

39. Garabetian, Anton, Program and Project Supervisor, Rail Crossings Engineering Section, Consumer Protection and Safety Division, California Public Utilities Commission, October 15, 2012.

Response 39-1

The Construction Authority acknowledges the rules and regulations to which this project is subject. The Construction Authority will file formal applications in accordance with the CPUC's Rules of Practice and Procedure for new crossing locations, including grade separation structures. The Construction Authority will also file requests for modifications to existing crossing in accordance with the CPUC's General Order 88-B. With the exception of two new flyover structures, all grade crossings are existing rail at-grade crossings.

Response 39-2

The project is proposed as an at-grade system similar in design to Metro's existing Blue Line and Gold Line between Union Station and Sierra Madre Villa. As stated in Section 3.12.3.4 of the Draft EIR, fencing will be provided along the alignment where LRTs travel at speeds in excess of 35 mph in adherence with CPUC guidelines. As the design of the project is refined, it is possible that fencing also will be specified at other locations. The Construction Authority will work with SCRRRA/Metrolink and the Cities to identify additional fencing locations as needed.

Response 39-3

As shown in Table 2-27 of the Draft EIR, the operation of the project would result in additional traffic delay at the Grand Avenue and Foothill Boulevard (Intersection No. 3) in the AM peak period. However, the analysis also indicated that the highest peak hour volumes at this crossing intersection would not result in a significant impact. Following the Metro *Policy for Grade Crossing for Light Rail Transit*, the Grand Avenue and Foothill Boulevard intersection was evaluated in the Initial Screening, Milestone 1 evaluation and it was determined that a grade separation would not be required. The intersection was categorized as "Possible At-Grade Operation" and will be evaluated further in a Milestone 2 analysis. Table 2-32 in the Draft EIR presented the recommended improvements at the Grand Avenue/Foothill Boulevard intersection. As the design of the project is refined, the Construction Authority will work with the City of Glendora to determine which of the recommended improvements to implement.

Response 39-4

Section 2.6 of the Draft EIR included a traffic impact analysis of both the Vermont Avenue/East Ada Avenue (#4) and Vermont Avenue/West Ada Avenue (#7) intersections and did not identify a significant traffic impact at either intersection. Both intersections are currently Stop controlled.

Response 39-5

The Construction Authority has refined the design of the Glendora Station to include a pedestrian bridge at the Glendora Station connecting the parking garage and the station platform as recommended in the comment. This information, including a description of the pedestrian bridge has been included in the Final EIR.

Response 39-6

As stated in Section 2.5.5 of the Draft EIR, 26 crossings were evaluated using Metro's *Policy for Grade Crossing for Light Rail Transit*. This evaluation shows how highway traffic would be affected by proposed train headway operations. It is also used to determine whether an at-grade crossing is feasible or a grade separation should be studied in more detail. The study concluded that at-grade crossings were feasible for the nine crossings in the City of Glendora referenced in the comment. The Construction Authority proposes using safety measures, including four-quadrant gates, at each crossing in order to ensure safety while also maintaining the access needed for local traffic and emergency vehicle response time.

Response 39-7

As stated on page 2-92 of the Draft EIR, operation of the project will not result in a significant traffic impacts at the intersection of Bonita Avenue and Cataract Avenue (Intersection 34). The Milestone 1 analysis, in accordance with Metro's *Policy for Grade Crossing for Light Rail Transit*, also indicated that the highest peak hour volumes at this crossing intersection would not meet the warrants for grade-separation per the application of the Metro Grade Crossing Policy. The Milestone 1 grade-crossing analysis identified the Bonita/Cataract intersection as a location that would required detailed engineering-level operation and safety analyses, concluding that an improvement would be required to maintain safe operations with an at-grade configuration. These potential improvements are listed in Table 2-30 of the Draft EIR and include a recommendation to reconfigure the intersection as a traffic island or re-align Bonita Avenue and reduce the median width to reduce the size of the intersection. As stated in Section 2.6 of the Draft EIR, one of these recommendations will be implemented. The Construction Authority will continue to work with the City of San Dimas to further refine the design of the crossing to incorporate this recommendation or other improvements as the project design progresses.

Response 39-8

As stated in Section 2.5.5 of the Draft EIR, 26 crossings were evaluated using Metro's *Policy for Grade Crossing for Light Rail Transit*. This evaluation shows how highway traffic would be affected by proposed train headway operations. It is also used to determine whether an at-grade crossing is feasible or a grade separation should be studied in more detail. The study concluded that at-grade crossings were feasible for the six crossings in the City of San Dimas referenced in the comment. The project description includes safety measures, including four-quadrant gates, at each crossing in order to ensure safety while also maintaining the access needed for local traffic and emergency vehicle response time.

Response 39-9

The proposed at-grade pedestrian crossing location at the City of San Dimas connects the platform with the parking structure with a minimum of walking distance. The crossing in San Dimas, unlike the one in Glendora, traverses only one LRT track. Several such configurations are currently part of the operating Gold Line (Del Mar Station, Little Tokyo/Arts District Station), indicating that the proposed pedestrian crossing is safe and fully consistent with Metro design policy and practice. The Construction Authority will work with CPUC and the City of San Dimas to ensure that safety measures (such as pedestrian crossing gates, signs, and/or barriers) are appropriately configured in final design to address safety concerns.

