

## **Comment 1 for Concepts for In-Use Locomotive Regulation (locoregulation-ws) - 1st Workshop.**

First Name: Hao  
Last Name: Jiang  
Email Address: [hao.jiang@disney.com](mailto:hao.jiang@disney.com)  
Affiliation: Disneyland Resort

Subject: In-Use Locomotive Regulation  
Comment:

I understand ARB in this regulation intents to regulate line-haul and switch-yard locomotives that are powered by internal combustion diesel engine. Disneyland owns and operates 5 steam boiler type locomotives for its railroad attraction. These attraction vehicles are unique and were built over 70 years ago. They are burning net biodiesel and operated on Disneyland property only. See attached picture as example. I suggest ARB to clearly exempt this type locomotive in the regulation.

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/17-locoregulation-ws-A11RZFIMBDILYwhv.png>

Original File Name: #3 engine.PNG

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2020-11-05 10:10:56

No Duplicates.

## Comment 2 for Concepts for In-Use Locomotive Regulation (locoregulation-ws) - 1st Workshop.

First Name: Abas  
Last Name: Goodarzi  
Email Address: abas@ushybrid.com  
Affiliation: US Hybrid

Subject: Train Vs. Truck for clean mobility.

Comment:

As a local port resident and company, I commend ARB for clean transportation initiatives.

The freight train fuel efficiency and emission are way underestimated when compared with trucks, especially when we look at emission or fuel economy per ton-cargo/mile driven.

Trains are about 30% more efficient, simply due to not having and stop and go traffic when compared with trucks, however when we add the additional emission associated with loading and unloading of the train and then to the Truck for final delivery the total emission and fuel economy are at par. I do support clean locomotives and are needed for long Hauls, however for the line hauls (20-300 miles) Clean truck is good (emission/cargo-ton) as train and it can be implemented much faster with more suppliers and commercial competition, than a train. We only have one Train system supplier/GE and 4 years to get to demonstrate, which is too late for our community need.

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/18-locoregulation-ws-USRWI10DUGtWKQVn.pdf>

Original File Name: US Hybrid Green Transportation presentations .pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2020-11-13 11:09:02

No Duplicates.

## Comment 3 for Concepts for In-Use Locomotive Regulation (locoregulation-ws) - 2nd Workshop.

First Name: Donald

Last Name: Norton

Email Address: [executivedirector@csrla.org](mailto:executivedirector@csrla.org)

Affiliation: CA Short Line RR Assn (CSLRA)

Subject: Follow-up to Mar 30 Workshop

Comment:

Concerning current prices of new locomotives here is the information that we have:

1. Wabtec (former General Electric) - not building medium to low HP locomotives just high horse power 4000 to 4400 hp, cost \$3.5-\$3.9 million.
2. Progress Rail (former EDM/GM) - No low or medium HP conventional locomotives except for a Tier 4 with a Cat engine 2000 to 3000 hp. Cost: \$1.9 to \$2.8 million.
3. Knoxville Locomotive - Offering 1500 to 3000 hp Tier 4 locomotives with either and MTU or Cummins engine, cost \$2.2 to \$2.9 million.
4. Brookville Locomotive - Offering a Tier 4 unit with Cummins Engine 2000 to 3200 hp, price unknown.
5. Western Rail rebuilders has been working with Cummins on a prototype 2500 hp Tier 4 unit, pricing intended to be to be around \$1.8 million but that is just an estimate.
6. Railpower and other genset builders have gone out of business; no more genset being built due to the complexity and maintenance costs. Rail Serve was building a 1-engine 600 HP genset but they have only sold a few at \$800,000 (note: based on HP this unit could not perform most short line tasks other than yard switching)
7. Medium HP hydrogen/battery prototype demo units are 2 to 3 years out for availability with price tag of \$7 to \$11 million each.
8. Battery Locomotive low horse power for an 8 hour shift from Progress Rail - one working in Brazil and one to demo at PHL at Wilmington CA. Cost: \$3.5 million (Note: based on low HP and battery life this unit could not perform many short line tasks). Overall, the current cost of purchasing a medium HP Tier 4 locomotive should be assumed to be at least \$2 million.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2021-03-31 15:29:24

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 4 for Concepts for In-Use Locomotive Regulation (locoregulation-ws) - 1st Workshop.**

First Name: Scott

Last Name: McGhee

Email Address: Scott@ymsprr.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Support

Comment:

The Yosemite Mountain Sugar Pine Railroad fully supports the California Short Line Association comments with the subject "Comments Regarding Railroad Museums and Tourist Passenger Operations."

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2021-04-07 11:04:01

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 5 for Concepts for In-Use Locomotive Regulation (locoregulation-ws) - 1st Workshop.**

First Name: Eugene

Last Name: Vicknair

Email Address: eugene.vicknair@gmail.com

Affiliation: Western Pacific Railroad Museum

Subject: Proposed CARB Locomotive Regulations

Comment:

The Feather River Rail Society / Western Pacific Railroad Museum fully supports the California Short Line Association comments with the subject "Comments Regarding Railroad Museums and Tourist Passenger Operations."

