Is it better with the mic or without the mic?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: With.

MR. BALIAN: I just want to begin the presentation talking a little bit about what we're going to be doing
tonight. First, we're going to take you through a project overview. And then we're going to explain the environmental review process, the purpose of the scoping meetings and why we're here tonight, and talk a little bit about how important this is for the project. And then we're going to provide an opportunity for the public to ask questions and make comments.

The -- we are a partner in this endeavor with the FTA, the Federal Transit Administration. They are the federal agency that, ultimately, we will work with to go after funding. This is not a fully funded project, but in order for us to get funding, we need to go through these very important steps of understanding a project and making sure we understand the community concerns and comments about the project.

As I said, we're going to start at 6:15 tonight, we'll go to about 7:00 with our presentations. From 7:00 to 8:00, we'll have an open house; you can walk around the room, you can look at the boards around the room. There will be project specialists at each of the boards, you can ask particular questions. We want to make sure that we're
understanding and that you understand that's what we're proposing for the project, and that we understand your comments or your questions about the project.

It's important that we log your questions and
comments tonight. So as part of the format for the evening,
there are a couple different ways you can participate.

Following the presentation, if you have a comment card,
speaker cards on your chairs, you can fill those out. Once
you fill those out, you can hand them to the aisle. And then
you'll be introduced and you can come and speak in this
microphone over here. We will take down your comments.

There is a court reporter present; please state
your name and speak clearly, and we will get your comments
down. If it's a question we can answer on the spot, we
will. There's a lot of things that we don't know about the
project at this point, and we'll get back to you or will
publish your comments and responses as part of this ongoing
effort.

Once this portion of the event is finished at 7:00,
you can, again, come to the court reporter and speak
directly with the court reporter, if you're not comfortable
speaking in a microphone or wish to do it after the meeting.
You can do that at the court reporter between 7:00 and 8:00.
If you want to fill out a comment card on a separate
piece of paper, which will available after this part of the
event, and you can have your comment logged as part of the official record of the evening. So there are lots of opportunities for your comments. This is only meaningful if we hear from the public. And, again, we're very pleased
that so many of you are here tonight.

Generally, you know about the project. It's about 12.5 mile extension from Azusa to Montclair. It goes through six cities, six stations. It has two grade separations as part of this project, Glendora and in Pomona. It has a shared corridor with Metrolink and the freight. We do not share track with the other modes of transit. We have a separate dedicated track for east and westbound trains, light rail trains, but we will be within the same 100 foot railroad right-of-way that the Construction Authority currently owns.

This project is not fully funded, as I mentioned earlier. It's partially funded through Measure R., the County's sales tax increase that went into effect in 2008. The phase from Pasadena to Azusa is funded 100 percent through Measure R. through local dollars. There should be some residual dollars left available for this phase of the project, which we'll use as matching dollars for federal dollars, ultimately.

Many of you know that Metro does the countywide planning for rail. This is the 2009 long-range
transportation plan, which incorporates all the projects that it has within its planning documents, all the projects that are included in Measure R that are funded through Measure R. And we're very fortunate that the phase from
Pasadena to Azusa is fully funded, and we’re pleased that we will have some residual dollars available for this phase of the project and to give us an opportunity to go after federal dollars.

Our project history, many of you are familiar faces, and know about the project. We did begin in 1999 with the establishment of the Construction Authority. We were Metro. We’re a special purpose agency created by the legislature. It gave us all the rights and responsibilities to build this project, to allow us to award contracts, to acquire right-of-way, to acquire land that is necessary for the project, and it allows to build to the specifications that are required by Metro, who will, ultimately, operate it, as with Phase 1 from Union Station in Pasadena, we build it to specifications and turn it over to Metro to ultimately operate the system.

This project began with the Alternatives Analysis in 2003; since then, we’ve adopted several series of documents that allowed us to do some planning with this project. It got us to a point not only for the phase of Pasadena to Azusa, but also to have an understanding of what
needs to be planned from Azusa to Montclair, which brings us here today.

We believe that now, beginning in 2010, we started taking a fresh look at the environmental document that was
previously done, allowed us to tear off of that, take that
important information freshen it up, come out to the
community, do these scoping meetings, get comments and do
more research and evaluating of the project, itself, so that
we can qualify, hopefully, for federal funds.

This project will be cleared both under the
national and the state Environmental Quality Act. This
allows us to go after funding both at the state level and
the federal level. It a complicated process, takes between
a year to a year and a half. We believe we'll get through
the CEQA, which is the California process by the end of this
year. And then in about a year from now, get through the
NEPA process. Again, this is all to position ourselves to
go after federal dollars, so that the project can get funded
and into construction as soon as possible.

I'll introduce now Gene Kim, who will walk you
through the environmental process and talk about the steps
of the process, itself.

MR. KIM: Thank you. This is a slide that talks about
the project environmental process. And, basically, it
occurs in five steps, and where we are right now is at the
second step, which is the initiation of environmental

process. That environmental process is, as Habib said,

what we can call a combined environmental document.

I would like to emphasize that it would be the
same. The certifying agency for the federal document is
the Federal Administration (sic) and the certifying agency
for the CEQA document, the state document, is the Foothill
Construction Authority. At the conclusion of the
environmental process is something called Record of
Decision that is filed and it really signifies the clearance
of the project from an environmental standpoint both by
federal and state law.

The next stage is engineering and then is
construction. Assuming all the good things that Habib is
talking about happening, with respect to funding, the
construction period lasts about three years. And if
everything lines up and the project is able to stay on track
that way, we expect to go into construction somewhere around
2014, 2015 time frame. Again, construction takes about
three some-odd years. So the final step is opening day for
the project.

