connector and feel that it's totally the wrong direction for San Bernardino to go. We should be thinking of mass transit for the public to create car-less regional connectivity for as many people as possible. It seems like a huge expenditure of resources for an ill-advised scheme.

Thank you!
Ryan Leifield

I-57-1

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 16, 2024, 1:00:34 PM

FULL NAME:

Donald Leong

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

autonotification.colab.mime@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I disagree with the findings found in the Draft EIR. Based on the Draft EIR, the Metro Gold (A) line extension via Cucamonga Creek was cited as infeasible because it "impacts water drainage" and "only serves travelers from the west". However, people could take Metrolink or Omnitrans from the east and connect to the A line extension. As for the proposed autonomous vehicle system, I find it excessive that the tunnel is 70 feet below the ground, given that the majority of the line runs through industrial areas and warehouses. The vehicles themselves also provide poor capacity; they can only transport 100 people per hour in small pods which provides a cramped experience especially for people with luggage having to cram inside the tiny vehicle. A rubber tire train system, DMU, or LRT could provide more room for people and their luggage. I strongly urge the SBCTA to reconsider their proposal as it clearly does not meet the needs of ONT users as well as other suggested alternatives.

I-58-1
I-58-2
I-58-3
I-58-4

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

Online

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 9, 2024, 10:56:17 AM

FULL NAME:

Nicholas Leong

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

leongnicholas18@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

The proposal as it stands currently with autonomous rubber tire pods is not beneficial to us at all, as it only serves limited areas and does not integrate well with the rest of the public transportation system. I would instead like to see a Metro LRT extension to ONT (A line) via Rancho Cucamonga and/or upgrading the under construction SBX purple line to have bus lanes and signal pre-emption (along airport grounds and/or the ENTIRE route) to the airport.

1-59-1
1-59-2

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

Online on SBCTA website

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

From: Jeffrey Lewis <jeffslewis@gmail.com>
Date: December 2, 2024 at 8:58:54 PM PST
To: ONTconnector <ONTconnector@gosbcta.com>
Subject: ONT Connector

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I'd like to express my concern about the ONT Connector project. I feel that more traditional approaches such as light/heavy rail or bus rapid transit are proven and reliable. There are too many unknowns about the proposed underground solution, including basic questions such as capacity, design, and even the ability to load/unload luggage that weren't able to be answered during the meeting I attended. At a minimum, a dedicated bus way that could later be upgraded to rail (and thus do away with a transfer) would be much more convenient, especially when factoring in hauling luggage. I urge you to select proven technologies such as BRT or light/heavy rail.

I-60-1

Respectfully,

Jeffrey Lewis

Resident of the City of Ontario

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 12, 2024, 9:03:54 AM

FULL NAME:

Jonah Linder

ADDRESS:

2206 Guthrie Dr, 90034

EMAIL OR PHONE:

jonahlinder@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Dear SBCTA,

I highly encourage you to look to extended the A line, and a DMU shuttle that can later be converted to an Arrow extension. "Autonomous vehicle tunnels" are unproven, untested, dangerous and expensive endeavors. SoCal isn't the guinea pig for this tech, no one agreed to it.

I-61-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 5, 2024, 2:27:19 PM

FULL NAME:

Daniel Ryan Lucero

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

danielryandesign@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

With the money that would be use for a tunnel I would like to suggest to put that towards extending the Metro A Line from Montclair to Rancho then down to ONT- this would create a direct rout between future high speed rail and ONT, and would connect the foothill communities with a one seat ride to both high speed rail and ONT

1-62-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

From: Byron Lutz byronlutz@gmail.com
Subject: ONT Connector
Date: November 13, 2024 at 4:22 PM
To: ONTconnector ONTconnector@gosbcta.com
Cc: clerkoftheboard clerkoftheboard@gosbcta.com, rmarquez@chinohills.org, awapner@ontarioca.gov



CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Chair Marquez, SBCTA Board Members, and ONT Connector Project Staff,

My name is Byron Lutz. I'm a resident of Los Angeles and I work (and seasonally live) in Angelus Oaks. I would like to comment on the DEIR and **express my strong opposition to the Ontario International Airport (ONT) Connector project as proposed.** As a proponent of effective and fiscally-responsible public transit in San Bernardino County, I am deeply concerned that the proposed model will not meet our region's needs for reliable, scalable, and safe transit between ONT and Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink/Future Brightline West Station.

I-63-1

Key concerns about the ONT Connector's Build Alternative that must be addressed in the EIR:

-

Limited Capacity:

The project's peak throughput of 100 passengers per hour is inadequate compared to the project's own required capacity of 300 per hour and the 20,000-100,000 per hour achievable by BRT, light rail, or heavy rail, failing to address future demand at ONT and the Rancho Cucamonga/Brightline Station. 100 passengers per hour is comically low capacity for a connector to a growing airport.

That's only slightly above the capacity of single articulated bus.

I-63-2

-

Safety & Emergency Concerns:

The Boring Company's Las Vegas Loop, a similar model that is privately operated, has been plagued by traffic, slowdowns, confusion among drivers, and serious safety and EMS concerns during construction and in operation.

I-63-3

-

Costs & Funding Risks:

The \$490+ million estimate for this project is likely understated, given LA Metro light rail costs at similar project lengths ranging from \$1-7 billion. Address funding instability and sources, given that the project is severely uncompetitive, receiving \$0 from the most recent round of California TIRCP grants.

I-63-4

-

Redundant Shuttle Service:

This project will duplicate above-ground ONT Connect shuttle service and West Valley Connector BRT without enhancing capacity. Is this project even necessary?

I-63-5

-

Environmental Impacts:

This project will increase VMT and emissions during construction and will be ineffective in reducing long-term congestion, air pollution, or greenhouse gas compared to rail due to limited service capacity for mode shift. Provide an honest analysis of the proposed project vs rail alternatives with regards to VMT, congestion, and emissions.

I-63-6

SBCTA

should pursue real rail alternatives, as recommended in prior studies in 2008, 2014, and 2018. Options such as a Metrolink Riverside Line extension West to ONT and a Brightline West/Metrolink San Bernardino Line extension South to ONT would be more competitive for state and federal transit funding and better suited for future demand.

I-63-7

I

ask the board to prioritize high capacity, reliable rail solutions to meet San Bernardino County's long term transportation needs, and

I

ask the board to prioritize high-capacity, reliable rail solutions to meet San Bernardino County's long-term transportation needs, and reject the low-capacity, high-risk, unreliable model in the Build Alternative that fails to provide the transit service our region deserves.

This

Elon Musk tunnel solution is more of a joke and a scam than a real transit solution. Look at the tunnel in Las Vegas that *still* doesn't have autonomous driving, even though Musk has been promising it's only a few months or years away *for the last decade*.

Sincerely,

Byron

Lutz

Los

Angeles (Los Angeles County) and Angelus Oaks (San Bernardino County)

I-63-7

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 23, 2024, 9:41:24 PM

FULL NAME:

Nathan Machida

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

nhmachida@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Please consider that since there will be surges of passengers using the facility when either a regional/intercity train arrives in RC or during peak arrival times at ONT, that a high capacity vehicle type like a traditional automated train (like Vancouver SkyTrain) or APM type train is more suitable for this facility than on-demand personal transit vehicles that can only transport one party at a time. The latter would result in boarding queues forming at either end of the new line, which add minutes to the journey, which will deter people from using transit instead of a personal vehicle. Making passengers wait for more than one vehicle is not a good experience.

Running a more traditional automated train that can handle the general number of waiting passengers every 2-5 min is an excellent passenger experience and can be implemented with proven existing technology.

Having it be a tunnel is smart.

I-64-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 19, 2024, 8:48:01 PM

FULL NAME:

Alejandro Marino

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

amarino2010@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Please ditch this tunnel and autonomous crap and extend the Metro A Line to ONT Airport. This is a good place to start: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jrv6LSZab5Y&t=1406s>

I-65-2 I-65-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

FULL NAME:

Ted Marsden

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

ted.marsden@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

ONT transportation plans for "passengers traveling to and from ONT will be transported in autonomous, zero-emission vehicles on an 'on-demand' basis" is a boondoggle and inefficient way to meet SoCal's future transportation needs.

We need high capacity, efficient, reliable train technology to get people to and from the region's best potential for airport growth. With upcoming attention and developments coming to our region, from the Olympics to Brightline West and more, a solid solution that is a Metrolink Riverside Line Extension West to ONT and Brightline West/Metrolink San Bernardino Line Extension South to ONT.

Forget the "Tesla Tunnels" and demonstrate that ONT is an airport meant for the future by connecting it to our region's already robust transit network. Build trains to the airport.

Here is a link to a video that looks at the problem in depth and, I think, provides some exciting and future-focused solutions. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jrv6LSZab5Y&";](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jrv6LSZab5Y&)

Thank you.

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

I-66-1

I-66-2

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 18, 2024, 1:51:35 PM

FULL NAME:

thomas matlock

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

ORGANIZATION:

MDB ret.

EMAIL OR PHONE:

tom@matlockdb.com

COMMENTS:

this would be a huge waste of taxpayer dollars. Unfortunately, the decision makers do not concern themselves with this kind of waste. There is no rational way to justify such a project.