Response 39-10

As stated in Section 2.5.5 of the Draft EIR, 26 crossings were evaluated using Metro’s *Policy for Grade Crossing for Light Rail Transit*. This evaluation shows how highway traffic would be affected by proposed train headway operations. It is also used to determine whether an at-grade crossing is feasible or a grade separation should be studied in more detail. The study concluded that at-grade crossings were feasible for the five crossings in the City of La Verne referenced in the comment. The Construction Authority proposes using safety measures, including four-quadrant gates, at each crossing in order to ensure safety while also maintaining the access needed for local traffic and emergency vehicle response time.

Response 39-11

The proposed at-grade pedestrian crossing location at the City of La Verne connects the platform with the parking structure with a minimum of walk distance. The crossing in La Verne, unlike the one in Glendora, traverses only one LRT track. Several such configurations are currently part of the operating Gold Line (Del Mar Station, Little Tokyo/Arts District Station), indicating that the proposed pedestrian crossing is safe and fully consistent with Metro design policy and practice. The Construction Authority will work with CPUC and the City of La Verne to ensure that safety measures (such as pedestrian crossing gates, signs, and/or barriers) are appropriately configured in final design to address safety concerns.

Response 39-12

Mitigation measure LTR-2 in the Final EIR has been expanded as follows to include an interconnection to the Metrolink crossing and the Arrow Highway/E Street intersection:

LTR-2—In La Verne, the Construction Authority shall cooperatively work with the City, and contribute funding as necessary, to ensure the signalization of the intersections of White Avenue and First Street, White Avenue and Second Street, Arrow Highway at the Metrolink crossing, Arrow Highway and E Street, and La Verne Avenue and Arrow Highway when warranted.

Response 39-13

Mitigation measure LTR-3 listed in Section 2.8.2 of the Draft EIR calls for the Construction Authority to work cooperatively with the City of La Verne, and contribute funding as necessary, to ensure the signalization of the intersections of White Avenue and First Street, White Avenue and Second Street, and La Verne Avenue and Arrow Highway.

Response 39-14

Mitigation measure LTR-4, listed in Section 2.8.2 of the Draft EIR calls for the Construction Authority to work cooperatively with the City of Pomona, and contribute funding as necessary, to ensure the signalization of the intersection of Fulton Road and Bonita Avenue and to address this issue.

Response 39-15

As stated in Section 2.5.5 of the Draft EIR, 26 crossings were evaluated using Metro’s *Policy for Grade Crossing for Light Rail Transit*. This evaluation shows how highway traffic would be affected by proposed train headway operations. It is also used to determine whether an at-grade crossing is feasible or a grade separation should be

studied in more detail. The study concluded that at-grade crossing was feasible for the Garey Avenue crossing in the City of Pomona. A subsequent additional VISSIM analysis similarly concluded that at-grade operation is feasible without significant impacts with the implementation of the identified mitigation measures. Please see Response 16-4, which provides the details of the VISSIM methodology and results.

The Construction Authority also proposes using safety measures, including four-quadrant gates, at each crossing in order to ensure safety while also maintaining the access needed for local traffic and emergency vehicle response time.

Response 39-16

As stated in Section 2.5.5 of the Draft EIR, 26 crossings were evaluated using Metro’s *Policy for Grade Crossing for Light Rail Transit*. This evaluation shows how highway traffic would be affected by proposed train headway operations. It is also used to determine whether an at-grade crossing is feasible or a grade separation should be studied in more detail. The study concluded that at-grade crossing was feasible for the Indian Hill Boulevard crossing in the City of Claremont referenced in the comment. The Construction Authority proposes using safety measures, including four-quadrant gates, at each crossing in order to ensure safety while also maintaining the access needed for local traffic and emergency vehicle response time.

Response 39-17

As stated in Section 2.5.5 of the Draft EIR, twenty-six crossings were evaluated using Metro’s *Policy for Grade Crossing for Light Rail Transit*. This evaluation shows how highway traffic would be affected by proposed train headway operations. It is also used to determine whether an at-grade crossing is feasible or a grade separation should be studied in more detail. The study concluded that at-grade crossing was feasible for the Claremont Boulevard crossing in the City of Claremont referenced in the comment.

CPUC’s comment regarding the extensive pedestrian crossing over four tracks is acknowledged; the concern is addressed by the four quadrant gates and pedestrian gates that will be part of the project design at this rail crossing location.

Response 39-18

The project definition includes the extension of the existing pedestrian tunnel at Montclair Station to provide safe access to the Metrolink and LRT platforms and parking lot/TransCenter. Please see Section 1.3.3.7 of the Draft EIR.

Response 39-19

The Construction Authority acknowledges the CPUC is a responsible agency under CEQA Section 15381 with regard to this project. The Construction Authority will submit for CPUC review the Final EIR and any substantial future design refinements.