The Metro Light Rail Transit Design Standards identify various pedestrian and bicycle safety measures at grade crossings to mitigate potential impacts.

Response 16-12

Parking at the Pomona Station is proposed to be located at the site of an existing safe manufacturing company which was presented and scrutinized as part of the public scoping process for the project conducted in late 2010 and early 2011. It is not feasible for the Construction Authority to consider a new parking location at this time. The number of spaces provided at the parking structure and the existing surface parking lot is forecasted to be sufficient at least through year 2035.

Response 16-13

The potential off-street transit center on Garey Avenue is not part of the proposed project, and was therefore not formally studied as part of this project. The Construction Authority will cooperate with the City and Foothill Transit should a transit center be pursued at this location. Please also see Response 16-15.

Response 16-14

Like the existing Metro Gold Line stations, the proposed station would include amenities supporting transit passengers in accordance with Metro’s standards. The Draft EIR addressed the station design issues by requiring the design to “feature materials, landscaping, art, and other Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension elements developed by the station design team that includes architects, landscape architects, and lighting experts. Surface treatments shall be provided at the face of safety walls and at roadway/pedestrian portals, and landscaping along safety walls outside of the LRT portal shall be provided where feasible to provide wall screening.”

This mitigation measure (VIS-5) has been expanded to clarify that the station design is to incorporate features pursuant to the standards established the in Metro’s Rail Design Criteria. The goal of the Criteria is to create site-adapted designs that reflect the specific urban context of each station and that enhance the neighborhood context in which the project is proposed. According to the Criteria, careful consideration must be given to station compatibility with proposed future development in the neighborhood of each station, and where applicable, future extensions and/or connecting line transfers. The Criteria also require that the Design Team work through the Construction Authority with the local jurisdictions and stakeholder groups to achieve design approvals for project visual elements (Please also see Response 16-24).

Also, improvements such as wider sidewalks, street furniture and amenities could be incorporated into the TOD that is considered for development around the station in the future by the City, which is under the City’s purview.

Response 16-15

The Construction Authority intends to conduct a “Bus Interface Study” at the time the project enters advanced engineering and design. A Bus Interface Study serves as a planning guide for transit agencies and stakeholder Cities, as well as for the Construction Authority. This study will take into account bus
transit service, including routes and bus stops as they exist closer to the time that the project is built, because undertaking the study now would require speculation as to the specifics of future bus service, including exact routes, service frequencies, locations of bus stops, among others.

**Response 16-16**

The comment concerns the proposed Towne Avenue flyover with respect to adjacent existing and planned residential uses. The proposed flyover addresses the need for, and is designed to allow, the LRT tracks to cross over the BNSF freight/Metrolink tracks as the LRT shifts from south to north of the BNSF/Metrolink tracks. The comment promulgates the City’s preference for a below grade rail separation for the light rail at Towne Avenue in the form of an open trench, or for lowering the existing rail lines, lowering Towne Avenue, and lowering other area streets to mitigate impacts of the flyover.

A below grade separation was reviewed and found to possess several engineering and environmental challenges along with additional construction impacts. The entire underpass would need to be at least 1,500 feet in length to meet Metro Design Criteria. Construction activity would result in greater noise and vibration impacts as well as visual impacts due to the construction footprint. Additional construction easements may also be needed to accommodate necessary equipment.

The excavation and grading associated with below grade construction would require an extended period for trench wall construction, the relocation of existing utilities, and construction of bridges for the BNSF/Metrolink tracks. This type of construction would also require extended periods of crane and truck activity associated with the installation of rebar and placement of concrete. The amount of excavated material would increase the haul loads and routes through adjacent neighborhoods and would require more traffic detours and lane closures.

The City also suggested lowering the BNSF/Metrolink trackbed or Towne Avenue by several feet so that a smaller portion of the flyover would be visible from the existing development. Lowering the BNSF/Metrolink trackbed and Towne Avenue is not feasible, as it would require extensive construction and could result in drainage problems. In addition, the Construction Authority has no purview to lower either the Metrolink or BNSF rail lines.

As stated in the Draft EIR, the proposed Towne Avenue flyover would be designed in accordance with the City of Pomona design policies and Mitigation Measures VIS-4 and VIS-5 would be applied to minimize visual impacts related to lighting and design characteristics of the proposed flyover. In addition, to further optimize the height of the proposed flyover the following mitigation measure has been included in the Final EIR:

> VIS-6 – The final design of the Towne Avenue flyover structure shall include considerations of materials and design refinements to reduce the height of the flyover structure above the surrounding grade to the lowest height feasible.

The Final EIR has also been updated to include information that there are additional residential uses adjacent to the alignment within Pomona. Please see Responses 16-18 and 16-24, which address the noise and visual issues and mitigations in detail in relation to this information.
Response 16-17

Emergency access and response times are addressed in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR.

The fire station on Bonita Avenue mentioned in the comment is LACFD Station 186 and has a response time of under 6 minutes as described in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR.

As discussed in detail in Response 16-4, an additional VISSIM analysis has been conducted in response to the City’s comments about traffic conditions at Garey Avenue and Bonita Avenue. The analysis indicated that with the identified mitigation measures in place, the Build Alternative results in LOS D in the AM peak at both Garey Avenue and Bonita Avenue. With the identified mitigation measures in place, the intersection of Garey Avenue and Arrow Highway also results in LOS D in the AM peak hour. Since the LOS would not worsen below LOS D in the AM peak hour, impact at these locations would not be significant. In the PM peak hour, both intersections would continue to operate at LOS C. Therefore, no significant emergency access disruptions would occur. Additionally, emergency responses to areas south of the LRT alignment from the LACFD fire station 186 would continue to utilize the existing Towne Avenue crossing as it is utilized currently and therefore, the proposed project would not affect this location for emergency access.

The Construction Management Plan (CMP) discussed in the Draft EIR includes provisions for coordinating with the police and fire departments of the affected Cities to develop alternate routes or adjust service areas, thereby allowing the departments to maintain emergency service coverage areas and response times during project construction. Similarly, access disruptions could also be minimized by developing and implementing alternate routes or amending service areas, as necessary, to maintain emergency service coverage areas and response times following project completion.

Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) was provided an opportunity to review and comment on the Draft EIR findings; the Construction Authority has not received any comments from the LACFD concerning the Draft EIR analysis of emergency response times or access.

Response 16-18

The existing residential land uses, including the single-family residences located west of Towne Avenue and south of the project right-of-way and the Quail Creek residential community located east of Towne Avenue and south of the right-of-way were identified as noise sensitive land uses and included in the Draft EIR noise analysis in Section 3.11.

In response to the comment an additional noise study was completed for the Serenity Villas Senior Community, located at the northeast intersection of Garey Avenue and the project’s right-of-way. The cluster applicable to Serenity Villas is referenced in Section 3.11 of the Final EIR as “WB1a”. The proposed westbound light-rail tracks are approximately 190 feet from the closest buildings in the community. The existing noise at the Serenity Villas Senior Community was estimated using the measured noise level at site LT-15. Measurement site LT-15 was located about 100 feet from the existing Metrolink tracks south of the right-of-way and had a measured noise level of 62 dBA Ldn. That noise level was adjusted to account for the greater distance between the Serenity Villas and the Metrolink tracks, which are the dominant noise source in the area. The existing noise level at the Serenity Villas Senior Community was estimated to be 58 dBA Ldn. The FTA moderate noise impact threshold for an existing noise level of 58 dBA Ldn is an increase of 2.4 decibels over the existing level. The predicted
future noise level at the Serenity Villas is 59.9 dBA Ldn under a theoretical “worst case” scenario with a train traveling at a maximum design speed of 65 miles per hour. The predicted increase of 1.9 dB and is below the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) impact threshold.

The predicted vibration level at the Serenity Villas Senior Community was also below the FTA impact threshold. The predicted vibration level at Serenity Villas is 66 VdB; the FTA impact threshold is 72 VdB.

Overall, the noise measurement sites were selected to represent a range of existing noise conditions along the corridor. Noise measurements in 2011 were repeated at select sites to verify the October 2003 measurements. Sites with repeat measurements include LT-14 in La Verne and LT-17 in Claremont. The results showed negligible difference in 24-hour noise levels between the 2003 and 2011 noise measurements. The conclusion from these results is that the 2003 noise measurements are still valid.

In general, the noise study attempted to conduct a noise measurement within 0.5-mile of all noise sensitive receivers. The existing noise levels in Pomona were documented with two long-term noise measurements in 2003, which were within 0.5-mile of all existing sensitive receivers. Therefore, no additional measurements were performed in 2011. The two measurement sites are:

- LT-15 at 2655 at Deodar Road, Pomona
- LT-16 at Mountain Village Senior Apartments, Claremont (approximately 500 feet from the Claremont-Pomona border)

Noise and vibration mitigation measures were recommended at locations where an impact was identified. Recommendations to petition for a quiet zone were made only at intersections where noise impact from the proposed project was identified at nearby residences. However, a quiet zone can be implemented even if it was not recommended as a noise mitigation measure. Implementing a quiet zone requires cooperation by all jurisdictions involved with the grade crossing and is contingent on approval by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). The Construction Authority does not have the authority to declare a quiet zone but will cooperate in preparing petitions to FRA for quiet zone designations. Standard grade crossing safety equipment for the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension should be sufficient to meet FRA’s supplemental safety measures requirement for designation of a quiet zone. The Construction Authority will work with local jurisdictions to try to secure quiet zones where appropriate. During that collaboration, the Cities can identify the grade crossings where quiet zones would be beneficial to the City.