I want to talk a little bit about the EIS/EIR
process. It's a combined process, as we talked about
earlier. It happens in two phases. The first phase is
called the draft environmental process, and the initiation
of the draft environmental process is something called public scoping. And that's where we are right now.

The purpose of draft environmental process is to define the alternatives, get them to a level of engineering.
in order to be able to assess the impacts of the alternatives that we carry forth through that full draft environmental document. The point of the environmental document is take a look at the alternatives, and I'll talk about those in a minute, and really understand what the benefits of project are, and what the impacts and effects of project are. And that's the type of feedback we want to hear tonight from you guys at this scoping meeting.

At the conclusion of environmental process, really what happens is, the draft environmental document gets published, it's circulated publicly. And there's a period called the public comment period, where everyone who has an interest in the project has an opportunity to comment on that project.

Before we advance to the next phase, which is the final environmental document, the Authority board is really going to go through a process of selecting a locally preferred alternative. And that's the alternative that the environmental document will clear. Okay?

In the draft process, it's possible to carry more than one alternative through. And as we do more detailed
engineering, it may turn out that one or more of the
alternatives end up falling out, but the key point is that
the between draft environmental and the final environmental,
the Authority board will be selecting a locally preferred
That's the alternative that ultimately will be environmentally cleared with the conclusion -- with the record of decision, as I talked about earlier.

Now, the purpose of the public scoping meeting today is to initiate the NEPA and CEQA environmental clearance processes, we talked about those. It's also to help define the scope of the environmental study. What we want to do is focus our study on those key areas of concern.

And a lot of what helps us is the type of feedback and comments we get at the public scoping meetings. This is a very important function for us.

We want to hear what you guys think about the proposed action, and I'm going talk about the alternatives.

We want to hear what you think about the purpose and need of the document. That document is very important, because it frames how we evaluate which of the alternatives is best suited as locally preferred alternative. So have we framed the purpose and need correctly and then when I talk about the alternatives, which of the alternatives that we talked about best meet that purpose. Okay?
Talk about the alternatives under consideration, and then really what we want to get to is we're going to document existing conditions. And then an important part of what we is review environmental document is our impact.
analysis. And for us the is most important thing is to be able to focus the environmental document on those areas of concern.

I've talked about the purpose and need of the project. We have a purpose and need in the back, and if you haven't had a chance to look at it, I just want to go over it real quickly how we're defining the purpose for this environmental process in this proposed action.

The need for project, first thing is the 210, it's very congested. Right now, we know that it can't accommodate the amount of traffic forecasted, peak-hour traffic, forecasted in the future. Bus and commuter rail service, the amount of bus and commuter rail service along this corridor is somewhat limited. There is an opportunity to expand transportation by making the best possible use of this Metro owned right-of-way.

The corridor's arterial network. There's a lot of spillover traffic, because of the congested conditions on the 210. And then we know from SCAG projections that the traffic and employment is growing within the study area.

That means more trips; that means more congestion.
So the purpose of the project is bi-fold. First, improve transit accessibility. That's actually being able to get to places much easier, with much easier connections. There are lots of activity centers along this particular
corridor. Reliability of transit service.

We're talking about shortening transit travel times, we're talking making travel times more reliable, we're talking about making schedules more reliable. An alternative mode to having to use the 210. There are a lot of trips right now that end up as auto trips along that 210 corridor, because there are competitive modes of traffic travel. Are there options to offer people to have a competitive trip for trips that would otherwise be served by the I-210?

Connections to Metrolink, we feel local bus service it's really important. There's an opportunity here to provide connections to the existing Metrolink service and then connect people to regional and local buses to get to where they want to go throughout the study area. And then finally, this is really about balance in the system. We're very imbalanced, in that a lot of the trips that take place in the study area, an overwhelming number of trips is really by automobile.

So by improving the transportation supply, through a really wise choice, a wise investment with infrastructure
and access that we already have, is there a way that we can change the mode sharing? Is there a way that we could reduce the amount of greenhouse gas emissions and tailpipe emissions that's being produced by the was we travel right
now?

So there are three alternatives that we're studying as part of this environmental process. And I'll go through them one by one. The first is called the No Build. And really, the No Build is what if we didn't do anything, what would things be like in 2035, if there was no action whatsoever? How well does this action meet the Purpose and Needs Statement that I talked about earlier.

The second is called the Transportation System Management or TSM Alternative. The best was to think of this is what is the best that we can do without actually building a new project?

So the way to think about this is kind of a best bus alternative. It would operate on existing streets, but there would be enhancements, operational enhancements, like signal synchronization and transit priority that would allow to get to point A to point B as quickly as possible through the existing street network. No capital investment, we're not building anything. Okay?

The final alternative is called the Build Alternative. And we're only carrying one Build alternative
into this environmental document and the Build Alternative
we're talking about is an extension of the existing
Gold Line. It's a light rail technology. And I'm going to
get into the specifics of the things you kind of want to
1 know about it, the characteristics of this particular
2 technology in a little bit.
3 But the things to the point out really is it's a
4 12.5 mile extension that goes through the cities of
5 Glendora, San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, Claremont and
6 Montclair, with a station proposed within each corridor
7 city. Six stations total. Each station, you can think
8 about each station really like as a Park and Ride station,
9 given the amount of access that we need to provide, we think
10 that that is really necessary in order to make these
11 stations useful to people.
12 So the No Build and TSM Alternative. I'm going to
13 focus more on the TSM. I think the No Build is pretty
14 self-explanatory. But the TSM Alternative is the best bus
15 solution. There are examples out there in operation today.
16 There is something called the Metro Rapid service. And what
17 that is, is a high frequency service using an articulated
18 bus.
19 It's a 60-foot bus; it's a high-capacity bus. It
20 operates along existing streets. And in this cases, it
21 would move along with configurations that pretty much
parallels the corridor. Its stop locations that would be

colocated really with the stations that I talked about that

are part the Build Alternative.