I-67-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

EMAIL

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 30, 2024, 4:56:28 PM

FULL NAME:

Aaron McCain

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

aaron.mccain@zerozillion.com

COMMENTS:

I do not support the use of autonomous electric road vehicles for ONT Connector. They produce pollutants from tire and brake wear, which contributes to the region’s terrible air and water quality It will wash into our rivers and oceans, harming local wildlife and groundwater. Steel-wheeled light rail trains would produce less particulate matter per rider and avoid the harmful chemical compounds that come from rubber tires. They also use less energy than rubber tires.

The proposed vehicles are not the most enery efficient. Battery production has large negative environmental impact. Every time a battery is charged, energy is lost. The losses increase over the lifetime of the battery. The vehicles should be powered by overhead catenary. It would provide consistent power supply with no losses in performance or efficiency over time. It would also eliminate charging time, reducing vehicle down time and the number of vehicles needed.

Please reconsider the plan for this project. Thank you.

I-68-1
I-68-2
I-68-3
I-68-4
I-68-5

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector
c/o Tim Watkins
San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
1170 W 3rd Street
San Bernardino, CA 92810
Email: ONTconnector@gosbcta.com

November 30, 2024

Subject: Public Comment on ONTconnector

Dear Chair Marquest, SBCTA Board Members, and Project Staff,

My name is Mike McCarthy and I am a resident of Riverside. I am a regular user of ONT airport. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the proposed ONT Connector project.

As a resident of Riverside, there is currently limited public transit accessibility to ONT, despite multiple nearby Metrolink stations and bus routes. As I write this letter on a Saturday afternoon, Google tells me the trip to ONT via bus will take 3.5 hours to go 23.1 miles door-to-door. There are occasional routes that will only take 2.2 hours via transit, but those are only during morning commute hours. This is not competitive with driving. As the primary passenger airport for the Inland Valley region, ONT needs to be accessible via transit to reduce VMT from both business and pleasure travelers.

I oppose the ONT Connector project because it is a last mile transit project (4.2 miles) that uses significant public funding to build a low capacity, experimental transit option that does not expand or extend the existing woeful transit options in the region. A capacity of 100 passengers per hour for approximately 19 hours a day will have a maximum throughput of under 2,000 passengers daily. A light-rail line can move 20,000 passengers per hour, which would serve both the airport passengers as a link to regional commuter-rail and buses, and as a potential connector between the Rancho Cucamonga and Ontario-East Metrolink stations to provide a north-south connection along the 15 corridor.

SBCTA and partner agencies have studied transit connection options for the ONT airport and adjacent Metrolink stations¹. Multiple options were investigated for transit and rail options connectivity, including Metro Gold Line extensions to ONT, Metrolink commuter rail realignments, and bus-rapid transit. Each of these alternatives would be better integrated as extensions to light-rail, commuter rail, or bus-rapid transit and better suited for long-term infrastructure spending to improve connectivity in the region. ONT is a major destination that is well suited to be a transit stop on either commuter rail and/or light-rail. It is extremely important to use public funding to connect to ONT in a way that expands and is compatible with existing capacity and modes of transit. The ONT connector is not compatible, scalable, or cost-competitive. Long-term operation of a low

¹ <https://www.gosbcta.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Los-Angeles-and-San-Bernardino-Inter-County-Transit-and-Rail-Connection-Study-2018.pdf>

I-69-1

I-69-2

I-69-3

capacity transit option for a single destination is a poor and non-scalable choice for public funding with no long-term benefits from connecting to the Rancho Cucamonga Brightline HSR spot, nor any buildout of capacity for the long-term California HSR phase 2 Los Angeles to San Diego route.

Please look to spend public funding wisely to improve and connect our existing transit network in the most effective way rather than experimenting with our tax dollars on techbro vaporware transit.

Sincerely,

Mike McCarthy

I-69-4

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 10, 2024, 1:24:00 PM

FULL NAME:

Michael McLeod

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

mcleodm19@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Build it! We need real transit options to ONT. If we take lessons learned from LAX, it's infinitely cheaper to do transit projects today than when they're desperately needed.

I-70-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

Lee, Jennifer J

From: Masaki Mendoza <masakimendoza@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 11:18 PM
To: clerkoftheboard
Cc: rmarquez@chinohills.org; awapner@ontarioca.gov
Subject: ONT Connector Public Comment, December 4, 2024

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Chair Marquez, SBCTA Board Members, and ONT Connector Project Staff,

My name is Masaki Mendoza, and I am a resident of Jurupa Valley, an ONT airport passenger, a Metrolink rider, and am currently studying math, economics, and urban planning at UC San Diego. I would like to comment on the DEIR and express my strong opposition to the Ontario International Airport (ONT) Connector project as proposed. As a proponent of effective and fiscally-responsible public transit in San Bernardino County, I am deeply concerned that the proposed model will not meet our region's needs for reliable, scalable, and safe transit between ONT and Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink/Future Brightline West Station.

The proposed project with the ONT Connector as an underground Tesla Tunnel is woefully inadequate to serve the transportation needs of future Ontario Airport passengers and the environmental challenges we must tackle as we seek to reduce our environmental impact. As ONT is projected to handle as many as [36 million annual passengers by mid-century](#), we must invest in high-capacity transit modes that will efficiently and sustainably handle this volume of people. With a projected peak hour capacity of a paltry 100 people per hour as projected in the DEIR, the Tesla Tunnels concept of the ONT Connector should be flatly rejected.

It is astonishing that this project is still under consideration when we know that a high-quality, high-capacity transit solution exists through rail-based mass transit. We should invest in projects such as Metrolink expansions and frequency upgrades or light rail projects such as an LA Metro A Line extension to Ontario Airport or a brand new light rail line connecting the Inland Empire to this vital airport. As a young person who wishes to see his community grow sustainably, I urge you to reject the ONT Connector in its current form and instead pursue true transit solutions that the Inland Empire deserves.

Sincerely,

--

Masaki Mendoza

Resident of Jurupa Valley, Riverside County

University of California, San Diego | Class of 2025

B.S. Joint Mathematics-Economics

B.A. Urban Studies and Planning

Cell: [REDACTED]

Email: masakimendoza@gmail.com

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 24, 2024, 8:55:01 PM

FULL NAME:

Brent Merideth

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

meridethbl@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Providing a non-car link to the airport is long overdue. But, the proposed system seems designed to prevent people from using it. Will a project succeed if those who use mass transit or walk must walk further than those who drive? In the Ontario connector project, this is the case at both the RC end and the Ontario end. A successful system must go to the airport, not the airport parking lot. Likewise, the collector must be at the train, not the train parking lot. This is especially true since the users are flying, so they'll have luggage, and sometimes lots of it. There's already an underground pedestrian tunnel at the RC station. Connecting to that existing infrastructure would likely be more efficient for the traveler. Lyft and Uber will get them closer to the train and the ticket counter with only slightly less convenience.

I-72-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 24, 2024, 8:59:51 PM

FULL NAME:

Brent Merideth

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

meridethbl@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

The Connector will travel essentially through Ontario Mills and, as far as I can tell, there will be no way for shoppers or employees to exit at this hub? It seems like a lost opportunity, especially if the strength of this underground pod option is that they have on-call pod flexibility.

Is a tunnel really the best way to quickly get people from point A to point B? If the primary goal is increased traveler speed, I'd think an overhead tramway or overhead rail would be as fast. Speed cannot be the highest scoring metric if the start and finish of the line are located in parking lots. If it's about cost, tunneling is very expensive. A quick google search says tunneling is \$250M to \$1B per mile while an elevated track is \$100M to \$300M per mile. A cable tramway is a fraction of either cost at around \$50M per mile, and using a detached cable system, it can move quickly. Or extend Brightline through the airport and terminate at the new Ontario Metrolink station west of the airport.

I-73-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 24, 2024, 9:48:22 PM

FULL NAME:

Brent Merideth

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

meridethbl@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Don't forget the other, closer Metrolink line serving areas south of the airport. The Riverside Metrolink line includes the East Ontario Metrolink station, which is located in a population desert at least a mile from the nearest home. It is much closer to the airport than the RC station is. This is a good opportunity to move that station to the west end of the airport near where people live, and the Ontario Amtrak station, and away from warehouses, and extend the Ontario Connector to it so Riverside and Jurupa Valley residents can use it too.

1-74-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 21, 2024, 1:23:42 PM

FULL NAME:

Ernest Felix Mesa

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

newgun2000@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

THIS SEEMS LIKE A HUGE WASTE OF TAXPAYERS MONEY, AND IF IT DOES NOT PAY FOR ITSELF THEN WE WILL HAVE TO PAY FOR IT. I WATCH THE LARGE SBX BUSES IN SAN BERNARDINO AND NEVER SEE MORE THEN A FEW PEOPLE ON ANY OF THEM. THE COUNTY SPENT MILLIONS ON THESE SPECIAL BUSES AND ON THERE OWN LANES. I THINK THE TAXPAYERS WERE LEFT PAYING FOR THIS AND THEY WILL WITH A UNWANTED AND NEEDED TUNNEL.