This updated information has been included in Section 3.11.7 of the Final EIR.

Response 16-19

The Draft EIR identifies locations where potential noise and vibration impacts were projected and recommended mitigation measures to achieve noise and vibration levels below the (FTA) threshold for moderate impact. The Draft EIR recommends mitigation measures only where predictions exceeded the applicable FTA threshold. Mitigation measures would be refined further during final design because refinements to the plans or advances in mitigation options may provide additional insights into what constitutes the most effective mitigation measure to achieve the FTA threshold criteria. The mitigation
measures identified in the Draft EIR however, commit the project to achieving the FTA threshold criteria regardless of the mitigation measure employed.

Low-impact frogs are specified to mitigate noise and vibration levels at locations where the trains can switch between eastbound and westbound tracks (commonly referred to as crossovers). Low-impact frogs are not a mitigation measure applicable to the flyover structures (such as at Towne Avenue).

**Response 16-20**

As discussed in Section 1.3.3.1 of the Draft EIR, two flyover structures “are necessary to allow the freight and LRT tracks to ‘switch places’: to maintain the required track separation between the BNSF freight and LRT tracks that would share a right-of-way, the BNSF freight tracks will be shifted and placed south of the LRT alignment in the City of Glendora for the first 4.3 miles of the project, but further east, the freight tracks would need to be placed north of the LRT alignment in order for BNSF trains to continue service to freight customers in Pomona and La Verne, whose properties are to the north of the right-of-way. The flyovers would eliminate the need for LRT at-grade crossings at these locations; however, the existing at-grade crossing would remain in place for the BNSF/Metrolink tracks.”

As the spur lines are operated by a freight railroad, detailed information concerning the number and exact type of freight customers is not within the Construction Authority’s purview.

**Response 16-21**

The TPSS buildings within the limits of the City of Pomona are labeled “B-8” and “B-9” in the Draft EIR (Appendix A). Both B-8 and B-9 would be located entirely on right-of-way or property owned by LACMTA (Metro) and neither structure would require property acquisition. Please note that the right of way boundaries shown in the engineering drawings (Appendix A) do not necessarily indicate the full extent of the property entitled to LACMTA, since—as in the case of B-8 and B-9—the LACMTA owns parcels adjacent to those indicated as constituting the right-of-way.

**Response 16-22**

The description of the Pomona Protection and Preservation Ordinance in Section 3.2.1.1 of the Final EIR has been updated to include the requirements and processes for protection of mature trees in the City of Pomona.

**Response 16-23**

The Draft EIR Land Use section generally describes the broad land uses adjacent to the project alignment in the City of Pomona. These broad categories include predominant land uses and do not include parcel-by-parcel information. The Draft EIR land use data were shown on SCAG maps that show existing land use data on a regional scale. SCAG data were used to ensure consistency in land use terminology and analysis throughout the 12.3-mile long corridor. The Draft EIR concluded that the proposed project would not divide an established community, would be compatible with surrounding land uses, and would be consistent with the local plans and policies.

In response to the comment, a follow-up land use survey of the alignment was also conducted on November 12, 2012. The results of the land use survey were then compared to County of Los Angeles
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land use data and generally, the land use survey was consistent with land uses identified in the County of Los Angeles data.

A summary of the land use survey and maps based on County of Los Angeles GIS data (July 2012) have been included in Final EIR to identify land uses in the surrounding area, and the discussion of existing and proposed land has been updated based on the survey and the County data. Information about existing uses has been updated in Section 3.10.2.4 as follows:

“The proposed alignment would traverse the northern portion of the City of Pomona. Land uses in the surrounding area include residential, industrial and commercial uses (see Figures 3.10-19 through 3.10-22). Residential uses are located north and south of the alignment and in the surrounding area. Existing residential uses along the alignment include the Serenity Villas Senior Center and the Arbours apartments. Other residential uses in the area include the Quail Park gated community, the Carriage Walk single-family residential homes, the El Sereno apartments and other multi-family residential uses located near the Pomona and Claremont border.

Other existing uses include the Palomares Park, RV parking uses and the Casa Hervera Industrial Park. Commercial and retail uses are located adjacent to this industrial park. The Casa Colina Rehabilitation Center is located north of the alignment along Bonita Avenue. The City of Pomona Fire Station 186 is located north of the alignment along Bonita Avenue east of the Serenity Villas Senior Center. A Metrolink parking lot is located northwest of the proposed station area.”

Additionally, information about the planned uses, as included in the current ongoing work on the Pomona Compass Blueprint Station, has been included in Section 3.10.3.4 of the Final EIR as follows:

“Planned uses for the surrounding area include residential uses along the alignment and adaptive reuse uses near the proposed station. A new single-family residential development (The Arbours) is under construction in the area. As previously stated, concepts for the Pomona Compass Blueprint Station Area Plan are currently being developed. This Plan will focus on existing and future land uses located around the proposed station. Current concepts include alternatives that identify new reuse opportunities that would be located near existing uses, including converting warehouses to include parking. The envisioned land uses include urban residential, live/work, office, and other adaptive reuse thereby creating a pedestrian friendly atmosphere. The proposed station would be consistent with these planned land uses.”

Clarification of the evaluation methodology was included in Section 3.10.3.1 of the Final EIR as follows:

“Specifically, existing and planned land uses have been identified and analyzed using the adopted General Plans, zoning codes, zoning maps, and applicable specific plans of the Cities in which the proposed project would be located. In some cases, draft plans have also been discussed in the analysis of planned land uses. Information regarding existing and planned uses, zoning and land use policies in the vicinity of the alignment as well as stations, parking, and TPSS sites was used to determine the compatibility of the proposed project with the project’s surroundings.”

The land use analysis in the Draft EIR relied on adopted plans and policies, and provided information (page 3.10-5 of Draft EIR) that the City of Pomona was updating its General Plan. The Draft EIR
included a discussion describing the City of Pomona draft General Plan on page 3.10-5 as follows: “At the time of this environmental document’s preparation, a draft General Plan was out for public review. The 2011 draft General Plan identifies future Metro Gold Line and potential High Speed Rail expansions. According to the 2011 draft General Plan, the foundation for the transportation programs of the General Plan should be to align new development with transit networks and improve connectivity between systems. The 2011 draft General Plan identifies transit-oriented districts throughout the City. These districts would feature a mix of uses located close to major transit stops or transportation crossroads. The districts are intended to take advantage of transit service by concentrating potential rider populations of residents, workers, and visitors next to stations and creating settings to encourage connectivity.”

In response to the comment, the following current information about “urban neighborhoods” has been included in Section 3.10.1.2 of the Final EIR:

“According to the draft General Plan, some of the areas surrounding the alignment would be designated Urban Neighborhoods. This designation would include moderately intense clusters of development that would contain a mix of uses. According to Figure 6.3 of the draft General Plan, the areas west of White Avenue both north and south of the alignment and east of Towne Avenue, south of the alignment would be designated Urban Neighborhood.

Additionally, as of November 2012, concepts for the Pomona Compass Blueprint Station Area Plan are being developed. This Plan will focus on existing and future land uses located around the proposed Gold Line station. Current concepts include alternatives that identify new reuse opportunities that would be located near existing uses. The concepts include converting warehouses to include parking and the envisioned land uses include urban residential, live/work, office, and other adaptive reuse, thereby creating a pedestrian friendly atmosphere.”

The proposed project would be consistent with the draft General Plan as it would improve connectivity between transit-oriented districts throughout the City and be compatible with the future designation of “Urban Neighborhoods.” Additionally, the proposed project would be consistent with the draft General Plan’s description of the development of a Gold Line station within the City. [The information above is based on personal communication with Tamseel Mir and with Cooper Carry Project Manager, Joe McClyde on November 30, 2012.]

Response 16-24

VIS-5 in the Draft EIR states, “Station design shall feature materials, landscaping, art, and other Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension elements developed by the station design team that includes architects, landscape architects, and lighting experts. Surface treatments shall be provided at the face of safety walls and at roadway/pedestrian portals, and landscaping along safety walls outside of the LRT portal shall be provided where feasible to provide wall screening.” The goal of the Criteria is to create site-adapted designs that reflect the specific urban context of each station and that enhance the neighborhood context in which the project is proposed. They also require that the Design Team work through the Construction Authority with the local jurisdictions and stakeholder groups to achieve design approvals for project visual elements (e.g., retaining walls, pole locations). The mitigation measure has been clarified in Section 3.13.4 of the Final EIR to include specific design features described in Metro’s Design Criteria as follows:
“VIS-5—All walls, structures and fences shall be properly screened or incorporate design features to improve appearance and reduce visual intrusion pursuant to the standards established in the Metro Rail Design Criteria. The goal of the Criteria is to create site-adapted designs that reflect the specific urban context of each station and that enhance the neighborhood context in which the project is proposed. The Criteria include artwork, signage, advertising, landscaping, and guidelines for the selection of materials and finishes. Station design shall feature materials, landscaping, art, and other elements consistent with Metro Rail Design Criteria, and developed by the station design team that includes architects, landscape architects, and lighting experts. Surface treatments shall be provided at the face of safety walls and at roadway/pedestrian portals, and landscaping along safety walls outside of the LRT portal shall be provided where feasible to provide wall screening. Per Metro Rail Design Criteria, artwork will be provided at each station and will be designed by professional artists. According to the Criteria, careful consideration must be given to station compatibility with proposed future development in the neighborhood of each station, and where applicable, future extensions and/or connecting line transfers. Neighborhood culture and character shall be emphasized through artwork. The Designer should become familiar with the general aspects of the entire system in order to determine how his individual project relates to the whole. The Landscape Architect shall coordinate design and production of construction drawings with Designers and Metro Art to ensure that landscaping, facilities architecture, site engineering and station art are visually and functionally compatible. Coordination is particularly important with regard to the design of lighting, paved surfaces, walls and site furnishings. Metro Facilities Maintenance group shall be involved in the review and comment stage of landscape design review submittals.”