As I mentioned earlier, there are some enhancements
that would be considered as part of this alternative.

Things like signal priority, signal synchronization

operational low-cost things you can do in order to really

get the buses through the network to serve trips from

point A to point B as fast as possible.

I want to talk about the Build Alternative now.

The Build Alternative, as most of you are aware, operates

along the existing Metro-owned right-of-way. I guess the

thing to point out is there is sort of a break point in the

corridor, where east of the corridor, it's really east of

San Dimas, there are four tracks going east through

Claremont. So the idea with this particular concept is

integrating two new light rail tracks for the Gold Line,

dedicated for the Gold Line, into the corridor. And that's

going to require a relocation of the existing two tracks.

As Habib mentioned earlier, the Gold Line would

operate exclusively on the Gold Line tracks, the freight

service and the Metrolink would operate on the freight

tracks that would be relocated. A couple things to point

out, for the most part, throughout the entire corridor, the

Gold Line and relocated tracks generally fit within the
right-of-way. There are a few locations where it does get very tight. On the eastern end of the corridor, there are three stations where a Gold Line co-located next to a Metrolink station. The proposed station near Claremont is
one of those. By and large this is at grade running system.

Okay?

There are two locations where there are grade separations that are planned. Those locations are Lone Hill in Glendora and Towne Avenue in Pomona. The reason why the grade separations are needed is because there are two locations really where the Gold Line tracks need to switch sides with the freight tracks. And the only way to do that really is to take the Gold Line and fly it up and over the existing freight track. That's the reason why the grade separations are planned in those two locations.

In terms of total travel time from Azusa to Montclair, we're talking about 18 minutes. In terms of span of service, we're talking about a service that starts a little bit before 6:00 a.m., about 5:45, 5:50. And the service would continue throughout the day to somewhere right around midnight, that will give you an idea of the span of service. And during -- and then the service is broken up into periods, the peak period and the off-peak period. In the peak period, the operations that are proposed for this service is six trains an hour, both directions, and the
off-peak, probably four or five.

This is a picture of the light rail mode that is the Build Alternative. The image is of an existing Gold Line. It's a train that's currently in operation in
the Metro Regional Rail System. As I said, the Gold Line is also used on the Green Line and the Blue Line. Its power source is from overhead wires. So there are overhead wires that power the light rail trains on the tracks. And the cars can be coupled in three-car sets. The maximum capacity of the train is about 500 passengers per hour (sic). And it's a very high capacity system.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Per train.

MR. KIM: Per train. And it will require the location and siting of the traction power substations. For a system like this, we're talking about a mile, mile and a half apart, for the most part those traction power substations can be sited within the right-of-way or within the footprint of the station area. We're going to be moving forward into the process of doing the siting analysis for that.

And so what we really want to hear from all of you today are your thoughts about the Purpose and Use statement, your thoughts about the Build Alternative. These are topics that we're looking at as the part of environmental study. Tell us which ones you think are the
ones we need to focus on. It's very helpful for us. There
are lots of ways that you can do that. Tell us if missed
anything.
We have boards here that really are meant to
characterize some preliminary concepts. Okay? I think the
thing to point out is that there is nothing at this stage
that is set in stone. What we want to do is present as much
information as we can to you as possible, to characterize as
accurately as policy the concepts that we developed in terms
of the alignment in some of the stations and really get that
feedback from you about where you think we're headed, what
you think the impacts are. Those comments are very
important for us, they help us focus the environmental
document.

So with that, I guess what I would like to do
really quick is just to reiterate how comments can be
provided. You can provide a comment during Q and A that
will happen momentarily. You can complete as comment sheet.
If you haven't seen one, ask any of the staff for one.
After the Q and A session is over, there will be a comment
box. Put your comment in the comment box, and that become a
part of the record.

You can also send a comment by mail, take a comment
card home with you, if you don't have a thought yet as to
what you want to put on the record, fill it out, mail it back
to the Authority at that address, right here. You can also

E-mail comments. And you don't have a comment, but you want
to come to the scoping meeting and hear a little bit more

information, we have one more tomorrow night in San Dimas at
the Ekstrand Elementary School.
Comments, if you're mailing them, have to be post marked on or before February 2nd to make it within the official comment period, to make it into the record. With that, I guess I would like to hand it over to Lisa to talk about the remaining schedule and just kind of the housekeeping, ground rules for the Q and A.

MS. LEVY BUCH: We're going to turn it over to you now to hear your comments and questions. We'll do our best; at this point, we may not have all the answers, but we'll do our best to answer those that we can. I have one speaker card so far. So if you want to speak and you have a card filled out with your name, just put your hand out and we'll pick them up.

This table, magically, after we're done, will turn into a comment table for everyone. So if you want to write a comment, you can do that at this table following our Q and A session. And then our court reporter will also be available for private comments follow this.

So with that, Deborah Page, do you want to come up?

MS. PAGE: Thank you very much for having a meeting
today. We really appreciate it. I actually live on Elder Drive. It's just south of where the tracks are going to run between College and Claremont Boulevard. It's has had a lot of impact to our neighborhood recently.
We're bearing the burden of a lot of things that actually support the whole community, where we live, including noise from the trains, and increased use of the park right by us for Little League and extra lights have impacted the quality of our life there.

I'm actually a strong environmentalist, so I'm not against light rail reducing greenhouse gasses from using cars, but I just wanted to ask a few questions. One is, I'm considering how when you put the train tracks right behind where those houses, they're going to be practically scraping the walls of my neighbors. And it's going to really impact them, their quality of life, I think really strongly.