1-75-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 18, 2024, 10:07:36 PM

FULL NAME:

He Muñoz

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

paradoxadk@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

In an effort to continue the reduction of poor air quality that plagues the city of Ontario for decades, it is imperative that the city of Ontario and Rancho Cucamonga expand & prepare its public transportation services. By being proactive, all areas of the cities can be connected to this project with buses/trolleys and light rail lines at major intersections within the area. This should reduce the influx of traffic congestion for Ontarians

I-76-1
I-76-2

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 11, 2024, 8:42:23 PM

FULL NAME:

Matthew Munson

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

[REDACTED]

COMMENTS:

How will the traffic be impacted due to construction? will it be a cluster** like the BRT situation on Holt? Or will it be more subdued? I have to deal with an extra 5 minutes extra on my commute each way due to construction already. Will there be noise issues for those who work above ground when they are drilling?**

I-77-2 I-77-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 27, 2024, 10:03:51 AM

FULL NAME:

Matthew Murphy

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

matthewmurphy26@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I work and ride public transit every week in Rancho Cucamonga and think that this tunnel is a pricy spectacle- if the county wants to seriously scale the airport, it's surrounding transit should be appropriately scaled as well. There is plenty of existing rail infrastructure near this airport that only needs relatively short connections in order to be activated at scale to best serve the area. With the Brightline station just a few years out, the SBCTA should consider an extension of the Arrow service from Redlands, whereupon the track diverges at the Rancho metrolink/ brightline station down Milliken to the Airport, and perhaps on to the LA/ Alhambra subdivisions. If the SBCTA is willing to spend so much money on a frivolous project such as these car tunnels, which will serve only a fraction of customers as a rail link will (and without the potential of intermediate stations). At the very least, it is better off expanding the existing bus shuttle service with dedicated bus lanes.

1-78-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

From: Allen N anatian@gmail.com
Subject: ONT Connector
Date: November 13, 2024 at 3:32 PM
To: ONTconnector ONTconnector@gosbcta.com
Cc: clerkoftheboard clerkoftheboard@gosbcta.com, rmarquez@chinohills.org, awapner@ontarioca.gov



CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Chair Marquez, SBCTA Board
Members, and ONT Connector Project Staff,

My

name is Allen, and I am a resident of LA, an ONT airport passenger, and a Metrolink rider. I would like to comment on the DEIR and express my strong opposition to the Ontario International Airport (ONT) Connector project as proposed. As a proponent of effective and fiscally-responsible public transit in San Bernardino County, I am deeply concerned that the proposed model will not meet our region's needs for reliable, scalable, and safe transit between ONT and Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink/Future Brightline West Station.

I-79-1

Key

concerns about the ONT Connector's Build Alternative that must be addressed in the EIR:

-

Limited Capacity:

The project's peak throughput of 100 passengers per hour is inadequate compared to the project's own required capacity of 300 per hour and the 20,000-100,000 per hour achievable by BRT, light rail, or heavy rail, failing to address future demand at ONT and the Rancho Cucamonga/Brightline Station.

I-79-2

-

Safety & Emergency Concerns:

The Boring Company's Las Vegas Loop, a similar model that is privately operated, has been plagued by traffic, slowdowns, confusion among drivers, and serious safety and EMS concerns during construction and in operation.

I-79-3

-

Costs & Funding Risks:

The \$490+ million estimate for this project is likely understated, given LA Metro light rail costs at similar project lengths ranging from \$1-7 billion. Address funding instability and sources, given that the project is severely uncompetitive, receiving \$0 from the most recent round of California TIRCP grants.

I-79-4

-

Redundant Shuttle Service:

This project will duplicate above-ground ONT Connect shuttle service and West Valley Connector BRT without enhancing capacity. Is this project even necessary?

I-79-5

•

Environmental Impacts:

This project will increase VMT and emissions during construction and will be ineffective in reducing long-term congestion, air pollution, or greenhouse gas compared to rail due to limited service capacity for mode shift. Provide an honest analysis of the proposed project vs rail alternatives with regards to VMT, congestion, and emissions.

I-79-6

SBCTA

should pursue real rail alternatives, as recommended in prior studies in 2008, 2014, and 2018. Options such as a Metrolink Riverside Line extension West to ONT and a Brightline West/Metrolink San Bernardino Line extension South to ONT would be more competitive for state and federal transit funding and better suited for future demand.

I ask the board to prioritize high-capacity, reliable rail solutions to meet San Bernardino County's long-term transportation needs, and reject the low-capacity, high-risk, unreliable model in the Build Alternative that fails to provide the transit service our region deserves.

I-79-7

"Tesla Tunnels" are not public transportation. They are a gimmick.

Sincerely,
Allen
LA

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 10, 2024, 9:09:13 PM

FULL NAME:

Allen Natian

ADDRESS:

Los Angeles, CA 90731

EMAIL OR PHONE:

anatian@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

The “autonomous vehicle tunnels” are a massive waste of money and a boondoggle, and should be an A Line extension, a DMU shuttle that can later be converted to an Arrow extension, or both instead.

I-80-2 I-80-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 19, 2024, 12:13:36 AM

FULL NAME:

javier navarro

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]


EMAIL OR PHONE:

javiernavarrohelo@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I was looking at the document and I think it is fine and fully support the planned tunnel. However, I think there should be a consideration of a planned extension towards the Metrolink east ontario station as well. One of the biggest problems in the region, is that there isn't enough north south connectivity using public transit. By extending the tunnel south to the Riverside line, it would give people coming from Riverside an alternative to get to the airport. Right now if a person were living near downtown Riverside, and would want to get to the airport, their only option is via passenger vehicle. This would give them an alternative to the purgatory that is known as the I-15 between the 60 and the 10 freeway

I-81-1
I-81-2



Consider Adding this portion in black to the proposed tunnel as well

300 m
1000 ft

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 13, 2024, 5:06:48 PM

FULL NAME:

Harout Nazarian

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

hnazarian@berkeley.edu

COMMENTS:

This project is a terrible idea. Instead of focusing time and resources on coming up with rail solutions that would work for Ontario and for the entire county, we are following an untested and frankly ridiculous concept into oblivion. We need fast and reliable rail connections that will better integrate Ontario into the wider Metro/Metrolink/Amtrak system that could also serve to promote connections to the future Brightline station heading east.

I-82-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 10, 2024, 2:57:58 PM

FULL NAME:

Tyler Neflas

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

bookwormxd6@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I am excited for the prospect of the ONT Connector project providing connectivity from Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink to the airport, but I do not think using self driving cars is a worthwhile use of the time, money, and land needed for this project. Autonomous vehicle tunnels would be better served for use by rail that could connect to other existing services in the region to compliment the network available to users who are choosing not to use a car in the first place. The Metro A line just received funding to extend to Montclair, so a further extension to Rancho and down to ONT brings in riders from the West who would have a shorter trip to ONT vs LAX. Another option is extending Metrolink Arrow service from the SB in the east to Rancho and down to ONT. Having both options pulls in more folks to ONT from across SoCal, and is a much more robust and impactful choice than what is planned.

I-83-1
I-83-2

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 25, 2024, 6:12:37 AM

FULL NAME:

Joshua Negin

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

legobluecomet@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I am delighted that Ontario Airport is considering fixed guideway transit to allow people to access the airport via rail. However, I feel the idea to use autonomous car shuttles would be a far less ideal option than if a conventional automated people mover was used, such as the system under construction for LAX or which is already connects Oakland Airport to BART. Although headways are fixed, headways and capacity are also much more consistent. The Autonomous vehicles being proposed appear to be very low capacity; in a sudden high demand situation, the system may become saturated, especially at stations, leading to delays, as was demonstrated with the Musk Tunnel at the convention center in Las Vegas.

I also support the proposals outlined by the YouTuber Nandert in his video on transit for Ontario Airport (<https://youtu.be/Jrv6LSZab5Y?si=7514EtSj915iTsK5>), and feel his ideas should be considered.

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

L-84-1
L-84-2

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 21, 2024, 2:41:11 PM

FULL NAME:

Alix Nguyen

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

merguezandspam@protonmail.com

COMMENTS:

Couple questions, food for thoughts:- How does this fit with the West valley connector? Seeing the alignment it seems to overlap with parts of it while it could complement it- Any potential for stops in high density areas like Ontario Mills or Victoria gardens area? Current alignment only stops at ONT while it'd benefit the community to provide other access points.- Technology: the autonomous vehicles approaches has proven not as appropriate as light rail or people movers (ex the tunnels under Las Vegas). What are SBCTA plans for this so we don't create an expensive amd isolated infrastructure, but instead something that scales, is future proof, and fits with the other rail projects (ex the Foothill extension to Claremont).

1-85-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 10, 2024, 8:02:35 PM

FULL NAME:

Nora Nickolov

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

nnickolov@hmc.edu

COMMENTS:

Autonomous vehicle tunnels are a massive waste of money and not a good idea. Instead, an A line extension and/or a DMU (Diesel Multiple Unit) shuttle that can be converted to an Arrow extension in the future would be much better projects to pursue. Having good public transit connections to Ontario airport would increase ridership, make Ontario airport a more popular destination, and help both travelers and locals move around.

1-98-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 13, 2024, 8:29:37 PM

FULL NAME:

Aaron Noell

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

acnoell@yahoo.com

COMMENTS:

Key concerns about the ONT Connector’s Build Alternative that must be addressed in the EIR:

Limited Capacity: The project’s peak throughput of 100 passengers per hour is inadequate compared to the project’s own required capacity of 300 per hour and the 20,000-100,000 per hour achievable by BRT, light rail, or heavy rail.

I-87-1

Costs & Funding Risks: The \$490+ million estimate for this project is likely understated, given LA Metro light rail costs at similar project lengths ranging from \$1-7 billion.

I-87-2

SBCTA should pursue real rail alternatives, as recommended in prior studies in 2008, 2014, and 2018. Options such as a Metrolink Riverside Line extension West to ONT and a Brightline West/Metrolink San Bernardino Line extension South to ONT.