In addition, as recommended by the City, the design objective to minimize the height of the flyover as much as possible has been included as a mitigation measure VIS-6 in the Final EIR as follows:

“VIS-6 – The final design of the Towne Avenue flyover structure shall include considerations of materials and design refinements to reduce the height of the flyover structure above the surrounding grade to the lowest height feasible.”

The below grade separation (open trench) suggested to replace the proposed flyover at Towne Avenue is addressed in Response 16-16. Relocating the freight railroad’s customer to obviate the need for the flyover is an infeasible option as it is beyond the Construction Authority’s purview to do so.

The comment also suggests an inappropriate reliance on a Statement of Overriding Considerations as part of the Final EIR approval. As stated in the Introduction of the Draft EIR, the purpose of the EIR is to “evaluate the environmental effects of the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension from Azusa to Montclair (Azusa to Montclair Extension). The proposed extension of this Light Rail Transit (LRT) system constitutes a project for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Pursuant to CEQA requirements, the full extension to Montclair has been evaluated in order to address the potential effects of the entire project, from the City of Glendora in Los Angeles County to the City of Montclair in San Bernardino County.

According to the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, an “EIR is an informational document which will inform public agencies, decision makers, and the public generally
of the significant environmental effects of a project on the environment, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe alternatives to the project.

This Draft EIR is an informational document to be used by decision makers, public agencies, and the general public. It is not a policy document of the Construction Authority.

The EIR will be used by the Construction Authority in assessing impacts of the proposed project. During the project implementation process, mitigation measures identified in the EIR will be applied to the project by the Construction Authority and other involved agencies.”

The CEQA Guidelines permit the lead agency to adopt a statement of overriding considerations to approve a project which will result in significant effects that were “identified in the final EIR but not avoided or substantially lessened” (Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines). The approval of the project itself is a separate action by the lead agency; the EIR’s role is to present information about the project’s potential environmental impacts to the decision makers and the public. As discussed above, additional specific information has been included in Mitigation Measure VIS-5 and an additional Mitigation Measure VIS-6 has been added to address visual impacts of the flyover at Towne Avenue.

**Response 16-25**

The comment summarizes previous comments, which are addressed in Responses 16-1 through 16-24 above.

**Response 16-26**

Please see Response 16-1 concerning grade-crossing separation, Response 16-2 concerning on-street parking, Response 16-4 concerning traffic impacts at Garey Avenue; Response 16-5 concerning sidewalk and gates, Response 16-8 concerning land use, 16-11 concerning the station location.

**Response 16-27**

Please see Response 16-4 concerning crossing impacts, Response 16-6 concerning background growth assumptions used in the traffic analysis, 16-10 concerning station access and traffic, Responses 16-14 and 16-15 concerning transit connections, and Response 16-6 concerning the Towne Avenue flyover.
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Re: City of La Verne Comments Regarding 2012 Draft EIR for Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension

Dear Ms. Levy Buch:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the 2012 draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension. Following are La Verne's comments on the draft document:

1. Transportation - The City of La Verne has a number of comments, questions, and corrections regarding the Traffic (Transportation) section of the document. The primary issues of comment are as follows, followed by an extensive list of comments and corrections provided by the City's Traffic Engineer Warren Siecke.

A. The City questions the appropriateness of the two signals proposed at White Avenue/First Street and White Avenue/Second Street, particularly given their close proximity to each other. Warrant analyses should be prepared for each.

B. The City is generally supportive of the proposed signal at Arrow Highway/A Street, noting it is shown to take future intersection volumes from LOS F to LOS A, but nonetheless requests a signal warrant analysis.

C. The City appreciates that none of the at grade crossings in La Verne are proposed for closure by the EIR, but recognizes that previous PUC comments on an earlier environmental document for the project did propose closures. For the record, the City of La Verne remains adamantly opposed to the closure of any at grade crossings in La Verne. These crossings are critical to the City's ability to provide public safety response (Fire, Medical, and Police), given the location of the City's Public Safety facility being located north of Arrow Highway (2061 Third Street), in addition to providing major disruption to vehicular access by an estimated 10,000 or more residents.

D. Proposed Improvements addressing traffic impacts (Table 2-30; page 2-101) for La Verne are reversed from what will be required. Should provide left-turn
pocket for **eastbound** approach from Arrow Highway. Should provide right-turn for **westbound** approach from Arrow Highway.

**Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Draft EIR**  
Comments From Warren Siecke, City Of La Verne Traffic Engineer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Paragraph or Location</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S-10</td>
<td>LTR-3</td>
<td>A traffic signal warrant analysis should be made before including this as a mitigation measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>White Ave./McKinley Ave. should be included as a Pomona intersection rather than La Verne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-17</td>
<td>Par. 2</td>
<td>Arrow is a 6 lane facility in San Dimas and La Verne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-17</td>
<td>Par. 6</td>
<td>Bonita is a 2 lane facility from 3rd St. to east city limit of La Verne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-17</td>
<td>Par. 9</td>
<td>White is a 2 lane facility between Arrow and 6th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enlarge volume number font to make them readable throughout the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2-20</td>
<td>#64</td>
<td>Move White/McKinley to Pomona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2-26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Since capacity is determined by the segment that has the least number on lanes, revise White Ave &amp; Bonita Ave. per comments on page 2-17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2-30</td>
<td>#51</td>
<td>D Street/Arrow Highway Control is signalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2-30</td>
<td>#64</td>
<td>Move White/McKinley to Pomona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2-37</td>
<td>#64</td>
<td>Move White/McKinley to Pomona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2-43</td>
<td>#51</td>
<td>D Street/Arrow Highway Control is signalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>#64</td>
<td>Move White/McKinley to Pomona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2-46</td>
<td></td>
<td>See comments on page 2-26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2-48</td>
<td>Par. 1</td>
<td>Explain the proposed BRT routing. This is necessary to understand the streets that may be impacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2-53</td>
<td>#64</td>
<td>Move White/McKinley to Pomona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2-59</td>
<td>#51</td>
<td>D Street/Arrow Highway Control is signalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2-60</td>
<td>#64</td>
<td>Move White/McKinley to Pomona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2-63</td>
<td>#51</td>
<td>D Street/Arrow Highway Control is signalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2-64</td>
<td>#64</td>
<td>Move White/McKinley to Pomona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2-67</td>
<td>#51</td>
<td>D Street/Arrow Highway Control is signalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2-68</td>
<td>#64</td>
<td>Move White/McKinley to Pomona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2-70</td>
<td></td>
<td>See comments on page 2-26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2-78</td>
<td>Par. 2</td>
<td>Wheeler/Arrow Highway has existing “protected only” signal phasing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2-78</td>
<td>Par. 4</td>
<td>Westbound right turn pocket at D/Arrow may not be feasible due to the limited right of way. “Protected only” signal phasing is being installed this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2-81</td>
<td>#64</td>
<td>Move White/McKinley to Pomona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2-87</td>
<td>#51</td>
<td>D Street/Arrow Highway Control is signalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2-88</td>
<td>#64</td>
<td>Move White/McKinley to Pomona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2-89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Does D/Arrow qualify as an “impacted intersection” if it is analyzed as a signalized intersection (which it is existing)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Throughout the remainder of the report La Verne/Arrow was listed as a La Verne intersection. Change it here for consistency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30</th>
<th>2-89</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Change it here for consistency.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2-92</td>
<td>#51</td>
<td>D Street/Arrow Highway Control is signalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2-93</td>
<td>#64</td>
<td>Move White/McKinley to Pomona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2-96</td>
<td>#51</td>
<td>D Street/Arrow Highway Control is signalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2-97</td>
<td>#64</td>
<td>Move White/McKinley to Pomona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Parking Structure

A. While the City of La Verne supports the proposed parking structure location, the City would nonetheless encourage an analysis of alternate sites for parking, given this industrial property is privately-owned and is today occupied by a City-approved manufacturing business. Alternative parking sites would logically include Fairplex, SE Arrow and E Street, and First Street sites between E and White. This request for consideration of alternative sites is consistent with City Council request made on June 6, 2011.

B. The City would strongly encourage measures to minimize the height of the proposed 6-story parking structure. The structure height could be minimized through the inclusion of sub floors (basement), larger building footprint, and or inclusion of some surface parking as part of project.

3. Noise- There should be a no horn area for the entire stretch through the La Verne area where residential is less than 200 feet away.