I am the corporate secretary of the FRRS, which operates the Western Pacific Railroad Museum in Plumas County. We are a nationally known operational museum that attracts visitors from around the world to experience our railroad collection.

Aside from being a cultural resource, our museum is the single largest generator of tourism income for Plumas County, one of the most economically depressed regions of California. If the proposed CARB regulations pass without a museum exemption, we would lose almost all of our visitors and a vast majority of our support income. We survive because of our operational equipment and we support the economy of our region. The blow to the Plumas County economy would be tremendous.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2021-04-07 14:10:28

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 6 for Concepts for In-Use Locomotive Regulation (locoregulation-ws) - 1st Workshop.**

This comment was posted then deleted because it was unrelated to the Workshop item or it was a duplicate.

## **Comment 7 for Concepts for In-Use Locomotive Regulation (locoregulation-ws) - 1st Workshop.**

First Name: Gabriel

Last Name: Hydrick

Email Address: GabrielHydrick@countyofplumas.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Comments Regarding Railroad Museums and Tourist Passenger Operations

Comment:

The County of Plumas fully supports the California Short Line Association comments.

This regulation would do severe harm to all tourist railroad operations from non-profits to museums in the State and be detrimental to our local, rural economies as well as drive up consumer prices for the average California resident that is already struggling with housing, food, and gas prices.

Please consider and adopt the California Short Line Association recommendations.

Kind regards,

Gabriel Hydrick  
Plumas County Administrator

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2021-04-07 16:11:35

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 8 for Concepts for In-Use Locomotive Regulation (locoregulation-ws) - 1st Workshop.**

First Name: Lauren

Last Name: Knox

Email Address: lknox@cityofportola.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Comments Regarding Railroad Museums and Tourist Passenger Operations

Comment:

The City of Portola fully supports the California Short Line Association comments. Portola is a designated Train Town and the strain and potential loss of our Western Pacific Railroad Museum due to the proposed regulations will take away from much of the City's history and cultural resources. Please consider the California Short Line Association comments.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2021-04-08 11:28:49

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 9 for Concepts for In-Use Locomotive Regulation (locoregulation-ws) - 1st Workshop.**

First Name: Henry

Last Name: BAUM

Email Address: president@ncry.org

Affiliation:

Subject: Comments Regarding Railroad Museums and Tourist Passenger Operations

Comment:

The Pacific Locomotive Association fully supports the California Short Line Association comments. We operate both Steam and Diesel locomotives for the benefit of the public, on the last link of the Transcontinental Railroad, and cannot exist without being able to operate historic diesel locomotives and our oil burning steam locomotives. We work with our neighbors to monitor the air quality around our operations, and to date have not found any noticeable impact from our operations, but have noticed significant impacts from the rush hour vehicle traffic on the Niles Canyon Highway which parallels our route.

Please consider amending the exemptions to include museum operations such as ours where every locomotive is more than 23 years old.

Attachment:

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2021-04-08 16:31:32

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 10 for Concepts for In-Use Locomotive Regulation (locoregulation-ws) - 1st Workshop.**

First Name: Gary

Last Name: Starre

Email Address: [gastarre@gmail.com](mailto:gastarre@gmail.com)

Affiliation: Southern California Railway Museum

Subject: Diesel RR Locomotive regulation

Comment:

The Southern California Railway Museum in Perris, California, fully supports the California Short Line Association comments with the subject "Comments Regarding Railroad Museums and Tourist Passenger Operations.

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/32-locoregulation-ws-AnFcOQd0VWsBKgll.pdf>

Original File Name: SCRM-ltr to CARB 4.8.21.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2021-04-08 16:52:40

No Duplicates.

## **Comment 11 for Concepts for In-Use Locomotive Regulation (locoregulation-ws) - 2nd Workshop.**

First Name: Cheryl

Last Name: Marcell

Email Address: [cmarcell@csrmf.org](mailto:cmarcell@csrmf.org)

Affiliation: CA State Railroad Museum Foundation

Subject: In-Use Locomotive Regulation

Comment:

My comment is attached in the file upload below.

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/33-locoregulation-ws-WjkGcwFyV2kCYlcI.pdf>

Original File Name: CSRMF comment.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2021-04-09 18:05:53

No Duplicates.

**Comment 12 for Concepts for In-Use Locomotive Regulation (locoregulation-ws) - 2nd Workshop.**

First Name: David

Last Name: Kerr

Email Address: [kerrdavid@sbcglobal.net](mailto:kerrdavid@sbcglobal.net)

Affiliation:

Subject: Comments on Concepts for In-Use Locomotive Regulation

Comment:

Thank you for the opportunity to add my comments.

Please see the attached file for comments and questions.

Thank you.

David Kerr

Attachment: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/BARCU/barcu-attach/35-locoregulation-ws-UTJSO1Y6UG4DYFI8.pdf>

Original File Name: Comments from David Kerr.pdf

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2021-04-19 11:17:00

No Duplicates.

**There are no comments posted to Concepts for In-Use Locomotive Regulation (locoregulation-ws) that were presented during the Workshop at this time.**