I-87-3

I ask the board to prioritize high-capacity, reliable rail solutions to meet San Bernardino County’s long-term transportation needs, and reject the low-capacity, high-risk, unreliable model in the Build Alternative.

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

EMAIL

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Dec 1, 2024, 10:49:30 PM

FULL NAME:

Lavie Ohana

ADDRESS:

El Segundo, California

EMAIL OR PHONE:

lavie1540@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

The ONT Connector project is significantly inadequate for the proposed budget of \$538.5 million and extensive tunneling required. The distributed autonomous electric vehicle system is only capable of moving 100 people per direction per hour - only a couple percent of the 17,000 passengers ONT sees on a daily basis - entirely disregarding peak periods. This level of capacity would be easily met by a frequent bus line.

ONT still should have a proper airport connector - but a useful connector must be capable of significant peak volume. Most airport connectors are automated people movers capable of over a thousand passengers per direction per hour - a service convenient and fast enough to capture demand that a backed-up automated EV system would not.

SBcta should heavily reconsider the proposed Project and whether the capacity is representative of a half-billion-dollar budget. Far more has been - and can be done with far less.

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

I-88-1
I-88-2

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 16, 2024, 1:20:28 PM

FULL NAME:

Carlos Orozco

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

ORGANIZATION:

CARE Transportation Services

EMAIL OR PHONE:

socal.broker@yahoo.com

COMMENTS:

I think its a good idea, but the construction Cost is too high, burdensome and construction REDTAPE/ process will not be practical, plus most people will continue to use conventional transportation like, cars, UBER, Shuttle buses or public transportation...

The project will cause more traffic and congestion in and around the affected area!

1-89-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

EMAIL

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Dec 2, 2024, 5:52:04 PM

FULL NAME:

Hector Paez

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

hector.e.paez.r@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

This system needs to be trains or people mover type system. Autonomous vehicles will be too low capacity for surges that will result from the Brightline, Metrolink, and BRT traffic. If built as proposed the system will be unable to meet future demand and rob the catchment area of ONT airport of a truly modern, world class amenity, especially considering the future expansion plans of ONT.

I-90-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

From: **Tori Paine** tpaine1991@outlook.com
Subject: ONT Connector
Date: October 25, 2024 at 12:51 PM
To: ONTconnector ONTconnector@gosbcta.com



CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good Afternoon,

I was hoping you could clear up a few questions I have regarding the Ontario International Airport Connector Project. I was wondering what the current status of this project is? I found the website for the project, which has a ton of great information, but I was unable to find a date for when you would be deciding on the build or no build alternatives? Do you have a date for when that decision would be made?

Any information would be appreciated!

Thank you for your time!

Kind Regards,
Tori Paine

I-91-1

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 14, 2024, 9:02:25 AM

FULL NAME:

Janki Patel

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

jancal7880@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

This alignment shall incorporate stops where people would go, including Ontario mills and Toyota Arena. This could lead to a reduction of VMT, as the alignment can serve more uses in locations that have seasonal as well as sustained demand throughout the day and year. It would have a much higher utilization than train station to airport.

1-92-1

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 9, 2024, 9:24:32 AM

FULL NAME:

Tyler Peters

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

tylerspeters@icloud.com

COMMENTS:

I don't think an autonomous vehicle solution is the best solution. It is an inefficient way to move large amounts of people. It would be better if it was a train or people mover of some kind. And more efficient as well.

1-93-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 10, 2024, 10:55:20 AM

FULL NAME:

John Pierre

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

turtlenelson731@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

“autonomous vehicle tunnels” are a massive waste of money. An A Line extension, or a DMU shuttle that can later be converted to an Arrow extension, or both would be better suited for this project. Especially since the “autonomous vehicle tunnels” received ZERO DOLLARS in state funding. Thank you for you time.

I-94-2 I-94-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 27, 2024, 2:19:31 PM

FULL NAME:

Mob Reigen

ADDRESS:




EMAIL OR PHONE:

thisisgarbaggio@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Autonomous vehicle tunnels are an unproven technology, while being a huge waste of time and money in such a low density area. It would be much better to use proven technology for a high capacity connection to the airport, like funding for an A Line extension, or some other rail connection, perhaps an extension of the Arrow service.



HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 27, 2024, 1:45:51 PM

FULL NAME:

Jake Rosen

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

jakerosen22@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

There is no reason this infrastructure should be underground, given that surface streets here are under capacity and that public transit dollars are extremely scarce. Additionally, the proposed capacity of this new system is extremely low and does not justify this level of investment. Please consider at grade or elevated track instead.



HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Dec 2, 2024, 12:47:57 PM

FULL NAME:

Oriana Ruelas

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

Azelin2003@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

This is a project that pains me to hear is even being considered. Instead of valuing our communities and giving them a better way of getting around, like a rail connection, this project would reflect a poor choice in priorities. Working-class communities want better public transport systems like rail lines and trains. I would love to see an option to take a fully operational train to the Ontario airport to limit the car traffic in the area. There are better things to spend money on and this ONT Connector a Project shouldn't be one, let alone an option.

1-97-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 13, 2024, 7:41:41 PM

FULL NAME:

Nathan Schilling

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

nschilling10@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Dear Chair Marquez, SBCTA Board Members, and ONT Connector Project Staff,

Hello my name is Nathan from El Segundo, and I use ONT and the metro system fairly regularly. I would like to express my strong opposition to the ONT airport connector as currently envisioned, because of issues with limited capacity and safety. The draft EIR says the tunnels will have 100x less capacity than light or heavy rail. This means it will take more time and people will have to wait longer to get to Rancho Cucamonga. With safety, previous projects (like the Las Vegas tunnels the Boring Co. created) have shown flagrant disregard for worker and driver safety.

I-98-1
I-98-2
I-98-3

In summary, the Tesla Tunnels are slow, unproven technology that will take more time and money to build than currently estimated. Let's prioritize transit solutions we know work, like busses, light rail, and heavy rail, that have the added capacity for growth we all want to see at ONT airport.

I-98-4

**Sincerely,
Nathan Schilling**

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 13, 2024, 6:54:52 PM

FULL NAME:

Caleb Schimke

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

cschimke@live.com

COMMENTS:

Please reject the ONT connector. It is an inefficient and dangerous proposal that is detached from the needs of myself and our communities and serves mainly to pet one rich man's ego. We should instead be pursuing expansions to our mass transit systems in manners that have been continuously safe, efficient, and accessible for decades.

1-99-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

EMAIL

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 9, 2024, 9:30:52 PM

FULL NAME:

Zack Scriven

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

Zackscriven@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I think the autonomous vehicle tunnel from ONT to Rancho Cucamonga metro link station is a GREAT idea. I'm a California native and transit enthusiast. Most opposed are probably just not liking Elon musks politics, but the benefits could be great! Especially with bright line west coming to Rancho we need a direct connection with the air port. The Boring company has proved its viability in Vegas and is now expanding! Please continue with this visionary project! 🙏

I-100-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 23, 2024, 8:11:38 PM

FULL NAME:

Nathaniel Singer

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

physic.03-cools@icloud.com

COMMENTS:

I want to express support for tried and tested, high capacity, and easily interoperable transport modes such as light rail or a DMU (such as used in arrow service).

I-101-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 30, 2024, 9:49:28 PM

FULL NAME:

Justin Skoda

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

justin.skoda@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Explore TOD opportunities around stations. Explore conventional or autonomous bus with dedicated transit lanes. Tunneling is going to be expensive and the Las Vegas tunnels have very low throughput and low operational speeds. Terminal stations should be as close as possible to terminal footprints to reduce walk distances and improve ridership. Don't rely only on speculative unproven technology for the summary of all contemplated options. Advance at least one proven technology in the alternatives.

I-102-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 10, 2024, 4:52:00 PM

FULL NAME:

Mika Smith

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

[REDACTED]

COMMENTS:

I do not support the “autonomous vehicle tunnels”. I think they are a massive waste of money. I instead would like to ask for an A Line extension, a DMU shuttle that can later be converted to an Arrow extension, or both.

I-103-1
I-103-2

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 9, 2024, 9:22:16 PM

FULL NAME:

Thomas Smith

ADDRESS:



ORGANIZATION:

N/A

EMAIL OR PHONE:

ts503570@gmail.com



COMMENTS:

I would seriously consider flying out of ONT airport if it had better transit connections. As a result, I like the idea of better connecting ONT to the nearby Metrolink lines, but I don't think a proprietary, uncommon, expensive system like the proposed ONT Connector is a good idea. Omnitrans is already building the SbX West Valley Connector BRT, which serves the same area and plans to serve both ONT and the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink station. However, the WVC has a very limited length of bus-only lanes. Increasing the length of the bus lanes along the WVC - particularly along the section between ONT and Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink - would be a great improvement to the project. Increased bus frequencies, traffic priority, amenities, or even a dedicated bus route (akin to the Orange Line in Los Angeles) would also be good improvements. I think these improvements to the SbX WVC line would be a much better idea than the proposed ONT Connector project, and thus I oppose the ONT Connector.

I-104-1

I-104-2

IMAGE UPLOAD:



Above is a photo of the West Valley Connector (WVC) for reference.