4. Noise Barriers- Figure 3.11-32 shows the proposed sound barriers located north of Arrow Highway. Sound barriers should also be considered to be constructed on the north side of Arrow Highway between E Street and White Avenue, given proximity to existing residents and anticipated new TOD residential development. There should also be a sound wall constructed north of Arrow Highway between B Street and C Street with the new development of the ‘Vista La Verne Residence Hall (now occupied with 375 student residents) at the University of La Verne just north of this location (Page 3.11-59).

5. Full Quad Safety Gates- Only the E Street crossing and White crossing would not have full quadrant gates. Why are the full quad safety gates not being added in this section? (Page 3.12-15)

6. Deodar Cedar Protection- The City requires permits and the use of a certified arborist for pruning and removal of any heritage trees including Deodar Cedars, Camphors, Oaks, California Sycamores and Southern California Black Walnuts (Page 3.2-2 and 3.13-6)
7. Visual Impacts
   A. There will be visual impacts from a 6-story parking structure, quite different than the current environment. Should be disclosed, and ideally mitigated by reducing the final height of parking structure.
   B. Any removal of Deodar Cedars will also result in visual impact. See prior comment regarding permit requirement for pruning or removal of heritage trees. Preservation and/or relocation should be primary objective, with potential for 4:1 replacement, per Heritage Ordinance, as last resort.

8. Scoping Report (appendix- Table 4)- There is no reference to the public workshop and La Verne City Council study session having expressed concern about the singular parking structure site and a request for evaluation of additional alternate parking structure sites. Please add La Verne City Council's motion and recommendation, from meeting of June 6, 2011, as follows:

   City is not prepared to identify or recommend one specific site, but rather that all potential alternative parking sites should be considered in the EIS/EIR environmental document. These potential sites include a nearby self storage facility, the adjacent Paper Pak property, the original Fairplex lot, and potential sites on First Street. The City is supportive of the project, including a Gold Line financed parking structure, however the City Council cannot necessarily identify any one of the alternatives as selected or preferred at this time.

The City of La Verne appreciates Gold Line's response to the above comments where applicable, and incorporation of the comments otherwise. The City appreciates the opportunity to participate in the process and looks forward to further progress towards achieving this very worthwhile transit endeavor.

Sincerely,

Bob Russi
City Manager

Cc: Mayor and City Council
17. Russi, Bob, City Manager, City of La Verne, October 1, 2012.

Response 17-1

The comment that the City questions the appropriateness of the identified signalization measures is acknowledged and, as recommended by the City, the Construction Authority will conduct additional signal warrant analysis during the preliminary engineering phase of the project to verify whether signalization at these locations is still warranted. To clarify, the statement “when warranted” was added to the mitigation measure LTR-2 in Section 2.8.2 of the Final EIR.

Response 17-2

As recommended by the City, to verify that this signalization identified in the Draft EIR is appropriate, the Construction Authority will conduct an additional signal warrant analysis Arrow Highway/A Street during the preliminary engineering phase of the project to verify whether signalization at this location is still warranted. To clarify, the statement “when warranted” was added to in the Summary of Improvements with the Build Alternative in Section 2.6.3.3 of the Final EIR.

Response 17-3

The City’s opposition to the closure of any at grade crossings is acknowledged. The Construction Authority is not proposing any at grade crossing closures as part of the Azusa to Montclair project.

Response 17-4

The text in Table 2-30 has been revised accordingly. Please note that the ingress/egress traffic analysis assumed the correct lane configurations.

Response 17-5

As recommended by the City, the Construction Authority will conduct an additional signal warrant analysis during the preliminary engineering phase of the project to verify whether signalization at this location identified in the Draft EIR is still appropriate. To clarify, the statement “when warranted” was added to the mitigation measure LTR-2 in section 2.8.2 of the Final EIR.

Response 17-6

The tables and figures were revised accordingly.

Response 17-7

The text was revised accordingly.

Response 17-8

Bonita Avenue is predominantly a 4-lane roadway for the most part of the study area. The statement “for most of the study area” was added to paragraph 6 of page 2-17 of the EIR.
Response 17-9

White Avenue is predominantly a 4-lane roadway for the most part of the study area. The statement “for most of the study area” was added to paragraph 9 of page 2-17 of the EIR.

Response 17-10

The comment is acknowledged; however, limitations of the software used to generate the figures that show turning movement numbers prevent any font changes.

Response 17-11

The figures and tables were revised accordingly.

Response 17-12

The analysis was revised to reflect a 2-lane capacity for White Avenue in the City of La Verne. The average daily traffic analysis for Bonita Avenue is provided for the segment within the City of San Dimas, where Bonita Avenue has four lanes.

Response 17-13

The control type designation in Table 2-10 was changed from all-way stop to signalized. The intersection was already analyzed as a signalized condition, so the LOS results were not changed.

Response 17-14

The figures and tables were revised accordingly.

Response 17-15

The figures and tables were revised accordingly.

Response 17-16

The control type designation in Table 2-13 was changed from all-way stop to signalized. The intersection was already analyzed as a signalized condition, so the LOS results were not changed.

Response 17-17

The figures and tables were revised accordingly.

Response 17-18

The analysis was revised to reflect a 2-lane capacity for White Avenue in the City of La Verne. The average daily traffic analysis for Bonita Avenue is provided for the segment within the City of San Dimas, where Bonita Avenue has four lanes.

Response 17-19

A description of the TSM alternative and its route was included in Section 1.3.2 of the Draft EIR.
Response 17-20
The figures and tables were revised accordingly.

Response 17-21
The control type designation in Table 2-17 was changed from all-way stop to signalized. The intersection was analyzed as a signalized condition, so the LOS results were not changed.

Response 17-22
The figures and tables were revised accordingly.

Response 17-23
The control type designation in Table 2-18 was changed from all-way stop to signalized. The intersection was already analyzed as a signalized condition, so the LOS results were not changed.

Response 17-24
The figures and tables were revised accordingly.

Response 17-25
The control type designation in Table 2-19 was changed from all-way stop to signalized. The intersection was already analyzed as a signalized condition, so the LOS results were not changed.

Response 17-26
The figures and tables were revised accordingly.

Response 17-27
The analysis was revised to reflect a 2-lane capacity for White Avenue in the City of La Verne. The average daily traffic analysis for Bonita Avenue is provided for the segment within the City of San Dimas, where Bonita Avenue has four lanes.

Response 17-28
The traffic analysis was revised accordingly.

Response 17-29
The City’s installation of the “protected only” signal phasing is currently underway, as noted in the City’s comment, and would improve the westbound right turn operation at this intersection. The Construction Authority will therefore conduct an additional evaluation of physical conditions that exist with this signal phasing during preliminary engineering to verify the feasibility of a right turn pocket at this location.

Response 17-30
The figures and tables were revised accordingly.
Response 17-31

The control type designation in Table 2-26 was changed from all-way stop to signalized. The intersection was already analyzed as a signalized condition, so the LOS results were not changed.

Response 17-32

The figures and tables were revised accordingly.

Response 17-33

The intersection of D Street/Arrow Highway was already analyzed as a signalized intersection for all alternatives. As discussed in Section 2.9 of the Draft EIR, with the proposed project, LOS A would change to LOS C, which is an acceptable level of service.

Response 17-34

The text was revised accordingly.

Response 17-35

The control type designation in Table 2-27 was changed from all-way stop to signalized. The intersection was already analyzed as a signalized condition, so the LOS results were not changed.

Response 17-36

The figures and tables were revised accordingly.

Response 17-37

The control type designation in Table 2-28 was changed from all-way stop to signalized. The intersection was already analyzed as a signalized condition, so the LOS results were not changed.

Response 17-38

The figures and tables were revised accordingly.

Response 17-39

The City’s support of the proposed parking site at La Verne is acknowledged. The proposed parking site and structure were presented and scrutinized as part of the public scoping process for the project conducted in the late 2010 and early 2011, and subsequently studied for environmental impacts. As such, an alternative parking site at La Verne is not under consideration.

A parking facility at the Fairplex or SE Arrow and E Street would result in long pedestrian access routes, and would require long pedestrian bridges over Arrow Highway. The access point to a parking structure on First Street between E and White would likely need to be on First Street, which is a less intensively used and therefore a less desirable street on which to direct traffic from the parking structure. It is also less accessible than Arrow Highway.
Response 17-40

The City’s preference for a shorter parking structure is acknowledged. The parking concept for the La Verne Station in Draft EIR is a conceptual preliminary drawing. This concept will continue to be refined as part of advanced engineering that considers specific refinements including footprint dimensions and other factors.

Response 17-41

The City’s comment requesting a no horn area through La Verne where residential uses are located less than 200 feet from the project is acknowledged. Implementing a “quiet zone” requires cooperation by all jurisdictions involved with the grade crossing and is contingent on approval by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). The Construction Authority cannot declare a quiet zone but will cooperate with the City in preparing petitions to the FRA for quiet zone designations. Standard grade crossing safety equipment for the Metro Gold Line should be sufficient to meet FRA’s supplemental safety measures requirement for designation of a quiet zone. During advanced engineering and final design, the Construction Authority will work with local jurisdictions to identify possible quiet zones where appropriate. During that collaboration, the Cities can identify the grade crossings where quiet zones would be beneficial to the City.

Response 17-42

The City’s comment regarding sound barriers near existing and future residential development is acknowledged.