And the other thing I'm concerned about in that regard is the sight lines for us, because one of the things that we do have on our block is a really beautiful view of the mountains. We don't live in, like, the really, you know, fancy, classy part, you know, but we have these great unobstructed views. So it's kind of a compensation for some other things that we have to deal with.

And I'm really concerned about the sight lines of those wires. And, quite frankly, everything you've talked
about -- you showed the pictures of the train, you really
can't see how ugly those wires are. And how frequently
you're going to be putting the posts that support them, so
I'm really concerned about that. And one thing I wanted to
ask was would you consider lowering the grade level, rather
than filling it in. Because right now, it's just a big hump,
you know, with a ditch on either side, so that the sight
lines would be lowered for our neighborhood.

The other thing is that I know that Claremont is
considered a quiet zone. And I hear it's very expensive to
put in the double guardrails, and so that they don't blow
the horns through our neighborhood. And I was wondering if
possibly Gold Line, since I know you're highly funded, would
possibly help mitigate some of costs for Claremont. Because
I know right now, you know, the communities are all
suffering, they don't have enough money. So I wanted to
propose that.

MS. LEVY BUCH: I think a lot the questions will be
answered in the environmental process in term of the views
and how the trains would affect the views, as well as the
proximity to the home and it would mitigate any kinds of
impacts to homes.

Do you want to talk at all about the way the
barriers work and all that?

MR. KIM: Sure. Okay. I think I remember all the
22 questions.

23 MS. PAGE: Well, basically, had you considered lowering

24 the grade, rather than raising it up. So all the trains

25 would run lower. And the second was supporting putting
quiet zones in Claremont, both Claremont Boulevard and College.

MR. KIM: Okay. To answer your question directly, this extension project is an at-grade running project. There are two locations where it is not proposed to be running at-grade. The locations that I mentioned. There is a grade separation that is planned at Lone Hill in Glendora and there is a grade separation that's planned at Towne. So, I guess, it's related to your concern about sight lines.

And this is what I would say, as part of the environmental study, one of things we are going to be taking a look at is visual impact. Part of the visual impact chapter of the environmental report is to document that Group A's sight line study, to be able to actually look -- say something about the views of affected areas.

And so the Authority will be coming back and sharing the information from these studies, and whatever is selected for the LPA that goes into the final environmental document, at that point, it's required by federal and state law to identify mitigations or issues just you like the ones that you mentioned.
At this point, I would say that the Authority is mindful of the concern that you raise regarding sight lines. However, because of the cost to build the system, the amount of costs, what we're talking about at this point is
generally an at-grade running system. But I would say about

the height of the light rail vehicles, they're lower than

the height of Metrolink trains, for example.

MS. PAGE: I'm talking about the wires.

MR. KIM: I understand that.

MS. PAGE: Not the train. I'm not talking about the

train.

MR. KIM: So -- so above the trains is catenary that
does connect the overhead wire. So what we'll be doing is
documenting what the visual profile is on the corridor, so

that we make that information absolutely clear.

MS. PAGE: But you're documenting -- you're not saying

you're going to do anything about that.

MS. LEVY BUCH: That is part of the process. So we

understand that is an issue that's a concern.

MS. PAGE: -- the quiet zone.

MS. LEVY BUCH: As I said, at that issues that you

raised will all be addressed in the environmental document,

and then how they can be mitigated.

MS. PAGE: Thank you.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Jennifer Mawhorter? And then
Ginger Elliott.

MS. MAWHORTER: I'm thrilled. I wish it was built tomorrow. And I hope that you will consider making sure that the extension to airport gets built. That really,
really important to me. But you said it was 18 minutes to

Azusa.

How long does it take to get to Pasadena?

MR. KIM: Another 20 minutes.

MS. MAWHORTER: Another 20 minutes. So 38 minutes all
together?

MR. KIM: About 40 minutes.

MS. MAWHORTER: 40 minutes. And then another question I
had is about bikes. I would hope than when you're planning
this -- people that want to bike to the station, that
there's adequate bike parking that's, maybe, somehow secure,
so that bikes don't get trashed. And that there's ways to
take the bikes on the trains and that's clearly marked.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you. Ginger Elliott?

MS. ELLIOTT: I think, like everybody here, I'm thrilled
that you're here, and this project might actually happen.

But I'm also here to talk about possible alternatives to
what's being proposed at this point. I'm here to speak on
behalf of John Neiuber, the president of Claremont Heritage.

He couldn't be here tonight.

We're concerned about the impact that the proposed
train configuration will have on our 1926 Sante Fe, now Metrolink Depot. The building is on the National Register of Historic places. It faces the original track bed, the road bed of the Sante Fe, which was the birth place of all
of our Foothill communities along here.

To introduce a new set of tracks north of the Metrolink track, taking up -- my figures are anywhere from six to 10 to 11 feet of the current platform. It not only ruins that historic context, but is also makes us question just how much farther things might go, and just how much road we will lose. Right now, there's a fairly nice view of that facade of the Depot, which is quite stunning. And it can be seen as you drive up College Avenue, as you drive up other streets.

Putting the tracks directly in front of it with those wires is a real concern of ours. It's not just visual, it's a historic context that's been built there, and we're very happy with it. It will be closing of the Depot from some of the tracks. The only other meeting I've been to, it was pointed out that there will be four tracks, and that, therefore -- it's currently the law, that you can't cross four sets of tracks.