SbX_WVC_Purple.png

I-104-3

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 11, 2024, 11:39:48 AM

FULL NAME:

Francis Snyder

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

fsnydermusic@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Hello,

Why are we still pursuing Autonomous Vehicle Tunnels instead of prioritizing mass transit? Do you know what hundreds of self driving cars driving in a row sounds like to me? A worse train. Mass Transit is more efficient in almost every way, and has the potentially to build out existing infrastructure to better service surrounding communities. One suggestion would be to extend the Metro A line in lieu of these ridiculously expensive tunnels. We don't need new technology to help us efficiently move large amounts of people from place to place. We know how to do that already. We just need that common sense to put modern mass transit into practice.

I-105-1
I-105-2

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

youtube

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 25, 2024, 12:41:42 PM

FULL NAME:

Manu Sridharan

ADDRESS:

Claremont, CA

EMAIL OR PHONE:

msridhar@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I would like to voice my strong opposition to investing in autonomous vehicle tunnels as a way to improve access to ONT. The technology is bogus, and even if it worked, the capacity and impact would be far less than a simple frequent shuttle to a train station. Please invest in a shuttle with an eventual plan to achieve train connectivity, rather than wasting resources on unproven and unnecessary technology.

I-106-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 15, 2024, 12:00:34 PM

FULL NAME:

Nicholas Sundback

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

nts02010@mymail.pomona.edu

COMMENTS:

SBCTA should focus on connecting Ontario International Airport with high-capacity bus, Metrolink, and/or Metro A Line access. I lived in Pomona Valley and regularly used Ontario as a college student, but had no options to get to/from the airport besides Super Shuttle.

I-107-1

- 1. I do not believe SBCTA's proposed tunnel project will "only" cost \$500 million. There are no existing, completed projects I am aware of to compare the proposal to.**
- 2. There are vastly more cost-effective ways to get people in and out of the airport. Spending \$500 million (definitely will be more after delays and cost overruns) to move a couple hundred vehicles an hour using unproven technology is an outrageous waste of money.**
- 3. As an alternative, run FlyAway-style bus service to Ontario from the terminus of the A Line, UC Riverside, and other regional destinations.**
- 4. Use \$500m to speed up and improve frequency on the San Bernardino and Riverside Metrolink lines. This will attract airport passengers from LA and OC.**

I-107-2

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

Website

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Dec 2, 2024, 11:59:12 AM

FULL NAME:

Sierra Swearingen

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

sas.swearingen@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I'm very disappointed there was no rail alternative for this study. Autonomous electric vehicles are not the most efficient option and are a waste of money with unproven technology, high maintenance costs, and low capacity. ONT connect should be built as an electric rail transport system that could be connected to other rail transportation nearby. An extension of either the Metro A line or DMU train Arrow extension should be considered for the ONT project.

One of the above rail options needs to be considered due to rail's far superior operating efficiency, capacity, scalability, and connectivity to surrounding regions via transit. Electric rail environmental impact per rider is much lower than EVs.

I do not support any alternative with autonomous electric road vehicles due to their higher pollution from tire and brake wear, wasted energy costs from battery losses, and cost of vehicle down time for charging. These options also do not scale to serve capacity increases at ONT airport.

I-108-1

I-108-2

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 15, 2024, 6:12:23 PM

FULL NAME:

Ivan Tabares

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

ORGANIZATION:

N/A

EMAIL OR PHONE:

Ivantabares5150@icloud.com

COMMENTS:

If this 4 mile project is to commence, how will traffic in the construction area be affected? Meaning, will this be an open trench project or will it actually be tunneled underground via a Bore machine?

I-109-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

EMAIL

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 10, 2024, 4:15:00 AM

FULL NAME:

Aiden Tabrizi

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

alt.kt.@icloud.com

COMMENTS:

Please abandon the Autonomous Vehicle Tunnel project as it is a huge waste of efficiency and money. I would advocate for an A-Line extension instead.

I-110-2 I-110-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 18, 2024, 2:51:52 PM

FULL NAME:

Roldan Teroy

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

roldan.teroy@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

I support the Ontario CONNECTOR PROJECT, especially because it will interface with Metrolink. It will make going to and from Ontario International Airport much more convenient. As a disabled person, I hope there will be accommodations for wheelchairs.

1-111-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

EMAIL

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

From: Tim Watkins <twatkins@gosbcta.com>
Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 9:12:43 PM
To: Madison Viola <Madison@costinoutreachgroup.com>
Cc: Erin Ryan <Erin@costinoutreachgroup.com>
Subject: Fwd: ONT Connector

Tim Watkins

Begin forwarded message:

From: Aden Tessman <aden.tessman@gmail.com>
Date: December 2, 2024 at 7:27:36 PM PST
To: ONTconnector <ONTconnector@gosbcta.com>
Subject: **ONT Connector**

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it may concern,

I'm a Rancho Cucamonga Resident that works in Ontario and I regularly use the ONT airport. When I heard about the ONT Connector project, I was initially extremely excited. However, the more I've read up on the environmental review documents (ERD), the more discouraged I've become. I don't think the ERDs provide sufficient evidence of a congestion issue to justify the massive \$538.5 million price tag.

I-112-1

The ERDs claim that the tunnel system will be able to service a minimum of 100 passengers per hour in both directions which seems ridiculous on its face considering the construction cost. Additionally, the projected 2051 ridership (design ridership) is a paltry 523 persons per day according to Table 4-4 in Appendix Q. On this scale, it's hard to believe a potential rail system or even a simple shuttle service that runs at regular intervals isn't the obvious and more realistic solution.

I-112-2

Regarding the congestion problem between the Metrolink station in Rancho and ONT, I'm not convinced that there is one. I take Milliken Ave. in the northbound direction every day over the potential future tunnel and I've never thought of it as congested. It's simply not an issue.

I-112-3

Brightline West has the potential to have a real impact on the Inland Empire, but I don't think the construction of Brightline West will increase traffic from the Metrolink station terminus and

ONT. The entire reason someone would want to take Brightline west is to get to the high desert and Las Vegas while *avoiding* the airport.

Constructing a 4-mile tunnel for \$538,500,000 to solve a minor congestion “problem” is the urban planning equivalent of solving dandruff with decapitation. Squandering of public funds at this scale has the potential to be a national embarrassment. This project should be abandoned.

Thank you,

--

Aden Tessman, P.E., M.S.



I-112-4

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 22, 2024, 1:29:05 PM

FULL NAME:

George Z Tong

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

gspm72t@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

The current proposed ONT connector project using autonomous vehicle tunnels are a massive waste of money which would be better used to fund a metro A line extension to the airport which would serve current riders.

I-113-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 9, 2024, 10:33:42 PM

FULL NAME:

Luis Torres

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

saberleo456@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Absolutely SBCTA should not move forward with the "Tesla tunnels" proposal which would just serve to be an entire waste of money with no benefits and only detriments. All the other "Tesla tunnels" built were useless (see the Vegas Convention Center laughingstock). SBCTA would be better served by connecting ONT to the Foothill Gold Line extension. This would provide easy connection to Metrolink through Metro as well as many bus lines at Union Station in LA and the Montclair Transit Center. The A Line as it is now known would also have the ability to connect to Las Vegas using the Brightline station planned for Rancho Cucamonga. As a long time resident of San Bernardino County and a long time rider of Metrolink, it would be best for the County and the region to abandon the tunnels idea to better serve ONT with actual good connections to transit.

I-114-1
I-114-2

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 21, 2024, 12:37:02 PM

FULL NAME:

Salvador Torres

ADDRESS:

115 s.oakdale Ave

EMAIL OR PHONE:



COMMENTS:

Make it rail/subway I-115-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

EMAIL

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 27, 2024, 10:18:31 AM

FULL NAME:

Salvador Torres

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

salvadortorres823@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Convert the project to rail



I-116-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

EMAIL

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 11, 2024, 12:15:17 PM

FULL NAME:

Lucas Drumonde Voorheis

ADDRESS:



ORGANIZATION:

-

EMAIL OR PHONE:

lucas.voorheis@icloud.com

COMMENTS:

As a professional transportation planner and traffic engineer, and a resident of the Inland Empire (Claremont, technically LA County, but still very nearby), I support the connection between the Rancho Cucamonga Station and the Ontario Airport. However, I believe the mode choice selected is unwise. If the county plans to build an underground transit connection between these two important destinations, an extension of the A-Line between Montclair, the Ontario Airport, and the Rancho Cucamonga Station would serve this purpose better. Even a fixed-route bus service could perform this connection effectively, at significantly lower cost than tunneling with the proposed alternative, or with an A-Line extension. I oppose this proposal both as a local resident and as a professional.

I-117-1
I-117-2

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

Professional

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 14, 2024, 11:13:34 PM

FULL NAME:

Geo VR

ADDRESS:

Ontario

EMAIL OR PHONE:

gavr3@outlook.com

COMMENTS:

Heyy, I think a train track is not so good. I think a monorail track is better. The monorails in Disneyland and Disney World are good examples. A train track can fall get off its track really easily. It can get slippery, maybe something on the track, or earthquake. Rancho Cucamonga and Ontario airport are not so far away from each other. I think a bus shuttle would be fine. Also, maybe a monorail to a casino is better. Also maybe a monorail to Barstow and Las Vegas would be better too.

I-118-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

Dear Chair Marquez, SBCTA Board Members, and ONT Connector Project Staff,

My name is Michael Wang I am an ONT airport passenger and a Metrolink rider. I would like to comment on the DEIR and express my strong opposition to the Ontario International Airport (ONT) Connector project as proposed. As a proponent of effective and fiscally-responsible public transit in San Bernardino County, I am deeply concerned that the proposed model will not meet the region's needs for reliable, scalable, and safe transit between ONT and Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink/Future Brightline West Station.