The existing residences between E Street and White Avenue are located behind an existing row of buildings and more than 230 feet from away the proposed location of the light-rail tracks. With this shielding by buildings in front and distance from the proposed alignment no noise impact is predicted at these residences. Mitigation measures (such as sound barriers) were recommended only at locations where impact was identified.

The noise and vibration impact analysis is based on existing land uses at the time the environmental assessment was initiated. In response to the comment about the new Vista La Verne Residence Hall, following the same analysis procedure as presented in the Draft EIR, predicted noise levels at the Vista La Verne Residence Hall are below the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) impact threshold. Therefore, a sound wall is not recommended north of Arrow Highway between B Street and C Street.

Response 17-43

The E Street and White Street crossings will not have full quadrant gates because the existing highway median serves the same safety purpose as the fourth quad gate.

At E Street, for southbound lanes the highway median will discourage southbound traffic crossing the tracks in the wrong direction. This configuration is described in Section 3.12.2 of the SCRRRA Highway-Rail Grade Crossings Recommended Design Practices and Standards Manual, which applies to this part of the project because SCRRRA-operated Metrolink trains operate through La Verne and would share right
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of way with the Metro Gold Line. At this location, a fourth gate could be installed to achieve full "quad
gate" status but the median makes this unnecessary since it already provides similar safety features.

At White Avenue, for southbound lanes the highway median will discourage northbound traffic crossing
the tracks in the wrong direction. This configuration is described in Section 3.12.2 of the SCRRRA
Highway-Rail Grade Crossings Recommended Design Practices and Standards Manual. In this location a
fourth gate could theoretically be installed to achieve full "quad gate" status, but the extra long median
also serving the SCRRRA crossing, makes this unnecessary and impractical since it provides similar safety
features to a quad gate.

Response 17-44

Section 3.2.1.2 has been updated to include information that the City requires a permits and use of a
certified arborist for pruning and removal of any heritage tree, including Deodar Cedars, Camphors,
California Sycamores, and Southern California Black Walnuts.

Response 17-45

The visual impacts of the 6-level parking garage were considered in Section 3.13 of the Draft EIR, and
the visual impacts were found to be less than significant. As discussed in the Draft EIR, although the
proposed parking structure, approximately 55 feet high, would be taller than any of the immediately
adjacent buildings, the large industrial buildings along the north border of the railroad right-of-way
visually buffer the commercial and residential properties north of 1st Street from both the station and
parking structure proposed to the south. There are no residences in the immediate vicinity of the proposed
parking structure that would be affected by the introduction of new shade or shadow effects. In addition,
the structure’s height would be substantially below allowable heights of 72 feet for buildings in the Old
La Verne Specific Plan area where the site is located. Compliance with City of La Verne design policies
and the implementation of Mitigation Measures VIS-4 and VIS-5 will further ensure that the effect of the
parking structure and station on visual resources would not be significant. Therefore, a reduction in
height is not required to mitigate visual impacts.

Response 17-46

Section 3.13 of the Draft EIR identified removal of the deodar cedars in the City of La Verne as a
significant and unavoidable visual impact and identifies Mitigation Measure VIS-1, which includes
relocating trees and new and commensurate landscape planting.

The VIS-1 measure has been expanded to include information that: (1) the Foothill Construction
Authority Design Team will work with the Cities to develop an appropriate design strategy that
minimizes the loss of deodar cedars and incorporates new landscaping of commensurate quality when
called for, consistent with the Metro Rail Design Criteria; (2) the Criteria state that landscaping for new
facilities shall be designed in conformance with local landscape ordinances and existing plant material
shall be preserved, as appropriate; and (3) compliance with local jurisdictions tree preservation ordinances
prior to taking any action to trim or remove heritage trees, including required permits, would be required.
Prior to any removal or trimming activities, a certified arborist would conduct a detailed survey and the results of the survey would be presented to the City of La Verne consistent with the City’s tree preservation ordinances.

Response 17-47

The Scoping Report summarizes comments received during the scoping period that ended on February 2, 2011, prior to the June 6, 2011 recommendation referenced in the City’s comment.
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Dear Ms. Buch:

The Ontario-Montclair School District (District) appreciates the opportunity to address the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority, regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) prepared for the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Azusa to Montclair project. The District has reviewed the DEIR findings relative to pollution and air quality, transportation, pedestrian/bike riders/traffic impacts, noise and vibrations, and hazardous materials, during the construction phase and once fully operational following the project’s completion. Noted in the DEIR is the provision that appropriate mitigation measures are to be employed during the project’s construction and/or following its completion. In light of these findings, the attached comments are provided by the Ontario-Montclair School District in regards to ensuring a safe environment exists for the District’s students and staff, including those attending Moreno Elementary School (MES) located approximately .38 miles from the Montclair segment of the project, for the three project alternatives being presented (No Build Alternative, Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative, and Build Alternative Project).

Should you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

Craig Misso
Director, Facilities Planning and Operations
Ontario-Montclair School District
(909) 418-6369

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication and any documents, files, or previous e-mail messages attached to it, constitute an electronic communication within the scope of the Electronic Communication Privacy Act, 18 USCA 2510. This communication may contain non-public, confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole use of the designated recipient(s). The unlawful interception, use, or disclosure of such information is strictly prohibited under 18 USCA 2511 and any applicable laws.
Ontario-Montclair
School District

950 West D Street, Ontario, California 91762 • (909) 418-6366 • FAX (909) 459-2550

FACILITIES PLANNING AND OPERATIONS

Sent Via Certified Mail Receipt No. 7012 1010 0002 2750 1005
Return Receipt Requested

October 2, 2012

Lisa Levy Buch, Director of Public Affairs
Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
406 East Huntington Drive, Suite 202
Monrovia, California 91016

Re: Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Buch:

The Ontario-Montclair School District (District) appreciates the opportunity to address the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority, regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) prepared for the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Azusa to Montclair project. The District has reviewed the DEIR findings relative to pollution and air quality, transportation, pedestrian/bike riders/traffic impacts, noise and vibrations, and hazardous materials, during the construction phase and once fully operational following the project’s completion. Noted in the DEIR is the provision that appropriate mitigation measures are to be employed during the project’s construction and/or following its completion. In light of these findings, the following comments are provided by the Ontario-Montclair School District in regards to ensuring a safe environment exists for the District’s students and staff, including those attending Moreno Elementary School (MES) located approximately .38 miles from the Montclair segment of the project, for the three project alternatives being presented (No Build Alternative, Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative, and Build Alternative Project).

Preliminary Comments.
During construction of the Montclair segment extending from Mills Avenue to Benson Avenue, including the existing grade separation and the new light rail transit (LRT) bridge to be constructed over Monte Vista Avenue, the following areas will require further consideration to avoid adversely impacting daily operations at MES. The District is very interested in knowing the proposed construction timeline for the project and the potential impacts of the mitigation measures to be employed, including the following.

1. Traffic Management Control Plan
   a. Signallization/use of crossing guards
   b. Pedestrian/bike rider access
   c. Student transportation services
   d. Transporting of hazardous materials
   e. Emergency services
2. **Construction Activities.**
   a. Traffic diversion/detours/road closures
   b. Demolition
   c. Operation of construction equipment
   d. Increase in vehicles and related traffic activities
   e. Increase in freight transit activities
   f. Air quality impacts due to increased vehicle and tractor trailer engine idling
   g. Hazardous materials exposure
   h. Noise/vibrations
   i. Storm water drainage affecting road conditions and pedestrian access

**Specific Considerations.**
The following comments are submitted relative to the information contained within the DEIR:

1. In Section 2 - Transportation, Table 2-29 indicates a significant reduction in the level of service for the Montclair roadway section analysis from Richton Street to Arroyo Highway. This roadway is anticipated to remain at a "D" category level through 2035. With only one other intersection studied having a similar or lower grade, why were no mitigation measures considered to improve this road segment?

2. In Section 3.5 - Community Facilities and Parklands, under the subsection titled: Educational Facilities, City of Montclair Policy PF-1.1.1 seeks to protect elementary and secondary school plant investments by preserving the character and quality of residential and non-residential development. What mitigation measures will be proposed to ensure compliance with this policy?

3. In Section 3.5.2.3 - Schools, the DEIR indicates there are 18 educational facilities, including preschools, public schools, private schools, and colleges and universities, within .25 miles of the project. The MES is located approximately .38 miles outside of the project. What was the rationale for establishing the .25 mile threshold to be applied to educational facilities? Was this criteria used in any other area of the DEIR? If so, the impacts of such evaluation are requested.

4. In section 3.5.3.3 - Short Term Construction Impacts, subsection titled: Schools, the DEIR, indicates the potential for temporary construction noise impacts would be limited to locations within about 125 feet of the corridor. The MES is located approximately .38 miles outside of the project. What was the rationale for establishing the threshold at 125 feet?

5. In section 3.5.3.4 - Long Term Impacts, subsection titled: Schools, the DEIR, indicates:
   i. "There could be safety concerns for younger students who would walk to and from school near the alignment." What are the specific safety concerns for younger students who walk to and from school near the alignment and what mitigation measures are proposed to ensure their safety?
   ii. This section further states: "Operations of the project would not substantially increase noise levels or reduce air quality at most schools in the Study Area. However, Schools located within 125 feet of the alignment could be subject to substantial increase in noise and vibration." The statement does not address the degree of reduced air quality. The MES is located approximately
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.38 miles outside of the project. What level of noise and vibration and reduced air quality should be expected at this school site?