So people will not be able to come to the Depot and get to Metrolink's tracks, which will now be on the south side of the Depot. We find this another way of closing off
22 the Depot from public access, if you will. I realize your
23 plans are not precise now, but we're really worried about
24 how much more we're going to lose from that platform.
25 We wonder why an alternative cannot be to put the
Gold Line tracks at the south of Metrolink tracks, which is where most of us, who've heard about Gold Line for years assumed they would be built. That they would separate Metrolink. I've also heard there's a problem that more space may be needed for fire department access. Will that come off the platform? How wide will the platform be between the Depot and College Avenue, which is now where most people wait for the train. Will there be any cover for the weather? Will there be kiosks to buy tickets? Because everything that is now out there, that's going to have to be shoved so much further back with the Gold Line tracks. Will there actually be a station in Claremont? Stations mean depots. So will there actually be a building for the Gold Line in Claremont, and if so, where? And, finally, there's a rather large metal shed that sounds like it has some equipment having to do with the train just to south of the current platform, the further south platform, and I assume that will have to be moved also. It seems a shame to move things, that have already been made into public improvements, 10, 20 years later and pulling them all out again. So those are just some of my
questions and, of course, I expect to have an answer for every one of them.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Do you want to talk at all about how the station -- at what point the station concepts get more
defined and that we'll know the footage between things and all of that?

MR. KIM: The preliminary station concepts that you see after these scoping meetings are going to be really kind of our focus going forward over the next couple of months. Okay? If I might address -- a few of the questions that I thought I heard, the first has to do with the Depot, itself. There is no plan to take and remove the Depot at all. Yes, you are correct in that the proposed alignment does propose basically taking the existing freight tracks in that track bed that you talked about and move and relocating the tracks to the south to make room for platforms for a Gold Line station. That would be very close to the existing Depot. That is true.

As part of our environmental document, we're working with the State Historic Preservation office. It's one that is number one of our target list to handle the right way. And so I guess what I would say is it's important for the Authority to be mindful of the historic nature of the Depot, the structures that are there, the historic character and interaction between the old track and
the track bed and the Depot.

What I would put out there is, is there a way somehow that we can develop some type of design concepts that honor that, and that sort of allow the Depot to, maybe,
kind of carry forward a new set of functions and supporting some of the ticketing that will be needed for the Gold Line project. That is something that the Authority would very much like to work with the City of Claremont, and with your office on that particular issue. So the Historic Preservation, we'll be taking a look at. We're going to come back, actually, to the public. Okay?

And what we're going to present is more detailed alignment and station concepts. And by that point, when we do the level of detail, you'll get a really good idea of what we're proposing for these locations, and what we've done from a design standpoint to mitigate some of the concerns that we've heard from you today. It's very important to the Authority to hear these comments, and I, myself, can assure that these considerations are very, very important for us.

MS. LEVY BUCH: And that goes back to answer your questions. Judy Wright?

MS. WRIGHT: My name is Judy Wright. And I go way back before -- I go back to the first EIS/EIR that was written for this project, when it was still called the Blue Line,
not the Gold Line. That's how old I am. I'm also one of

the mothers of Metrolink. And they are not freight tracks.

They were negotiated just like the Santa Fe tracks were, and

they're owned by MTA and they're called Metrolink tracks.
So I think, at least on this corridor, they ought
to be called Metrolink tracks in your document. I'm so glad
that you have had this hearing and I hear some flexibility
in how you just answered Ginger's question. And I would
like to add to some of what Ginger said.

My friend Sam Padroza tells me I'm biased for the
Depot; I am. But I'm also biased for the Gold Line. I've
been a transit advocate for most of my life, and I'm very
eager to see this come here, but I want to come and be right.
I don't want to see us sacrifice part of the Depot or any of
neighborhoods. I want to see the that it can be done in a
compatible fashion. We need some plans to scale, so that we
can tell what the problems are going to be.

I happen to have written the National Register
Nomination for the Depot, so that's why I am biased for the
Depot. When it was written, the back perform is part of
that listing. So you're saying you're not going to touch
the station, but when you start touching the platform;
you're touching the station. And we need to talk about how
we can maintain so that you don't squeeze it.

I was so proud when we listed that on the National
Register, that people in South Claremont said, "We're so glad
you left the view in the south, the same as in the north, so
that we can enjoy it, too." And we still should leave that
view for people who live in the south. Four years ago, some
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of us came to a meeting in Claremont, the Authority I don't believe attended at that time, but we had it with our Planning and Transportation Commission.

I kept my notes from that meeting. We're still discussing the same issues, and I received no communication on those issues. So I'm hoping that, perhaps, this meeting will be a better one in that we can have some communication as we go along. I favor Claremont working the Depot becoming more of a functional building. The transit -- there is a transit store, Foothill Transit. And there's no reason why it couldn't have added services. It's Claremont's best kept secret. It should be advertised more.

There are almost 200 people a day who go through the transit. So probably more than most Village businesses.

And it could serve other functions if it were better organized.

I also think that, perhaps, you need to explain to us again, maybe not tonight, but sometime, about the four tracks instead of three. I know that there are a couple of people in the audience who would like to speak to that. I'm also concerned about all of the easements needed by the fire
department. I know almost development that has occurred in Claremont that has public access has to be negotiated with the fire department. And usually they're able to narrow some of the
streets, like in our West Village area, where they wanted
25-foot road, I think. Can't we work on that together?
Can't we move the vault next to the tracks? And put it east
instead of there, so that there's more room there. I just
think there's some flexibility here that should be looked
at.
And I have these notes here, and you answered some
of them with Ginger. But I think some of us would like to
continue to participate in this. We don't want this to be
the last time that we talk, because we're very concerned
about the impact in our community. But we also want this to
come as soon as possible. Thank you.
MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you. Mark Von Wootke and then
Bob Tener.
MR. VON WOOTKE: I just want to say that I'm delighted
that the Gold Line is coming to Claremont and we want to
welcome you. As it's been pointed out, the Depot is not
only a historic treasure, I think it's an underused resource
that could very much accommodate things we're talking about
in terms of public use. The thing I would like to talk
about is the access to the train station.
Claremont is historically a transit oriented town.