I-119-1

Key concerns about the ONT Connector's Build Alternative that must be addressed in the EIR:

- **Limited Capacity:** The project's peak throughput of 100 passengers per hour is inadequate compared to the project's own required capacity of 300 per hour and the 20,000-100,000 per hour achievable by BRT, light rail, or heavy rail, failing to address future demand at ONT and the Rancho Cucamonga/Brightline Station.
- **Safety & Emergency Concerns:** The Boring Company's Las Vegas Loop, a similar model that is privately operated, has been plagued by traffic, slowdowns, confusion among drivers, and serious safety and EMS concerns during construction and in operation.
- **Costs & Funding Risks:** The \$490+ million estimate for this project is likely understated, given LA Metro light rail costs at similar project lengths ranging from \$1-7 billion. Address funding instability and sources, given that the project is severely uncompetitive, receiving \$0 from the most recent round of California TIRCP grants.
- **Redundant Shuttle Service:** This project will duplicate above-ground ONT Connect shuttle service and West Valley Connector BRT without enhancing capacity. Is this project even necessary?
- **Environmental Impacts:** This project will increase VMT and emissions during construction and will be ineffective in reducing long-term congestion, air pollution, or greenhouse gas compared to rail due to limited service capacity for mode shift. Provide an honest analysis of the proposed project vs rail alternatives with regards to VMT, congestion, and emissions.

I-119-2

I-119-3

I-119-4

I-119-5

I-119-6

SBCTA should pursue real rail alternatives, as recommended in prior studies in 2008, 2014, and 2018. Options such as a Metrolink Riverside Line extension West to ONT and a Brightline West/Metrolink San Bernardino Line extension South to ONT would be more competitive for state and federal transit funding and better suited for future demand.

I-119-7

I ask the board to prioritize high-capacity, reliable rail solutions to meet San Bernardino County's long-term transportation needs, and reject the low-capacity, high-risk, unreliable model in the Build Alternative that fails to provide the transit service the region deserves.

ONT Connector Public Comment Form


Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Dec 2, 2024, 5:40:10 PM

FULL NAME:

Robert Whitton

ADDRESS:




EMAIL OR PHONE:

rwhitton808@icloud.com

COMMENTS:

You should rail options. The underground zero emission cars have proven to not be as efficient in the Las Vegas Loop example. They do not carry as many passengers and there are a whole host of problems that are associated with that versus a rail option. This doesn't make much sense.



I-120-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 13, 2024, 4:07:53 PM

FULL NAME:

Benjamin Witt

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

blajini29@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

Dear Chair Marquez, SBCTA Board Members, and ONT Connector Project Staff,

My name is Ben Witt and I am a resident of Los Angeles, an ONT airport passenger, and a Metrolink rider. I would like to express my strong opposition to the Ontario International Airport (ONT) Connector project as proposed. As a proponent of effective and fiscally-responsible public transit in San Bernardino County, I am deeply concerned that the proposed model will not meet our region's needs. It's honestly wild to me that we would consider a proposal from Boring Company that has a peak throughput of 100 passengers/hours whereas BRT, light or heavy rail can move 20-100K passengers per hour. Why on earth are we still considering this?

1121-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 28, 2024, 6:37:53 AM

FULL NAME:

Anonymous

ADDRESS:

Pomona CA

EMAIL OR PHONE:

Why

COMMENTS:

I don't want Tesla tunnels paid for by my tax dollars creating traffic underground. Brightline West and LA metro have already set you up to use rail to your advantage. Start building out the San Bernardino county metro system now before you have to deal with the headache LA is going through trying to keep up with traffic. The Inland Empire is not small cute towns anymore and it's time to stop pretending they are, the population has grown and won't stop soon, a robust regular transportation system is needed, not underground freeways.

I-122-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 13, 2024, 3:34:35 PM

FULL NAME:

Concerned Citizen

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

barn03@sbcc.edu

COMMENTS:

SBCTA should consider an inclusive and integrated transit system to connect to the airport. A good transit connection is badly needed. A Tesla tunnel is not the answer. For one, Tesla does not support the project. Second, limiting the tunnel to Telslas is exclusionary, inequitable, and will not be integrated with the local rail or Metrolink system. If you are going to bore a tunnel, please put a public train there, or at least a BRT. Thank you.

I-123-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

WORD OF MOUTH

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

From: clerkoftheboard clerkoftheboard@gosbcta.com
Subject: RE: ONT Connector
Date: November 13, 2024 at 8:38 AM
To: Gray graythecolor@proton.me, ONTconnector ONTconnector@gosbcta.com
Cc: clerkoftheboard clerkoftheboard@gosbcta.com, rmarquez@chinohills.org, awapner@ontarioca.gov



You don't often get email from clerkoftheboard@gosbcta.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good morning,

Your written public comment was received and will be distributed as Support Material for the November 14, 2024 Transit Committee.

Respectfully,
Clerk of the Board

From: Gray <graythecolor@proton.me>
Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 7:47 PM
To: ONTconnector <ONTconnector@gosbcta.com>
Cc: clerkoftheboard <clerkoftheboard@gosbcta.com>; rmarquez@chinohills.org; awapner@ontarioca.gov
Subject: ONT Connector

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Chair Marquez, SBCTA Board Members, and ONT Connector Project Staff,

My name is Gray. I'm a resident of Moreno Valley, an ONT airport passenger, and a frequent Metrolink rider. I'd like to comment on the proposed ONT connector and express my strong disapproval of this project.

I-124-1

I'm concerned that the proposed model is neither effective nor fiscally responsible, and that it won't adequately meet the transit needs of passengers of the ONT airport, or the residents of San Bernardino County in general.

My most severe concerns are:

- **Limited capacity** - The proposed project can support up to 100 passengers per hour. This isn't enough; the project itself requires a capacity of 300 passengers per hour. The alternative mode of transit, that is, light rail and/or heavy rail, can support 20,000 to 100,000 passengers per hour.
- **Environmental impacts** - The proposed project will increase vehicle miles traveled and won't be effective in reducing carbon emissions in general compared to rail because of its limited capacity and lack of density. San Bernardino County already is known for its bad air quality, please don't make it any worse.
- **Safety** - It's a thin, underground tunnel which is packed with cars. How will emergency services

I-124-2

I-124-3

- **Safety** - It's a tunnel, underground tunnel which is packed with cars. How will emergency services get to where they need to go in this tunnel? It's unsafe.

SBCTA should pursue realistic, viable rail alternatives, which are all more environmentally friendly, more efficient, and more safe than the proposed ONT connector. I ask the board to pursue more feasible alternatives.

Sincerely,
Gray,
Moreno Valley, Riverside County



I-124-4
I-124-5

From: Gray portughalam@gmail.com
Subject: ONT Connector
Date: November 12, 2024 at 8:27 PM
To: ONTconnector ONTconnector@gosbcta.com
Cc: clerkoftheboard clerkoftheboard@gosbcta.com, rmarquez@chinohills.org, awapner@ontarioca.gov



CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Chair Marquez, SBCTA Board Members, and ONT Connector Project Staff,

My name is Gray. I'm a resident of Moreno Valley, an ONT airport passenger, and a frequent Metrolink rider. I'd like to comment on the proposed ONT connector and express my strong disapproval of this project.

I'm concerned that the proposed model is neither effective nor fiscally responsible, and that it won't adequately meet the transit needs of passengers of the ONT airport, or the residents of San Bernardino County in general.

My most severe concerns are:

- **Limited capacity** - The proposed project can support up to 100 passengers per hour. This isn't enough; the project itself requires a capacity of 300 passengers per hour. The alternative mode of transit, that is, light rail and/or heavy rail, can support 20,000 to 100,000 passengers per hour.
- **Environmental impacts** - The proposed project will increase vehicle miles traveled and won't be effective in reducing carbon emissions in general compared to rail because of its limited capacity and lack of density. San Bernardino County already is known for its bad air quality, please don't make it any worse.
- **Safety** - It's a thin, underground tunnel which is packed with cars. How will emergency services get to where they need to go in this tunnel? It's unsafe.

SBCTA should pursue realistic, viable rail alternatives, which are all more environmentally friendly, more efficient, and more safe than the proposed ONT connector. I ask the board to pursue more feasible alternatives.

Sincerely,
Gray,
Moreno Valley, Riverside County

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Oct 22, 2024, 11:04:01 AM

FULL NAME:

transit advocate

ADDRESS:

[REDACTED]

EMAIL OR PHONE:

greysquirreluk@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

We need modern, fast, frequent, fully elevated and electrified passenger rail everywhere! We need to copy what Europe and Japan are doing. Ignore the NIMBY suburbanites and build the rail transit anyway.

I-126-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

rtands.com

KEEP ME INFORMED

NO, do not add me to your email distribution list

ONT Connector Public Comment Form

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: Nov 9, 2024, 7:30:38 PM

FULL NAME:

Xavier

ADDRESS:



EMAIL OR PHONE:

xavierrc819@gmail.com

COMMENTS:

The current “autonomous vehicle tunnel” may be one of the largest mistake at ONT which can be avoided. Why settle for a low capacity vehicle when the whole point of making the right of way underground is to help with moving more people? It’s going around the whole point of making the tunnel and frankly a waste of taxpayers dollar; how is luggage going to fit inside that car that i’ve seen in the renderings? What about family’s who wants to travel together? The autonomous vehicle tunnel is simply a piece of technology that is not needed in many situations, including this one, because there is already technology, a train, that would solve all of these issues. I am imploring you to consider the A Line extension. Yes, it is Los Angeles county but it would allow the LARGEST economic driver to reach employees and people who don’t want to travel to LAX with a direct connection! If not that, a DMU shuttle would do wonders or even better, both! Please do not use the autonomous vehicle tunnel.