I. Within this section it is stated no schools in the city of Pomona, San Dimas, or Montclair are located within the .25-mile of the alignment. Why was a .25-mile threshold used for schools?

6. In section 3.12.2.4 – Emergency Response, subsection titled: City of Montclair, the DEIR indicates the pedestrian tunnel that crosses under the westbound Metrolink track would be extended. What mitigation measures are proposed to ensure a pathway through this area remains accessible during construction?

7. In section 3.12.3.4 – Long-Term Impacts, subsection titled: The Cities Affected, the DEIR indicates there will be minor modifications made to the existing grade separation in the City of Montclair. What would comprise these modifications?

8. In section 3.12.3.5 – Cumulative Impacts, the DEIR indicates safety concerns would increase locally, particularly if other development and transportation projects are constructed in the vicinity of alignment for the Project. What mitigation measures are proposed to ensure this area remains safe if further development occurs?

9. In section 3.15. – Growth-Inducing Impacts, the DEIR indicates no significant increase in direct or indirect growth in the cities served by the Project. Please confirm the development areas analyzed include the Project’s impact on potential development of the undeveloped properties located directly south of the Montclair segment.

10. Once the transit station is in full operation, what will be the extent of testing and investigation conducted to verify that the actual environmental conditions affected by the facility’s operations are within the thresholds anticipated in the Final EIR?

11. The District is interested in receiving a copy of your agency’s response to the February 2, 2011 Scoping Comments submitted by the EPA.

Please continue to send public notices and information regarding the Project to me. If you have any questions, please contact me at 909-418-6369.

Sincerely,

Craig Misso  
Director, Facilities Planning and Operations

Response 18-1

The comment that the District has reviewed the Draft EIR and provided the comments to ensure a safe environment for the District’s students and staff, including those attending Moreno Elementary School located approximately 0.38-mile from the project, is acknowledged.

The project construction start date and timeline will depend on the project first attaining environmental clearance and then on funding availability.

The Draft EIR included Mitigation Measures CTR-1 and CTR-3 in Section 2.8.1 that include a range of measures, as follows:

**CTR-1—** During final design, site- and street-specific Worksite Traffic Control Plans shall be developed in cooperation with the appropriate departments of transportation in each Azusa-Montclair corridor City and with Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties, and implemented to accommodate required pedestrian and traffic movements. To the extent practical, traffic lanes will be maintained in both directions, particularly during periods of peak traffic operations. Access to homes and businesses shall be maintained throughout the construction period. To the extent feasible, lane closures shall occur during off-peak, weekend, or nighttime hours.

**CTR-3—** A Traffic Management Control Plan shall be developed and implemented. The Plan shall be developed in close coordination with local jurisdictions, the local emergency response agencies (including fire departments, police departments, and ambulance services), school districts, and other agencies as appropriate. The Plan shall include, but not be limited to:

- Providing public information through media alerts, flyers, and the Construction Authority’s website to alert and inform the community about construction activities and schedules, including planned street and access closures.
- Providing traveler information through traffic advisor radio, changeable message signs (CMS) that includes detour routes.
- Creating a hotline for the community with a direct connection to personnel who can answer questions, provide information, and resolve issues. In addition, field offices shall be opened at specific locations identified as best serving the community and neighborhoods.
- Developing specific street closures and phasing plans, and other measures.
- Posting advance notices indicating when access would be closed or limited on city streets
- Posting signs indicating access routes and alternate access points, as well as announcing that affected businesses are open.
- Placing newspaper notices to indicate street and access closures
- Before any significant bus rerouting changes are made, fliers shall be provided on buses at least two weeks in advance notifying riders of route modifications. In addition, hoods shall be placed over bus-stop signs notifying riders of what modifications have been made to the bus route.
Further details concerning a traffic management control plan, which is part of the Construction Management Plan (CMP) that will be implemented throughout the construction, will be developed and finalized as the project design is refined.

The Construction Authority will work with the Ontario-Montclair School District to ensure the Construction Authority’s contractor(s) fully implement the CMP to minimize delays to traffic on Monte Vista Avenue.

**Response 18-2**

A mitigation measure is considered if the proposed project results in a significant impact to the roadway segment. The Level of Service (LOS) D is considered an acceptable level of service for a roadway segment in urban areas. At LOS D, a roadway segment is anticipated to operate at fair conditions. For the impact to be significant, the LOS due to the project is compared to the No Build LOS (without the project) for the same analysis year, which is the year 2035. If the difference is greater than the significance threshold criteria set forth by the Los Angeles County Traffic Impact Analysis Study Guidelines, then a mitigation measure is to be considered. For the segment of Central Avenue from Richton Street to Arrow Highway, the LOS D is the same for the No Build (i.e., future conditions without the project) and Build conditions (i.e., future conditions with the project). Consequently, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact and no mitigation measures were considered.

**Response 18-3**

The analysis in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR concluded that the proposed project would not impact any school properties in Montclair. Also, the rail corridor has been part of the environment for over 80 years and the proposed project would be consistent with this historic rail setting. Therefore, the proposed project would not be inconsistent with this City of Montclair policy, and no mitigation is required.

**Response 18-4**

As described in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR, indirect impacts would involve changes to pedestrian or vehicular access. Direct impacts would involve physical acquisition, displacement, or relocation of parkland or a community facility and would occur only at facilities that are adjacent to the alignments. Indirect impacts would be most likely to occur at any facility within 0.25-mile of the project. While most of the construction of the project alignment is anticipated to occur with the existing rail right of way, which would limit the noise effects on any uses that are not adjacent to the alignment, a larger 0.25-mile radius was selected to evaluate the potential for indirect impacts involving changes to pedestrian or vehicular access.

**Response 18-5**

No construction noise impacts at the MES facility would occur because the MES is located over 2,000 feet from the project and construction activity. As sound dissipates with distance, at this distance construction noise would not be perceptible to persons using the MES facility.

As discussed in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR, a significant impact to community facilities would occur if the proposed project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of
new or physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts. A distance of 125 feet from the corridor was intended to capture only severe effects that would impede the functionality of a community facility or similar land use within this close proximity to the project. Additionally, the project construction will comply with local, state, and regulatory requirements and/or permits, as well as implement noise control mitigation measures N-1 and N-2 described in Section 3.11.

Response 18-6

Safety impacts are discussed in Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR. Issues related to safety of students include the potential for crime and for accidents at at-grade crossings involving student pedestrians and LRT trains. At designated pedestrian crossings where the LRT alignment is located within a school zone, automatic gates for pedestrians would be used. However, there are no pedestrian crossings within school zones within the City of Montclair. Mitigation measures that would further address safety concerns include SS-3, which requires lighting along pedestrian pathways; SS-5, which requires stations to be designed to maximize visibility for pedestrians to minimize crime and improve pedestrian safety; SS-6, which requires security personnel to monitor pedestrian crossing activity at locations with adjacent schools as well as implementation of measures to ensure pedestrian crossing safety; SS-7, which requires a hazard analysis to be prepared by the Construction Authority to determine a design basis for warning devices; and SS-8 which requires traffic warning measures, such as signage, to alert motorists to significant pedestrian activity.

As described in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR, operation of the project—which uses electrically-powered light rail trains and not the gasoline or diesel fuels that generate air pollutant emissions and are used by freight and Metrolink trains—would not substantially degrade air quality at schools. Furthermore, as described in Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR, the project is expected to reduce mobile source air toxics (MSAT) emissions in the region resulting, generally improved air quality.

Since the MES is beyond 125 feet from the alignment, there would be no long-term noise impacts as stated in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR.

Please see the Response 18-4 regarding the rationale for the selection of the 0.25-mile radius for the study area.

Response 18-7

The Construction Management Plan that will be finalized as the project design is refined will include strategies and measures, such as alternative routes and pathways, to maintain access. The Construction Authority will work with the Ontario-Montclair School District during the development of the CMP measures to ensure that the pathway remains accessible during construction to the extent possible, and that safe alternate routes will be designated if temporary closure of the pathway is required.

Response 18-8

The existing grade separation at Monte Vista Avenue will be maintained and there will be no modifications to the grade separation during construction of the new LRT bridge, as described in
1.3.3.7 of the Draft EIR. No minor modifications to Monte Vista Avenue are anticipated at this time and this clarification has been included in the Final EIR.

Response 18-9

As described in Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR, mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce safety impacts to a less-than-significant level. These mitigation measures would also serve to reduce the proposed project’s contribution to any potential cumulative safety and security impacts. Therefore, it is not expected that the proposed project of the proposed project would result in a significant cumulative impact to safety and security.

Response 18-10

The area south of the project alignment in Montclair is mostly built out. A review of parcels immediately south of the alignment in Montclair identified only one vacant parcel located south of the station. This parcel is zoned for industrial use. The City of Montclair General Plan designates this area as Planned Development, Community Plan, and Conservation Basins. As stated in Section 3.15 of the Draft EIR, the project could potentially attract new transit-oriented development around LRT stations. However, any such future development in Montclair would be subject to the City’s land use regulation and would have to be in accordance with the City’s land use designations and zoning regulations.