And we've been able to maintain a very walkable transit oriented community. And so I think it's important that people on all sides of the tracks are able to come to the
station, which would be the Depot really, and access all of
the trains, not just Gold Line, but Metro. If the MET grade
crossing that we now have for pedestrians isn't possible to
extend, although, that might be considered. Because I've
seen it work in other places in Europe and so forth.
I think it's not -- it's relatively easy to have an
undergrade pedestrian crossing or access that accesses all
the trains, but it would also weave the north side of the
tracks together with the south side of the tracks.
Pedestrians here could come to the Depot and access all the
tracks. The fact that the grade slopes would make an
underground passage almost that grade on this side. Then,
of course, there would need to be stairs coming out to the
tracks. It's happened in so many stations all over the
world. In fact, some of the cost of that might be
recovered by having some shops or something in there, as
happens in many places. That is something to consider.
The other thing, aside from walking the transit,
which we really want to encourage here and accommodate, is
biking to transit. And I was happy to see someone else talk
about that. We have a bike station here in Claremont.
We're encouraging more people to walk. Your collection area for pedestrians is about a mile; you can walk to the station. You can multiply that times three for four with biking to transit. And the cost of getting a transit rider
there walking or on a bike is substantially less than the  
cost of somebody driving there.

So I really would like you to encourage you to  
accommodate bikes in every way you can, not only at our  
station, but all stations up and down the line. Now, it  
might be said, well, everybody in Southern California drives,  
and no doubt, that's true. But I think you'll find that  
people who are using public transit might be a different  
mindset, more inclined to walk, more inclined to bike than  
driving. And so accommodating bikes at the station,  
accommodating bikes on the trains. I've been on the Metro  
Folding Bike task force, and there's tremendous potential  
for bringing folding bikes on transit. So you have them to  
use on both ends of your ride.

So I just want to welcome you and encourage you to  
explore these opportunities and to recognize that Claremont  
is a transit oriented town. And we would love to be able to  
walk and bike, as well as some people, of course, we'll need  
to drive. But we don't want our Depot sitting in a vast  
parking lot or having transit parkers competing with  
merchants who need parking spaces.
Thank you very much.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you. Bob Tener and then

Paul Wheeler.

MR. TENER: Good evening. I join my fellow Claremonters
in thanking both FTA and the Construction Authority, a very important process and you're very open to us and we hope that continues. I'm Bob Tener. I'm a Claremont resident.

I chair the Planning Commission, but my remarks tonight are mine alone. They don't reflect any position of the city, because the Planning Commission has not had this issue on their addendum. It's has no bearing on the use of other Planning Commission.

One thing, four very specific points and recommendations for your planning studies that are going to support the draft EIS. The first has to do with the very broad range of positive benefits that have not yet appeared either in your presentation or in the Notice of Intent.

Eliminating -- reducing congestion on the I-210 is a certainty and that's going to happen. Don't over look the reduction in congestion on the I-10. It should be in the report.

Five of the six stations that are located east of the 57 serve populace that's going to be very, very pleased to Claremont and the other stations and take Gold Line particularly to the west. I would suggest also that there
are auto commuters today who frequently use Baseline or Foothill or Arrow Highway, who likewise are going to be part of the auto-to-rail shift. So if your analysis is complete, I think you will find the reduction of congestion to be a
very dominant factor.

Secondly, beyond simply relieving congestion, I urge that Benefit Analysis go deeply and specifically to the other benefits of auto drivers climbing on the rails. Specific benefits to the physical environment: Air quality improvement, micro and macro, fossil fuel consumption reduction and many others.

Also, and certainly second, Mark Von Wootke's comments, and would simply say if your planers take a look at downtown Claremont, let's say a two to three-block radius around not Depot, I think you're going to find a fairly model and exemplary transit oriented development in place. And the synergy between road line travel and the environment in Claremont is going to have both economic benefits and also provide rail riders an excellent exposure to that part of Claremont.

With regard to the three or four tracks, you are on no -- I would just remind particularly the public, that on September 14th, the city council of Claremont expressed its official statement in concurrence with the conceptual presentation that came through the Construction Authority.
supporting the four-track configuration.

I am, likewise, as long-time Claremont Heritage member, very cognizant, inch by inch, of the dimensions north-south across the platform of the Depot. And we will
trust you, and we may even assist and advise you, given the opportunity as those details are worked out in carefully engineering designs.

And, fourthly, I urge that the draft EIS give very close attention to a number of mitigations matter and some in particular that I would say deserve top priority. The first is public safety. Public safety issues at grade crossing, having to do with air quality, related nighttime noise. I'm sure that you will have experienced from other rails and from other analyses that we'll lead you to finding the right mitigation to those issues.

Secondly, I especially urge that close attention and detail be given to mitigating wherever the property lines are intended to fall on the south side of the tracks across from the Depot. As you know, it's a very tight order, and literally every centimeter is going to count there. And mitigation for any property -- for any property that's a property taking or property intrusion, is the right thing to do there.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Can I ask you to wrap up, because we have quite a few more speakers?
MR. TENER: You bet. Those were the particular points with regard to the EIS. But I also want to second the comment that right beyond this extension to the Ontario Airport is going to bring exceptional benefits of
all of the kinds the EIS is going to cover. And so we'll be
applauding every comment that appears, that may refer to
extending us to the east.

Thanks for your time here.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you. Paul Wheeler and then
Danny -- I'm sorry if I say it wrong.

MR. HALZNECHT: Danny Halznecht.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: In the first -- we're neighbors to the
tracks. And when we first looked at your preliminary plans
years ago, one track as proposed. We believed you and we
really believed this is a very good solution, rather than
having two, which really means four tracks through
Claremont. Currently, if you look at College Avenue and
Indian Hill, where they cross the track, the track, it really
backs up. It backs beyond Bonita and almost down to Arrow.