I-127-1

HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE PROJECT?

SOCIAL MEDIA

KEEP ME INFORMED

YES, add me to your distribution list

Tim Watkins
Chief of Legislative and Public Affairs
San Bernardino County Transportation Authority

Dear Sir:

I only recently became aware of the Ontario International Airport Connector Project. So, with a final route already being decided on & nearly all of the various reports prepared, I fully expect that my comments on a very much lower cost idea for this project to be pretty much ignored. After all, it really would be quite embarrassing for someone from the general public to come up with an obvious & simple plan to connect the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink station with the Ontario International Airport.

IL-1-1

Reading about the history of this plan, it's apparent that with the building (finally) of a dedicated fast passenger train between Las Vegas & Los Angeles (Southern California) there is a claimed greater, more immediate need for this connection. However, **realistically just how many people/day** will actually be willing to ride a train (either Metrolink or the fast train from Las Vegas) & then transfer to a people-mover cabin to get to the Ontario International Airport that will travel several miles underground.

IL-1-2

In view of the fact, that the current Riverside Metrolink line tracks run just North of the Ontario International Airport property the logical & sensible project to build, at probably less than 1/10th of the construction cost, would be to build a spur line from the Riverside Line tracks onto the Airport property. The West-side entrance being East of Deer creek on the West end of the Airport & the East-side entrance far enough East of the single boarding platform to match the entrance on the West-side in grade & turning radius. Only **ONE** platform is

IL-1-3

really needed as it should be built roughly equi-distant from the 2 terminals. Access from the train platform would be by an enclosed walkway with moving sidewalks installed to both the departing (security control) & arriving (luggage carousels) entrances to the Airport terminals.



IL-1-3


Regardless of whether the train boarding platform(s) are built at-grade or elevated they should be designed with boarding planned for both the North & South sides for both East & West bound trains. Although it would probably save money (for now) only one set of tracks should be built at first. The second set can be built once trains are averaging 70-80% full every 8-10 minutes on holiday travel days.

Another way that'll save money on start-up would be for the Operator to purchase several of the new Arrow Service trains rather than the full Metrolink train sets. The trains can be strung together as ridership rises. The purchase price is much lower & operations cost should also be lower to some degree. Also, with most all of the passengers carrying some luggage having single deck boarding it should run faster.




IL-1-4

The immediate building of the platform at the Airport is only the first phase of this project. While building the second track within Ontario International Airport is another phase it's not the only other one. A third phase to this project would be to build a spur adjacent to Deer Creek from the spur-line link North to connect with the current freight line that runs parallel to Archibald Avenue East of the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink station. Once completed, you could then run loops starting from San Bernardino/Redlands both West bound through Rancho Cucamonga or through Riverside with the trains continuing in the same direction they're headed. Those trains running first through Riverside would continue on & looping North back through Rancho Cucamonga to San Bernardino/Redlands & vice-versa for the trains coming from the San Bernardino Line.



IL-1-5

The reason for running trains in a loop both ways is to attract some people who would transfer trains from both the Inland Empire-Orange County & the 91/Perris Valley Lines. This would help to increase Ontario International Airport's attractiveness to some inland Southern California residents. If over time, Metrolink was carrying 10% of the passengers at Ontario International Airport at full fares (which people flying should do) this new service could be quite profitable for Metrolink. Otherwise, I suspect that Omnitrans will end up stuck with another loser that'll force it to cut back &/or cancel more bus service in San Bernardino Conuty.



Respectfully submitted,
Charles Michel Deemer


IN REGARDING:

ONT CONNECTOR

Web Videoconference
PUBLIC HEARING

Taken on
NOVEMBER 13, 2024

Reported By:
MONICA ANDRADE, CSR NO. 12836



BARRETT
REPORTERS • VIDEOGRAPHERS • INTERPRETERS
REPORTING

(888) 740-1100

www.barrettreporting.com

ONT CONNECTOR VIRTUAL PUBLIC HEARING

NOVEMBER 13, 2024

5:30 P.M. - 7:23 P.M.

Stenographically Reported By:

Monica Andrade, CSR #12836

1 VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE, NOVEMBER 13, 2024, 6:12 P.M.

2 - oOo -

3

4 BRIANA EGAN: Okay. And I do plan to also
5 submit, like, a formal letter, but just wanted to
6 ensure that my participation was registered in this
7 meeting today.

8 So my name is Briana Egan. I'm a resident of
9 Loma Linda. And I am a writer of SBCTA transit and
10 advocate in the region for public transportation. I
11 just wanted to register that I oppose the ONT Connector
12 Project as proposed with the current model as proposed,
13 the autonomous vehicles on and on-demand basis like in
14 an underground connector.

15 I do feel that this model really
16 underestimates the transit need in the region. It only
17 looks -- it has a limited scope of connecting onto the
18 airport with Rancho Cucamonga station just with, you
19 know, those confines without actually looking broader
20 of the overall transit need and potential for the
21 region.

22 And I do feel that the SBCTA should really
23 seriously consider and heavily, you know, reconsider
24 and evaluate rail options between these two locations,
25 especially given Bright Line West coming into Rancho

VC-3-1

VC-3-2

1 Cucamonga. So to speak more about that I think if
2 we -- if we take a step back and think more about,
3 like, Metrolink extensions between Cucamonga station
4 and Ontario airport, we could extend the Metrolink San
5 Bernardino Line south to the airport. We could extend
6 the Riverside Line west to the airport and create like
7 a "Y." And in doing so you can greatly expand the
8 connections between San Bernardino County and Riverside
9 County, as well as Los Angeles County and Las Vegas.
10 So I think it's really important that we -- that we
11 consider that.

12 And I do have concerns about the model itself
13 of the ONT Connector. The documents, the drop DIR
14 itself describes the peak one-way passenger throughput
15 of approximately 100 people per hour. This is just so
16 low, especially given the travel projections at both
17 destinations and the fact that, like, bus rapid
18 transit, light rail and heavy rail have peak capacity
19 of, like, 20,000 to 100,000 passengers per hour.
20 That's really what we should be aiming for with this
21 project. And so, yeah, I do believe that, like, it's,
22 you know, not too late for SBCTA to -- to realize,
23 like, the -- I guess, the challenges associated with
24 this model, not to mention like the price cost going
25 way out of control to, like, half-a-billion dollars and

VC-3-2

VC-3-3

VC-3-4

VC-3-5

1 the fact that this will duplicate existing ONT Connect
 2 Shuttle Service and the West Valley Connector BRT
 3 without providing, like, substantially better service.

VC-3-5

4 And so, yeah, I think I -- like, I question,
 5 kind of, the -- the VMT reductions that this project
 6 says that it will provide, as well as I don't
 7 understand why the rail studies that have been studied
 8 in the past in, like, 2008, 2014 and 2018 were kind of
 9 rejected in favor of this, like, Tesla tunnel model.

VC-3-6

VC-3-7

10 So, yeah, in summary those are my thoughts. I
 11 really think that this region deserves much higher
 12 capacity rail connections instead of this project. I
 13 feel like it is misguided. I think that a rail
 14 extension would be much more competitive for, like,
 15 state and federal transit funding and would actually
 16 meet the demand at both of these locations. So I
 17 wanted to provide those comments tonight.

VC-3-8

18 All right. Thank you. Okay. I'm going to go
 19 ahead and leave the room. And thank you for being here
 20 and listening to the public.

* * *

23 BART REED: We're ready to go.
 24 I am the executive director of the Southern
 25 California based transit coalition. We're a national

VC-6-1

1 nonprofit that deals with transportation advocacy, land
 2 use planning, its movement and mobility. In our role,
 3 we find this project, especially the options that are
 4 currently selected which is a -- a car tunnel to be
 5 objectionable. The EIR service can carry 100 people
 6 per hour. That is basically carpooling, you know. 10
 7 cars that -- 20 cars that boarding -- can fit four
 8 people per car. It's not a good idea.

VC-6-1

VC-6-2

9 What needs to be done is the project needs to
 10 be rejected as selected and either a Metrolink
 11 extension or a light rail extension needs to be
 12 provided to the airport and through the airport so it
 13 connects in both directions: One from the Metrolink
 14 San Bernardino Line side and find somewhere to go
 15 useful to bring more connectivity from the airport from
 16 the eastern sides.

17 Transportation by mass transit, meaning
 18 trains, should be able to carry a hundred to 300 people
 19 per -- per train or better. The tunnel is not a good
 20 use of public funds and it just needs to -- it's not
 21 proper in terms of any urban planning of public
 22 transit -- transit conclusions. It's just politically
 23 driven based upon a poor concept by a billionaire
 24 entrepreneur who doesn't like transit so it's a tunnel.