Response 18-11

As part of the project, the adopted Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) will be implemented to ensure that the identified mitigation measures are timely implemented, and any long-term mitigation measures are monitored. As part of this program, the results of the monitoring will be reported as specified in the MMRP.

Response 18-12

The Construction Authority reviewed comments received from agencies during the scoping process, but the scoping process does not include the preparation of formal responses to agencies. The comments received during the scoping process were considered in the preparation of the Draft EIR and the Draft EIR was distributed to the agencies for their review.
October 3, 2012

Ms. Levy Buch
Construction Authority Director of Public Affairs
Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
406 E. Huntington Drive, Suite 202
Monrovia, California 91016-3633
llevybuch@foothillextension.org

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE METRO GOLD LINE FOOTHILL EXTENSION FROM AZUSA TO MONTCLAIR PROJECT, (SCH #2010121069), LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Dear Ms. Buch:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has received your submitted Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the above-mentioned project. The following project description is stated in your document:

"The Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension is a phased project that extends the existing Metro Gold Line by 24 miles to the east, from the City of Pasadena to the City of Montclair. Construction of the first phase from the Pasadena Sierra Madre Villa Station to the Azusa-Citrus Station began in late 2011, and construction in anticipated to be completed in late 2015. The proposed project, known as the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension from Azusa to Montclair, is the next phase of this planned extension. The project would share right-of-way with Metrolink, but the light rail transit (LRT) trains would operate on separate tracks and use different platforms than Metrolink commuter trains. The project would traverse six Southern cities. Each City has an adopted General Plan, and in many of the proposed LRT station areas, Specific Plans guide development. Each City also has a zoning code, which is a set of legal regulations that the city uses to implement the policies and land use designations outlined in the General and Specific Plans. Much of the land uses surrounding the project alignment are industrial or commercial."

Based on the review of the submitted document DTSC has the following comments:

1) The EIR should evaluate whether conditions within the Project area may pose a threat to human health or the environment. Following are the databases of some of the regulatory agencies:
National Priorities List (NPL): A list maintained by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S.EPA).

Envirostor (formerly CalSites): A Database primarily used by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, accessible through DTSC's website (see below).

Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS): A database of RCRA facilities that is maintained by U.S. EPA.

Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS): A database of CERCLA sites that is maintained by U.S.EPA.

Solid Waste Information System (SWIS): A database provided by the California Integrated Waste Management Board which consists of both open as well as closed and inactive solid waste disposal facilities and transfer stations.

GeoTracker: A List that is maintained by Regional Water Quality Control Boards.

Local Counties and Cities maintain lists for hazardous substances cleanup sites and leaking underground storage tanks.

The United States Army Corps of Engineers, 911 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, California, 90017, (213) 452-3908, maintains a list of Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS).

2) The EIR should identify the mechanism to initiate any required investigation and/or remediation for any site within the proposed Project area that may be contaminated, and the government agency to provide appropriate regulatory oversight. If necessary, DTSC would require an oversight agreement in order to review such documents.

3) Any environmental investigations, sampling and/or remediation for a site should be conducted under a Workplan approved and overseen by a regulatory agency that has jurisdiction to oversee hazardous substance cleanup. The findings of any investigations, including any Phase I or II Environmental Site Assessment Investigations should be summarized in the document. All sampling results in which hazardous substances were found above regulatory standards should be clearly summarized in a table. All closure, certification or remediation approval reports by regulatory agencies should be included in the EIR.
4) If buildings, other structures, asphalt or concrete-paved surface areas are being planned to be demolished, an investigation should also be conducted for the presence of other hazardous chemicals, mercury, and asbestos containing materials (ACMs). If other hazardous chemicals, lead-based paints (LPB) or products, mercury or ACMs are identified, proper precautions should be taken during demolition activities. Additionally, the contaminants should be remediated in compliance with California environmental regulations and policies.

5) Future project construction may require soil excavation or filling in certain areas. Sampling may be required. If soil is contaminated, it must be properly disposed and not simply placed in another location onsite. Land Disposal Restrictions (LDRs) may be applicable to such soils. Also, if the project proposes to import soil to backfill the areas excavated, sampling should be conducted to ensure that the imported soil is free of contamination.

6) Human health and the environment of sensitive receptors should be protected during any construction or demolition activities. If necessary, a health risk assessment overseen and approved by the appropriate government agency should be conducted by a qualified health risk assessor to determine if there are, have been, or will be, any releases of hazardous materials that may pose a risk to human health or the environment.

7) If the site was used for agricultural, livestock or related activities, onsite soils and groundwater might contain pesticides, agricultural chemical, organic waste or other related residue. Proper investigation, and remedial actions, if necessary, should be conducted under the oversight of and approved by a government agency at the site prior to construction of the project.

8) If it is determined that hazardous wastes are, or will be, generated by the proposed operations, the wastes must be managed in accordance with the California Hazardous Waste Control Law (California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.5) and the Hazardous Waste Control Regulations (California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4.5). If it is determined that hazardous wastes will be generated, the facility should also obtain a United States Environmental Protection Agency Identification Number by contacting (800) 618-6942. Certain hazardous waste treatment processes or hazardous materials, handling, storage or uses may require authorization from the local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA). Information about the requirement for authorization can be obtained by contacting your local CUPA.

9) DTSC can provide cleanup oversight through an Environmental Oversight Agreement (EOA) for government agencies that are not responsible parties, or a Voluntary Cleanup Agreement (VCA) for private parties. For additional information on the EOA or VCA, please see
www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Brownfields, or contact Ms. Maryam Tasnif-Abbasi, DTSC’s Voluntary Cleanup Coordinator, at (714) 484-5489.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Rafiq Ahmed, Project Manager, at rahmed@dtsc.ca.gov, or by phone at (714) 484-5491.

Sincerely,

Rafiq Ahmed
Project Manager
Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program

cc: Governor’s Office of Planning and Research
    State Clearinghouse
    P.O. Box 3044
    Sacramento, California 95812-3044
    state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov.

    CEQA Tracking Center
    Department of Toxic Substances Control
    Office of Environmental Planning and Analysis
    P.O. Box 806
    Sacramento, California 95812
    Attn: Nancy Ritter
    nritter@dtsc.ca.gov

CEQA # 3642

Response 19-1

Section 3.9.2 of the Draft EIR describes the methodology used to establish existing conditions within the study area. As described, the environmental database reports from 2003, 2005, and 2011 were reviewed for local, state, and federal listings for properties within 1,000 feet of the railroad right-of-way. Regulatory database lists were reviewed for cases pertaining to leaking USTs, hazardous waste sites, and other sites of environmental concern. Sites identified during the database review and during the site inspection that pose a potential environmental concern are noted in Section 3.9.2.1 and Section 3.9.2.2 of the Draft EIR.

Response 19-2

Construction of the project will require a number of property acquisitions in the vicinity of station locations, parking structures, and traction power substations. A Phase I ESA for each property will be conducted prior to the acquisition, and if RECs are identified a Phase II ESA would then be conducted. In accordance with existing requirements, regulatory oversight with an appropriate agency will be requested if the results of the Phase II ESA indicate that it is warranted. The agencies include the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), local Fire Department, or Department of Public Works if any UST removal is necessary, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWCB) if any groundwater contamination is encountered above regulatory limits.

Response 19-3

In accordance with existing requirements any environmental investigation, sampling, and/or remediation would be conducted under a Workplan that would be submitted to the appropriate regulatory agency for approval. The findings of any investigations, including any sampling, would be clearly summarized. The project is currently in the conceptual engineering phase, and any additional investigations and remedial activities, if needed, would occur during the final design and engineering phase, at the time the property acquisition process is being undertaken; therefore, closure, certification, or remediation approval reports are not included in the EIR.

Response 19-4

In accordance with existing requirements, an investigation for the presence hazardous chemicals in building to be demolished will be conducted and documented and any remediation of the contaminants would be remediated in compliance with the applicable California regulations and requirements.

Response 19-5

In accordance with existing requirements, sampling for the presence hazardous chemicals in excavated and imported soils will be conducted and documented. If any soil is contaminated it will be properly disposed of in compliance with all applicable existing requirements and regulations.
Response 19-6

In accordance with existing requirements, a health risk assessment will be conducted if hazardous materials releases are identified during construction of the project that may pose a risk to human health or the environment.

Response 19-7

Select soil samples were analyzed for organochlorine pesticides during the Phase II ESA conducted along the railroad right-of-way in 2005. Organochlorine pesticides were not detected above applicable regulatory limits (Section 3.2.9.1 of the Draft EIR). Environmental investigations for additional properties that will be acquired as part of the project will be conducted, as appropriate, based on historic use and hazardous materials use.

Response 19-8

As discussed in Section 3.9.4.2 of the Draft EIR, there are no elements related to the long-term operation of the project that would increase the potential for exposure to hazardous materials.

Response 19-9

The information that the DTSC can provide cleanup oversight through specific agreements for government agencies that are not responsible parties and with private parties is acknowledged.
October 4, 2012

Ms. Lisa Levy Buch, Director of Public Affairs
Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
406 East Huntington Drive, Suite 202
Monrovia CA 91016

SUBJECT: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase 2B

Dear Ms. Levy Buch:

Thank you for this opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase 2B. The City of Arcadia has long been a partner with the Construction Authority and we are currently working on substantial construction and development efforts to effectuate Phase 2A of the project through Arcadia. As you know, we support the project and your efforts to complete the required environmental review and documentation of Phase 2B of this important project. The clearance of Phase 2B is vitally important to the region as a whole and certainly as it impacts the City of Arcadia.