So what I ask you to do in your preliminary design
concepts is a couple of things. Look at -- they need a bus
lane. There's one in the San Fernando Valley. It's
extremely inexpensive. Spend the money wisely and
prudently, and with hard work for all us to make it.
Another way is to consider the conflicts of all these tracks with our traffic, and, maybe, put it in like the Alameda corridor and put it in a trench. I see in Pasadena you've done it and it really seems, you know, an open trench, that
really seems to work.

And if that's too much money, get rid of prevailing wage. You're a smart man. You don't pay the guy 45 bucks an hour to lean on a shovel. Why do you want us to pay that equivalent to build your railroad?

Thank you.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Thanks, Paul. Danny and then Joel --

another big name -- Covarrubias.

MR. HALZNECHT: Hi. Good evening. I'm Danny Halznecht.

That's kind of a tough act to follow there. One thing that Paul didn't mention is he owns a property right on the south side of the tracks. There's a picture of the Depot. It's right there. It pretty important, the real estate is very tight there. I happen to live in the planned unit development complex on Leyland Court, which is on the corner of Arrow Highway and Claremont Boulevard where we already have some real issues with the FTA buses that come down that street quite a bit.

We have had an issue at our complex a few years ago, a couple years ago with regard to drainage and flooding. We had units flooded out due to improper grading,
and drain clearances up there with regard to Metrolink.

There's been talk about don't touch the station, if there's a grade separation at Towne Avenue and, apparently, that is to, what, assuage Metrolink, the Metrolink gods. Why can't
you build a below grade on the south side of the existing
Metrolink tracks, make that below grade and put the
Gold Line down through that?
I assume it's going to be a narrower vehicle, it's
going to take less real estate to put in. And also, I
think, on that picture that you guys showed, it didn't show
the wires hanging over the top that.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, it did.
MR. HALZNECHT: Did it? I didn't see it. But you'll
notice I just took my glasses off. It's just very narrow
through there. There's been some talk about opening up
1st Street all the way through Richton in Montclair. I know
were -- other than being a southern Claremonter, it's also
on the county line in kind of nebulous area over there. The
maps didn't even show the area where I'm at.
And we're very concerned about narrowsness. The lady
that spoke that lived on Elder Drive, I understand those issues.
I also sell real estate in this town. And I understand the
impact of that. If the Metrolink tracks are moved to the
south side of that corridor, that, you know, you have no
control over what Metrolink does with their train, whether
it's below grade, above grade, at grade.

And, you know, we have to stop playing Little League on Saturday when that train comes by anyway because of the sound and the force of those things coming by --
through there. And it's been an issue. I think we really
need to take a look. We fought very, very hard to got the
210 Freeway below grade. They said it couldn't be done.
Well, it was done, and we got it done. And I think we're
going to get to take a look at the impacts that this could
cause.

So thank you.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you, Danny. Joel then
Thomas Bleakney.

MR. COVARRUBIAS: Hi. Joel Covarrubias. I apologize
for the long last name. I'll see what I can do about it.
I just had a few comments, I act like I'm reading. Few
comments. Number one, I wanted to know what kind of
ridership has been projected on this line, on this part
of, apparently, a very long line, possible from Ontario to
Long Beach at this point.

And that brings me to my second point, I've been
working as a citizen with a lot -- on a lot of these
projects, working, going to these kinds of meetings, and
I'm aware that their current proposal is Blue Line to go
Pasadena from Long Beach once regional connector opens up.
And then we're extending it to Azusa, and then we're extending it possibly to Montclair and then to Ontario. It seems a little operationally suspect.

And I'm assuming that Metro is going to be handling
the operational aspects of this line. I would also assume
that there needs to be some discussion between Metro and the
Gold Line Authority about how this would work. Would there
be a Long Beach to Pasadena line? And then a Montclair to
Pasadena line broken up or would it be one single line that
traffic traverses, what, 70 miles or something like that?
Anyway, I would like to hear more about that. I
think a lot of other people might want to as well.
Especially, getting back to the Blue Line is currently
running a very short head ways, possibly every six minutes,
something like that. And would they be the same frequency
out here as well?
You know, whether or not that's a good thing, let
people decide. But I think it would be good to address.
Finally, I think a lot of people's concerns here, I've seen
this happen with the Westwood -- West Side Extension, where
lack of -- certain lack of discussion happened with certain
groups within the communities. And it leads to friction,
you know, I just urge you to, you know, keep open ears and,
you know, I understand a lot of these decisions haven't been
made yet, so you can't be too committal about it.
But at the same time, you know, it's just good to keep the lines of communication open. Especially, with this extension, probably more than any other extension. It has a historical aspect to it. I think people feel very strongly
about it. Just make sure that you watch those structural
resources at the Depot.

Thank you.

MS. LEVY BUCH: To answer one of the questions. With
regards to the ridership, one of our functions right now is
to look at the ridership, and we're also going to be taking
in consideration the other projects, the regional connector
and elements of the Metro system that's being planned and
under construction. So that will all be part of the
ridership that we looked at, so we are cognizant of that and
we're also working very closely with Metro.

Thomas, and then the last card I have is

Duane Jackman.

MR. BLEAKNEY: Hi, I'm Thomas Bleakney. I have two
points and I did come late. So I apologize if these have
already been asked. The first is in regards to bus
connections with the stations. You've talked about the
frequency of train sounds nice, but it's important that
there be bus connections that support those trains.

The other issue -- suggestion is that your stations
make adequate provisions for multiple charging ports for
electric vehicles. Have you provided any in that planning
at all? As I understand the EV1 era of electric vehicles,
there was a charging station here at Claremont for that.
And it sounds like there's going to be a lot more electric
vehicle in this next phase, and so you'll probably need
multiple stations for that.