VC-6-3

25 But the problem is San Bernardino County, bad

1 choices are being made. San Bernardino County is
 2 choosing activities like hydrogen trains rather than
 3 electric trains. Electric is used in the rest of the
 4 country. Electric is used to get the Gold Line or the
 5 Metro A Line to Montclair/Clairemont and that's the type
 6 of selection that should be used to extend it to the
 7 airport. That would be the proper transit. Another
 8 alternative would be branching or a deviation of
 9 Metrolink to get to the airport to connect to the
 10 eventual Rancho Cucamonga Brightline coming to the
 11 region.

VC-6-3

12 So, essentially, what we want to recommend
 13 that the tunnel be rejected, the concept of putting
 14 vehicles in the tunnel be rejected and further review
 15 should bring into, A, the light-rail line into the
 16 airport or Metrolink's heavy rail line. And that would
 17 be the proper way to go. And it would be a better use
 18 of public funds.

19 I understand the State of California has
 20 already rejected grant applications for this tunnel. —
 21 And anybody in the world of transit knows that that's a
 22 waste of time. So I recommend a no-go on this concept.
 23 And it's onward and upward. Thank you.

VC-6-4

* * *

24
 25 JOAQUIN DOMINGO: Okay. As a frequent user of

VC-2-1

1 Ontario airport and as a Metrolink rider, I am deeply
 2 concerned with the Ontario airport connector project.

3 The proposed project fails to meet projective
 4 ridership, which would provide only 100 riders per hour
 5 and this limitation should be fully analyzed in the
 6 EIR. The EIR should also compare this to high capacity
 7 transit options, such as light or heavy rail. The
 8 project has also failed to receive any funding from
 9 California's most recent transit and intercity rail
 10 capital program. Additionally, the \$490 million
 11 estimate is likely understated. LA Metro's light-rail
 12 cost and similar links range from 1 to \$7 billion.

13 The Las Vegas Loop, a similar technology to
 14 the proposed Ontario connector, lacks significant
 15 information on operational data. An EIR should review
 16 performance data to the Las Vegas Loop addressing how
 17 these findings would serve San Bernardino and its
 18 residence.

19 Ontario airport is poised to become a major
 20 airport in the greater LA region. The Ontario
 21 connector denies Ontario airport of this feature,
 22 providing low ridership, high-risk technology and a
 23 lack of funding. SBCTA should seriously reconsider
 24 real rail alternatives, such as a Metrolink Riverside
 25 Line extension or an extension of the LA Metro A Line.

VC-2-1

VC-2-2

VC-2-3

VC-2-4

1 Alternative -- alternatives which have high ridership
2 capacity and prepare Ontario airport for future riders.

3 I humbly ask the board to prior -- prioritize
4 high capacity to make the future of San Bernardino's
5 residents. Thank you.

6 * * *

7
8 DIEGO TAMAYO: Awesome. Thank you.

9 I would like to give my comment in opposition
10 to the Ontario connector project. There were multiple
11 alternatives that were studied, including passenger
12 rail, were rejected in favor of an autonomous vehicle
13 model that has not seen success in Las Vegas. There
14 have been features of safety codes. There have been
15 instances of trespassing. There have been instances of
16 vehicles encountering traffic in these tunnels not
17 meeting expectations of passenger mobility,
18 inefficiency while robbing Las Vegas residents of
19 having the potential for an effective transportation
20 system like the hyper loop because Elon Musk sell --
21 sold them short. Sold them short. That is what
22 happened there.

23 I do not wish to see the Inland Empire have
24 the same phenomenon. Residents of Ontario deserve
25 better. As a Claremont student myself, I would go to

VC-2-4

VC-7-1

VC-7-2

1 the airport on passenger rail. We need and deserve
 2 better. This autonomous vehicle transportation
 3 mobility method is not the way to go and this
 4 alternative needs to be scrapped and reconsidered,
 5 especially tax payer dollars are going towards a
 6 project that would initially have been privately funded
 7 by Elon Musk's Boring Company. Thank you.

VC-7-2

* * *

8
 9
 10 PETER KEARNS: Hi, my name is Peter Kearns. I
 11 am a frequent transit user in the Southern California
 12 area. I use Metrolink, Metro, all of the train lines.
 13 I also follow projects pretty closely. This project
 14 stands out to me due to the outrageously low ridership.
 15 I am going to quote Page 2-15 from the EIR document,
 16 2.3.2.8.

17 "The proposed project would provide a peak
 18 one-way passenger throughput of approximately
 19 100 per hour," end quote.

VC-5-1

20 That is 100 people per hour. That is a
 21 shockingly low number for a project of this budget and
 22 this size. I cannot help but advocate for the no-build
 23 option as all other transit options have been turned
 24 down by this board. This would be an outrageous misuse
 25 of funds shown by the fact that this project has also

1 been turned down for federal funding. This project has
 2 no legs. Please do not do this. Terrible thing. It
 3 almost feels like a joke. But, yeah, so I can't help
 4 but advocate for the no-build option. Please, please
 5 do not build this tunnel. That's it.

VC-5-1

6 Thank you.

7 * * *

8
 9 JAMES ALBERT: Okay. Hi. Yes, this is James
 10 Albert speaking in support of expanding this connector
 11 project to include the east Ontario Metrolink station,
 12 which is located less than three miles away from
 13 Ontario airport on the Riverside Metrolink line.

14 Okay. Yes, I just think it's essential that
 15 this project included as part of its plan just because
 16 of the rising population in Western Riverside and, you
 17 know, we have only a few international airports in the
 18 Inland Empire. From my knowledge it's San Bernardino,
 19 Ontario and Palm Springs. So I think it's critical to
 20 the objectives of this plan to incorporate those
 21 communities as part of this plan to reduce vehicle
 22 miles traveled into -- into this plan especially in
 23 these communities that have limited access to
 24 alternative modes of transportation. Thank you so
 25 much.

VC-1-1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

* * *

WAYANNE WATSON: So I am a resident of Loma Linda in the Inland Empire. I use the Ontario airport and Metrolink. I'm very concerned that this is not a responsible use of public funds. This seems like a project with very low ridership. That's also very, very expensive. I think that \$500 million seems quite underestimated for how expensive this project would actually be. And it seems that there are already bus routes that are planned that would cover the same route. That seems like a much more cost effective and still environmentally friendly solution.

VC-8-1

I'm also concerned this seems like a untested idea. I don't see a lot of examples cited in the report of other public works projects that have used a similar model of a tunnel and autonomous vehicles. I think it would be fine if we were in the private sector and we had private funds to use for this, but for tax payer money this doesn't seem like a good use.

VC-8-2

I see on Page 63 of the environmental report that there's already a planned West Valley Connector that's going to be opening in 2028 which is ahead of the proposed opening of this route. And the West Valley Connector, according to this document, I think,

VC-8-3

1 would be forecasting 8200 daily passengers which is
 2 quite a bit higher than a hundred per hour that the
 3 report is estimating of the autonomous vehicles. But I
 4 would strongly -- strongly urge the SBCTA to reconsider
 5 this project. I -- I do not support it. Thank you.

VC-8-3

* * *

8 HENRY FUNG: So my name is Henry Fung. Some
 9 questions regarding this document. Regarding the no-
 10 build alternative, why is the under construction West
 11 Valley Connector not included in the no-build
 12 alternative?

VC-4-1

13 The West Valley Connector is a project that is
 14 currently being built and served in the exact same
 15 purpose as the Ontario Connector in that it connects to
 16 the Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink station and Ontario
 17 airport. It could be used as the baseline for
 18 comparison, not the existing condition which does not
 19 include the ONT Connector and only includes the ONT
 20 Connector tunnel bus, Line 380, which is not
 21 synchronized with Metrolink service.

VC-4-2

22 Secondly, is the alternative analysis with the
 23 conventional rail alternative part of this
 24 environmental document. In the presentation there was
 25 a Harvey Ball -- there was a Harvey Ball guidance or

VC-4-3

1 record comparison of the alternative. It is not in the
2 environmental document. The rail -- the conventional
3 rail alternatives were listed as an alternative --
4 alternatives consider -- alternatives considered but
5 not forwarded for further consideration.

6 I disagree with that. Those conventional rail
7 alternatives could be studied because conventional rail
8 technology is a very mature technology. This proposed
9 tunnel is using novel technology that has concerns.
10 For example, evacuation is a concern with narrow --
11 narrow or thin tunnels compared to either traditional
12 subway board tunnels which are -- accommodate trains
13 or, of course, with a conventional rail service which
14 is mature technology.

15 And, also, there is -- so -- so we also should
16 be considering the tunnel bus alternative as well as a
17 alternative. The requires that you have alternative
18 under consideration that are logical and fully
19 developed and this environmental report does not fully
20 develop any alternative other than no-build and build.

21 And one additional alternative, either a
22 tunnel bus or conventional rail should have been
23 developed as a full alternative in the environmental
24 impact report.

25 Thank you. That's my comment.

VC-4-3

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

* * *

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER' S CERTI F I C A T E

I, MONI CA ANDRADE, Certi f i e d Shorthand Reporter, Certi f i c a t e #12836, State of Cal i f o r n i a, do hereby certify that the virtual public hearing was taken before me at the time and place therein named; that the said virtual public hearing was reported by me in machine shorthand and then transcribed through computer-aided transcription, and the foregoing pages contain a true record of the proceedings to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am a disinterested person and am in no way interested in the outcome of this action, or connected with or related to any of the parties in this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand on DECEMBER 6, 2024.



MONI CA ANDRADE, CSR #12836
LI C E N S E E X P I R A T I O N : 08/30/24