We have several comments that we feel have not been adequately addressed in the Draft EIR. We provided a precursor to these comments in our letter of February 4, 2011, when we responded to the Notice of Preparation for the EIR (attached). The City of Arcadia’s concerns primarily relate to how the Phase 2B project addresses impacts to facilities planned in Arcadia as part of Phase 2A.

- We understand that a new ridership forecast has been completed. Please describe how the ridership forecast varies from the model used in the Phase 2A EIR. If the model does vary, please explain how the differences may impact facilities (i.e. parking structures) planned for Phase 2A.

- It appears that the projection year has been modified to 2035 and that parking facilities for the Phase 2B stations are being designed to meet the demand anticipated in the projection year. This methodology differs from that used in the Environmental Impact Report for Phase 2A, which employed a rationale that parking would be provided in “staged implementation” where a certain number of spaces would be necessary on “opening day” and spaces would be added at a projection year of 2025. In the case of the Arcadia parking structure, the EIR states that 300 spaces be provided on “opening day” and that 800 spaces are “forecasted to
be necessary” in 2025. There should be analysis within the EIR for Phase 2B as to how the projection year change may impact the timing and provision of these parking spaces in Arcadia.

- What is the relationship between project opening day and the projection year? Table 2-64 of the 2007 Final EIR for Phase 2A identifies the parking demands for all Phase 2 stations for opening day and the projection year 2025. In that table most all parking estimates for opening day of the 2B cities are significantly lower than the projection year. How does this relationship change in the current EIR?

Again, we thank you for this opportunity and look forward to the analysis of these questions within the EIR and the overall continued progress on the project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Philip A. Wray
Deputy Director of Development Services/City Engineer

cc: Dominic Lazzaretto, City Manager
    Jason Kruckeberg, Assistant City Manager/Development Services Director
    Linda Hui, Transportation Services Manager

Attachment: February 4, 2011 Letter
February 4, 2011

Ms. Lisa Levy Buch, Director of Public Affairs
Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
406 East Huntington Drive, Suite 202
Monrovia CA 91016

SUBJECT: Notice of Preparation of Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Buch:

Thank you for this opportunity to review and comment on the Notice of Preparation of the Environmental impact report for Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase 2B. We support the project and your efforts to environmentally clear this important extension.

We have some comments to be considered. The impacts on the operational capabilities of the stations and parking structures in the Phase 2A segment should be given serious consideration when developing the Phase 2B project scope. How will the Phase 2B project address impacts on Phase 2A facilities? As part of the Phase 2B project, will a new ridership forecast be done? If the new forecast is significantly different from the one that was done as part of Phase 2A project, some mechanisms need to be put in place to remedy any impact on the Phase 2A segment (station, parking, etc.).

Again, we thank you for this opportunity and look forward to the continued progress on the project.

Sincerely,

Philip A. Wray
Deputy Director of Development Services/City Engineer

PAW:pa

cc: Jason Kruckeberg, Assistant City Manager/Development Services Director
    Linda Hui, Transportation Services Manager
Chapter 7—Responses to Comments
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20. Wray, Philip, Deputy Director, Development Services/City Engineer, City of Arcadia, October 4, 2012.

Response 20-1

Your support of the project is acknowledged.

Response 20-2

The travel demand model that was used for the 2007 EIR has been updated to meet the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) requirements so that the project will qualify for federal New Starts funding. Metro updated the model, now called the Corridor Base Model-2009, and presented it to FTA on September 30, 2009, obtaining their concurrence to utilize the new model for the next phases of the corridor projects and transit studies. The Corridor Base Model-2009 was used to develop the ridership forecasts in the current EIR for the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Azusa to Montclair project (formerly named “2B”).

In addition to updating the model, the horizon year for the project is now 2035 (versus 2025 considered previously), resulting in higher population and employment and a more extensive rail network. In summary, the ridership forecasts have changed for the following reasons:

- Forecast year is 2035
- Socioeconomic factors (population, employment) are higher
- Measure R rail projects expected to be built by 2035 are included. The Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension runs as part of the North-South Line, connected to the current Metro Blue Line by the Regional Connector project in downtown Los Angeles.
- The “constrained” run of the model was used to allow only as many park and ride trips as there are actual parking spaces available. Previously, demand was unconstrained to evaluate the total demand that would exist if parking, theoretically, were in unlimited supply.

The constrained model run is conservative in its estimation of ridership. It incorporates the same framework as the model used previously but takes into account the limited parking at each station location, a factor which affects ridership in the Gold Line’s Park and Ride market.

The table below provides a comparison of the estimated ridership per station between the 2007 EIR for the Pasadena to Azusa project and the current EIR for Azusa to Montclair. Although the model predicts more passengers at each station, the parking facilities will not be impacted because the model assumed that parking is constrained to the number of parking spots the Construction Authority plans to construct (please see Response 20-4).
Chapter 7—Responses to Comments

Response 20-3

The Arcadia Station is in the previous phase of the project, and was not part of the project evaluated in the Draft EIR. In the Pasadena to Azusa (“2A”) EIR, the travel demand model identified the need for 300 parking spaces at Arcadia Station in opening year 2012 and 800 parking spaces in the forecast year 2025. For the proposed project, the opening year is 2020 and the forecast year is year 2035 (see Response 20-2). Therefore, in the Draft EIR analysis, it was assumed that there would be 800 parking spaces at the Arcadia Station in both the opening year 2020 and forecast year 2035 model runs. These projections do not change the timing or provision of parking in Arcadia.

Response 20-4

The table below presents the ridership and parking demand forecasted for the Arcadia Station in opening year and in forecast year based on the Draft EIR model runs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>2,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>2,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>1,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwindale</td>
<td>2,166</td>
<td>2,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>2,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>2,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,808</td>
<td>13,144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Opening Year 2020</th>
<th>Forecast Year 2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>Parking Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>2,072</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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October 4, 2012

Ms. Levy Buch
Construction Authority Director of Public Affairs
Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority
406 E. Huntington Drive, Suite 202
Monrovia, CA 91016-3633

Dear Ms. Buch:

Notice of Availability of Draft EIR
for the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension—Azusa to Montclair

The City of Claremont appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR for the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension—Azusa to Montclair. The following are Claremont’s comments:

1. Incorrect Identification of Adjacent Land Uses: Throughout the EIR, the uses adjacent to and surrounding the Metro right-of-way in Claremont are incorrectly described as typically commercial and industrial. In Claremont, the amount of residential, park, and educational uses along the project alignment exceed the amount of commercial and industrial property abutting the right-of-way. Specific corrections are as follows:

A. The route description provided on page 1-27 fails to acknowledge that abutting the north side of the right-of-way are a City park east of Cambridge Avenue, and a mixed residential/commercial complex between Cornell and Oberlin Avenues. Abutting the south side of the right-of-way are multiple- and single-family residential areas between Carnegie and Mountain Avenues, a residential complex between Spring Street and College Avenue, a City park west of Elder Drive, and single-family homes on Elder Drive west of Claremont Boulevard.

B. The land use maps on Figures 3.10-22 through 3.10-24 are incorrect as follows:
   - The following residential complexes are incorrectly identified as commercial:
     ➢ Residential complex east of Carnegie Avenue, north side of Right-of-Way.
Senior residential complex east of Mountain Avenue, north of the right-of-way.

Part of the residential complex west of Mountain Avenue, north side of the right-of-way.

The apartment complex east of Cambridge Avenue, north of the right-of-way.

Residential complex east of Carnegie Avenue, south of the right-of-way.

Part of the condominium complex on West First Street, on the north side of the right-of-way.

Two of the single-family homes on Elder Drive, south of the right-of-way.

- The City park east of Carnegie Avenue, north of the right-of-way, is incorrectly shown as multi-family residential.

- The Mixed-Use (commercial/residential) development between Cornell and Oberlin Avenues, north of the right-of-way, is incorrectly identified as industrial.

- The Keck Institute (private college) on Wharton Drive, south of the right-of-way is incorrectly identified as industrial.

- The residential complex east of Indian Hill Boulevard, south of the right-of-way is incorrectly identified as “other.”

- The residential complex west of College Avenue, south of the right-of-way, is incorrectly identified as Industrial.

C. Paragraph 3.10.2.5 on page 3.10-32 incorrectly states that the project alignment would be entirely bordered by industrial, commercial, or university properties aside from residential areas on the north side between Carnegie Avenue, Indian Hill Boulevard, Claremont Boulevard, and the LA-SB county line. See the above paragraph for corrections. The last sentence of this paragraph is unclear.

D. The paragraph on page 3.10-40, which describes uses and zoning surrounding the Claremont Station, is unclear and incorrectly identifies the uses and zoning of the surrounding properties. The surrounding area to north includes commercial and office uses in the historic Claremont Village (CV) zoning district. Multi-family residential uses located to the south and office uses to the west are in the Mixed-Use 2 (MU2) zoning district. The proposed parking area located on the existing Metrolink parking site is also in the MU2 zoning district. The water utility site is zoned Public (P).

2. **Required Grade Crossing Improvements:** To mitigate the impact of the train horns on the sensitive uses in the areas adjacent to and nearby the right-of-way, it is