MS. LEVY BUCH: The Authority has a grant right now to
look at the bus interface car stations, so we are looking at
that. And we're also working very closely with all the
cities to make sure that the interfacing is there. Thank
you.

I'm going to go ask people to keep your comments as
short as possible, so we can open it up to open house and
have people be able to ask their questions one on one and
write their comments down.

MR. JACKMAN: I'm Duane Jackman. I live nearby. I was
interested in your maps showing the locations of the
stations, and also the size of the land that's available in
each of those. That's one thing that I would like to
understand why -- how that fit into when, maybe, you
projected the participation of the riders would be. And
second is the location of the stops. I know you're working
with cities, and you're committed to those cities to provide
mass transportation.

But there are a couple of people that referred to
what happens around the world with regards to transportation. And I think that if you're really looking at it this far in advance, you need to look a little bit outside of the box and see if you might to be able to find
transportation that could be provided for riders to Pasadena and beyond.

That really is compatible with all the things going on currently in the cities, but it's also very conducive to riders. I have a feeling that you have more riders from Rancho Cucamonga probably than any other community by the year 2017. The other thing I note from a transportation point of view, is the concept of having foot traffic out of traffic and rapid transportation at different levels. So I think we can get into these tight areas. We need to look at that, even if it's just a short distance underground for riders or a short distance for a train. I think that's really something that needs to be studied carefully.

And I appreciate you coming tonight.

MS. LEVY BUCH: Thank you. And I just got two, so Kent Hughles will be our last speaker.

MR. HUGHLES: Thank you. I was sitting there listening and I had a couple of questions. I'll make it fast. In using the Gold Line and going to -- I mean, I like the idea of going to Pasadena in 40 minutes and sitting down. Once I get there, will there be connecting -- if I do this, will
there be connecting transportation to get me where I'm going?

Is that being coordinated in line with us being down here or is it going to be -- I hope it's going to be
there situation? If I want to, say, go to Pasadena and go
down to Lake Avenue shopping, will I be able to get a bus, or
is that going to be only what Pasadena does? Is that going
to be a Pasadena issue or a Gold Line issue?
MS. LEVY BUCH: Why don't you go ahead and give us your
questions.
MR. HUGHLES: The other one is the noise. People who
live along the corridor right now, they have to deal with
probably one horn every half hour, at the most. Now you're
talking about going to up to six trains an hour with the
Gold Line, which means a horn about every ten minutes. It
also means stoppage on Indian Hill and College Boulevard
about every ten minutes, and maybe a little bit more during
the peak periods of traffic when people are trying to get
around. I just wanted to mention that.
And the other one is, seven years is a long time to
be able to project what you think is going to go on. And I
just want to mention to people here in general, that what
you're projecting may not be what happens. You're counting
on this. So that's all I wanted to say. Thanks.
MS. LEVY BUCH: Do you want to talk about grade cross
analysis that we're going to do really, really quickly. And anything with regards to how we're going to coordinate with Metro with regards to buses?

MR. KIM: Sure. The environmental document does include
a section on traffic and the traffic impacts at grade crossing. There is something called a Metro grade process policy. It will be applied to every cross location in the entire study area. So it will be looked at. And what comes out of that study will help tell us what mitigations do make sense for impacts at that given location, and we're aware that there is concerns in Claremont about that.

With respect to where you get on a station in you Pasadena, the Construction Authority is working very closely with Metro. And Metro has a Measure R. program, and part of that program is to realign their services and realign their routes. There are a lot of legacy routes that have been here a long time, but there are new systems coming on line.

So what they're very interested in doing is to come up with a sort of a bus tier network that feeds into stations that does serve a couple functions. One is local circulation to get where you want to go in your immediate vicinity of the station, and also to serve trips that are a little bit longer. So, you know, it kind of happens in staging, but Metro is embarking on those types of bus service restructuring plan as part of the Gold Line.
MS. LEVY BUCH: I think the comments tonight here tonight were really helpful and were all taken on the record by our court reporter. We will stay a little longer then 8:00 if necessary to answer your questions, to get your
feedback in writing, if you would like to speak to the
court reporter.

And, again, you have until February 2nd, the
close of the comment period, to provide your comments in
writing. And the address and all that information is on
your handout as well as on your comment sheets.

Thank you for coming.

MS. IRVINE: My comment is: I live on this street that
runs immediately below the proposed train tracks, the
current Metrolink tracks, and I need that street to use the
Metrolink train on a daily basis. And it's greatly improved
the quality of my family's life. And so we're excited about
having more opportunities to use public transportation to
get more places. We wouldn't live in Claremont if it didn't
have the Metrolink train. And we hope the Gold Line train
will help with meeting other work opportunities and provide
other opportunities for my family.

And since I live, you know, just on the south side
of the tracks, I'm a little concerned about the noise.

Currently, I can't sleep past 6:30 in the morning due to the
train horns. And so, yeah, that's my only concern is that
noise being reduced as much as possible.  We've already put
in sound proofing insulation in our walls, and they're
called, like, freeway sound reducer windows, but the horns
are still quite loud.
And, of course, I'm concerned about it reducing the value of my house, since I live south, immediately south, of the tracks.

MR. BELLIS: I'm a resident over on Elder Drive, and I live on the north side of the street. And the north side of my property is right up against the existing railroad right-of-way. And I understand it's going to be very tight having the tracks, four tracks, in that narrow corridor. And I'm really concerned about the sound, and, like, the sight and visual picture and the vibrations. And I was hoping the that the Authority considers putting up sound walls and other structures to mitigate the sound and the sight and visual aspects of the train.
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